

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2009 - 2010 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: PEMBROKE LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Rosemary Lester

SAC Chair: Gail Perrott

Superintendent: Dr. James Notter

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 09-18-2009

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commission
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Frances Haithcock, Chance
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

VISION and MISSION STATEMENTS

The vision of Pembroke Lakes Elementary is to provide the highest quality of education for all students. Our mission, in collaboration with the community and parents, is to establish a safe learning environment with high expectations that challenges individual students to meet their potential using effective teaching and technology.

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

SCHOOL PROFILE/DEMOGRAPHICS

Brief History and Background of the School

- The school opened in 1976 and is a neighborhood school and currently serves 710 students in grades kindergarten – fifth.
- The school is not retrofitted, which causes many tech challenges including the out-dated infrastructure, electrical power, placement of equipment and equalization of all classrooms.
- Pembroke Lakes provides after-school tutorial camps in reading and math. The aftercare program also provides our students after school academic programs.

Unique School Strengths for Next Year

- 100% of teachers are highly qualified
- 83% of teachers are ESOL endorsed
- 53% are dually certified ESE and Elementary Education
- 51% of our teachers have 15+ years experience
- 45% of teachers with advanced degrees
- Test score percentages in all areas increased or maintained
- 4% National Board certified teachers

Unique School Weaknesses for Next Year

- Lost a portion of the school budget
- Due to budget, 2 trained teachers with experience in technology and Science were surplus.
- Have a drop in enrollment.
- The free and reduced lunch sub group is increasing.

Student Demographics

School Year	2007	2008	2009
Female Percentage	48.1	47.3	48.7
Male Percentage	51.8	52.6	51.2
White Percentage	40.4	34.9	31.1
Black Percentage	11.5	14.1	15.5
Hispanic Percentage	41.7	44.5	47.2
Asian Percentage	2.20	2.32	1.80
Native Percentage	0.25	0.41	0.41
Multi Percentage	3.88	3.69	3.88
Free Reduced Percent	26.1	27.3	34.8
ELL Percentage	8.80	6.84	5.69
ESE Percentage	12.1	12.3	10.8

Student Attendance Rates

School Year 2007 2008 2009
94.50 95.00 94.70

Student Mobility

School Year 2007 2008 2009
13.70 14.70 13.60

Student Suspension Rates

School Year 2007 2008 2009
In-School Suspension 0.10 0.40 0.40
Out-of-School Suspension 0.50

Student Retention Rates

School Year 2007 2008 2009
2.35 2.55

Class Size

School Year 2007 2008 2009
PK – 3 Average 17.90 17.00 17.50
4 – 8 Average 20.56 21.29 20.32

Academic Performance of Feeder Pattern

NA

Partnerships and Grants

Our partners annually sponsor the "Colonial Williamsburg SS Live" Program, provide financial donations to the school to enhance our science, soc. studies, reading, and math curriculums, provide incentives to motivate student achievement, established a schoolwide student banking program, teacher incentives, donate products and goods, and assist with food drives.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#)

[Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Trend Data](#)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\) Trend Data](#)

HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record *
Principal	Rosemary Lester	M.S. B.S. Certifications: Adm/Sup K-12, School Principal All Levels, Elem. Ed. 1-6, Early Childhood Nursery-K, Emotionally Handicapped K- 12, Specific Learning Disabilities K-12, ESOL	9	22	2003-2009 = A 2006-07: Rdg:87%Math:89% Wr: 95%Sci:52% AYP:Yes 2007-08: Rdg:87% Math:91% Wr: 97%Sci:59% AYP: No 2008-09: Rdg:88%Math:91% Wr: 99% Sci:61%AYP:Yes
Assis Principal	Cynthia Slater	M.S. Educational Leadership B.S. Elementary Education (1-6) ESOL for Administrators ESE Certification	5	5	2003-2009 = A 2006-07: Rdg:87%Math:89% Wr: 95%Sci:52% AYP:Yes 2007-08: Rdg:87% Math:91% Wr: 97%Sci:59% AYP: No 2008-09: Rdg:88%Math:91% Wr: 99% Sci:61%AYP:Yes

* Note: Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades and AYP information along with the associated school year)

HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as a Coach	Prior Performance Record *
Reading	Evelyn Evans	BS music Ed., Music K- 12, Elementary Ed 1-6 ESOL Reading Endorsement in progress	25	9	2003-2009 = A 2006-07: Rdg:87% Math:89% Wr: 95% Sci:52% AYP:Yes 2007-08: Rdg:87%Math:91% Wr: 97% Sci:59% AYP: No 2008-09: Rdg:88% Math:91% Wr: 99% Sci:61% AYP:Yes

* Note: Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades and AYP information along with the associated school year)

HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1.Classroom Walk-Throughs 2.Modeling of 9 High Yield Strategies 3.Professional Development 4.New Educator Support System	1.Mrs. Lester,Ms. Slater 2.Mrs. Lester,Ms. Slater 3.Mrs. Lester 4.Mrs. Lester, Ms. Morris	6/1/2010	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified
NA	NA	NA	NA

Staff Demographics

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 Qualified	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed
38	1	25	23	51	45	100	6	4	83

Teacher Mentoring Program

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Lisa Siedle	Mark White	Team leader with teacher changing grade level, expertise with Instructional Focus Calendar and grade level strategies	Team collaboration, CWT
Kay Cleary	Amy Montgomery Mary Maxwell Joyce Palmer	Team leader with teacher changing grade level, expertise with Instructional Focus Calendar and grade level strategies	Team collaboration, CWT
	Brian Doogue	Team leader with teacher changing grade level	

Danielle Villano	Suzie Hicks Krissy Loconto Cindy Vanderlaan	New teacher on staff, expertise with Instructional Focus Calendar and grade level strategies	Team collaboration, CWT
Rosanna Orrett	Carole Cohen	Team leader with teacher changing grade level, expertise with Instructional Focus Calendar and grade level strategies	Team collaboration, CWT
Jenny Summerall	Adam Rizzi Carol Rose Allison Koplo	Team leader with teacher changing grade level New teacher on staff, expertise with Instructional Focus Calendar and grade level strategies	Team collaboration, CWT
Kim Gregory	Lauren Chunn	Most senior ID teacher	Team Collaboration, CWT

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Title I, Part A

NA

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

NA

Title III

NA

Title X- Homeless

NA

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

NA

Violence Prevention Programs

NA

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

NA

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-based RtI Team

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

- Administrators
 - ESE Specialist
 - Reading Specialist
 - Guidance Counselor
 - Psychologist
 - Social Worker
 - Classroom Teacher
 - Itinerant Teachers as needed
- Comprehensive Problem Solving Team

Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g. meeting processes and roles/functions).

Meets regularly (every 2nd and 4th Thursday of the month). Reading Specialist facilitates meeting. Student data reviewed. Parent is always included. Recommendations recorded and followed up by reading specialist and/or ESE specialist.

Describe the role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan

- Review and Monitor Data
- Vertical Teaming
- Collaborate with Classroom Teachers
- Differentiated Professional Staff Development
- (K-5) Grade Level Team Meetings

RtI Implementation

Describe the data management system used to summarize tiered data.

We will be using the district's data management system for RtI to summarize tiered data.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

Monthly Professional Learning Communities and grade level team meetings for close progress monitoring.

School Wide Florida's Continuous Improvement Model

Plan

Data Disaggregation 2008-2009 FCAT Data

What strengths and weaknesses were identified in the 2009 data by grade level, subject area, and clusters/strands?

Reading Strand Key: Grade 4 Grade 5
A. Comparisons and Cause/Effect decreased 1% increased 6%
B. Reference and Research decreased 2% increased 7%
C. Main Idea, Plot, Purpose decreased 6% decreased 6%
D. Words and Phrases in Context increased 4% decreased 11%
Math Strand Key: Grade 4 Grade 5
A. Algebraic Thinking increased 5% decreased 11%

- B. Data Analysis & Probability increased 2% decreased 16%
- C. Geometry & Spacial Sense increased 4% decreased 9%
- D. Measurement decreased 2% decreased 9%
- E. Number Sense, Concepts & Operations decreased 1% increased 1%

Instructional Calendar Development

What is the process for developing, implementing, and monitoring an Instructional Focus Calendar for reading, writing, mathematics, and science?

All teachers will follow the Focus Calendar developed by the district. All Grade Level Teams monitor, and analyze test core content areas for writing, reading, mathematics, and science.

Which instructional Benchmarks will be given priority focus, based on need, for each content area (reading, writing, mathematics, and science)?

Reading: LAA221 (old) LA 1.7.3. (new) main idea and details
 Math: Measurement, data analysis and probability strands
 Writing: main ideas and supporting details
 Science: Scientific Thinking, Earth and Space Sciences

What is the process to ensure instruction is based on individual students' needs, as opposed to the master schedule?

Monitors the Instructional Focus Calendar which infuses:

- Differentiated Accountability
- BEEP Mini-Assessments
- Realigning Reading Groups
- Data Analysis with Team Leaders
- Data chats and student progress monitoring
- Progress monitoring will be done with BEEP Lessons, mini-Benchmark assessments. BAT 2 results and Treasures FCAT Format Benchmark Assessments for 3rd and fourth quarters. Progress monitoring STAR Early Literacy in grades K and 1, Letter & Sound Inventory, Phonics Survey in Cool Tools, Rigby PM Benchmark used in grades 1 & 2 as well as recommended assessments from the Focus Calendar.

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

Departmentalized instruction in grades 4 and 5 pair science/writing, and reading/social studies. All grades use non-fiction text for the teaching of reading. Hands on science activities require math related data.

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?

NA

DO

Direct the Instructional Focus

How are lesson plans and instructional delivery aligned across grade levels and subject areas?

Team planning, team leader meetings, curriculum committees for vertical alignment.

How are instructional focus lessons developed and delivered?

Instructional focus calendars will be implemented across all curriculum areas.

How will instructional focus lessons be revised and monitored?

Lessons will be revised based on student performance.

CHECK

Assessment

Describe the types of ongoing formative assessments to be used during the school year to measure student progress in core, supplemental, and intensive instruction/intervention.

BAT, FCAT, Mini Assessments from Beep, STAR, STAR Early Literacy, FAIR, and District Assessments designated on the Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC's).

How are assessments used to identify students reaching mastery and those not reaching mastery?

Teachers will use the previous FCAT Strands & BAT Strands to drive instruction in grades 3 – 5 for all students, based on their needs. Progress monitoring assessments will show proficiency with a score of 70% or greater. STAR Early Literacy provides progress monitoring reports in strengths and weaknesses for K & 1.

Maintenance

How is ongoing assessment and maintenance of Benchmark mastery for each grade level and content area built into the Instructional Focus Calendar?

IFC's build skills required in each grade level.

Describe the process and schedule for teams to review progress monitoring data (summative and mini assessments) to identify the required instructional modifications that are needed to increase student achievement.

Regular team meetings will be held to review data from assessments and modifications to the instructional process will be implemented as needed.

Monitoring

Describe the Principal's and Leadership Team's roles as instructional leaders and how they will be continuously involved in the teaching and learning process.

- Discussions To Take Place
- Leadership Team Meetings-Monthly
- Grade Level Meetings-Weekly
- SAC SUB Committee Meetings-Monthly
- Team Leaders Meetings-Monthly

ACT

Supplemental and Intensive Instruction/Interventions

Identify the core, supplemental, and intensive instruction and interventions.

Progress monitor AYP Subgroups, differentiated instruction, Reading groups/skill groups, classroom assignments, modified assignments & homework for these students.
Individual Zone of Proximal Development for Accelerated Reader to meet needs
ESOL Matrix
SWD IEP accommodations

How are supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions and tutorials structured to re-teach non-mastered target areas?

- Differentiated Accountability
- BEEP Mini-Assessments
- Realigning Reading Groups
- Data Analysis with Team Leaders
- Review Data and Student Progress
- Computer Assisted Instruction
- Progress monitoring will be done with BEEP Lessons, mini-Benchmark assessments. BAT 2 results and Treasures FCAT Format Benchmark Assessments for 3rd and fourth quarters. Progress monitoring STAR Early Literacy in grades K and 1, Letter & Sound Inventory, Phonics Survey in Cool Tools, Rigby PM Benchmark used in grades 1 & 2 as well as recommended assessments from the Focus Calendar.

How does the school identify staff's professional development needs to improve their instructional strategies?

PGP's, Needs assessment data, analyze test results

Which students will be targeted for supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions?

Level 1 and 2 and the lowest 30% in reading and math.

How will the effectiveness of the interventions be measured throughout the year?

Curriculum portfolios inclusive of BAT, mini benchmark assessments, and grade level progress monitoring data.

Enrichment

Describe alternative instructional delivery methods to support acceleration and enrichment activities.

- Differentiated curriculum
- Combination of curriculum compacting and acceleration of topics for high achievers and gifted track
- Integration of 9 High Yield Strategies

Describe how students are identified for enrichment strategies.

- NNAT – Grade 2
- FCAT scores Grades 3-5
- Teacher/Parent request

Professional Learning Communities

PLC Organization (grade level, subject, etc.)	PLC Leader	Frequency of PLC Meetings	Schedule (when)	Primary Focus of PLC (include Lesson Study and Data Analysis)
K-5 curriculum	Team Leaders, L. McLaughlin, E. Evans	1/month	Sept. - May: One per month	Student progress monitoring, Data Chats, Data Analysis

NCLB Public School Choice

Note: For Title I schools only

- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status
No Attached Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status
- Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification
No Attached Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification
- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status
No Attached Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

Pre-School Transition

- Visitation of pre-schools in the area to our Kindergarten classes
- “Kindergarten Roundup” – an orientation for incoming kindergarten students
- Screening of all incoming kindergarten students

Postsecondary Transition

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

NA

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goal

Needs Assessment:	Based on School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data: Did the total percent proficient increase or decrease? What is the percent change? What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed decrease in proficiency? Did all student subgroups meet AYP targets? If not, which subgroups did not meet the targets? Did 50% or more of the lowest 25% make learning gains? What is the percent of the lowest 25% of students making learning gains? Did 50% or more of the total number tested make learning gains? What is the percent of students making learning gains?
--------------------------	--

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
Low strands: Grade 3: Ref & Reas (61%), Main Idea/Pur (67%) Grade 4: Comparisons (71%) Decrease from '08 Main Idea/Pur (72%) Decrease from '08 Grade 5: Words/Phrases (66%) Decrease from '08 Main Idea/Pur (68%) Decrease from '08 • All student subgroups met AYP. • 62% of the lower 25% made learning gains. • 72% of the students made learning gains. • 75% of Economically Disadvantaged were proficient • Proficiency increased from 87% to 88%.		By June 2010, 75% of 4th and 5th grade students inclusive of all sub-groups will make learning gains on the 2010 FCAT Reading Assessment.		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not meeting AYP criteria, inclusive of all subgroups, will receive extra support in reading through reading resource interventions with the 9 High Yield Strategies. All students will participate in differentiated literacy centers to improve main idea /details and vocabulary strategies.	Team Leader ESE Specialist ESE Support Facilitator	CWT Monthly Team collaboration Data Analysis	Reading Portfolio
2	ELL students will use instructional software and website activities to increase acquisition of the English language.	ESOL Coordinator & Team Leader	Monthly Team Collaboration	Data Reports
3	Grades K - 5 students, inclusive of all subgroups, will utilize newspaper articles, and/or Time for Kids, Scholastic News, National Geographic , and other current publications to promote comprehension in non-fiction areas.	Team Leader	CWT Team Collaboration	FCAT 2010

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
By June 2010, 75% of 4th and 5th grade students inclusive of all sub-groups will make learning gains on the 2010 FCAT Reading Assessment.	Renaissance reports	Reading Specialist	9/24/09	Review of reports at team meeting	Team Leader
By June 2010, 75% of 4th and 5th grade students inclusive of all sub-groups will make learning gains on the 2010 FCAT Reading Assessment.	Differentiated Learning Centers	Reading Specialist	10/7/09 - Gr2 and 3 10/14/09 - Gr 4 and 5 10/21/09 -	CWT	Team Leader, Reading Specialist

By June 2010, 75% of 4th and 5th grade students inclusive of all sub-groups will make learning gains on the 2010 FCAT Reading Assessment.	-Differentiated Learning Centers -Data analysis	Team Leader, Reading Specialist	Gr K and 1 10/23/09	Share Best Practices CWT	Team Leader, Reading Specialist
---	--	---------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------

For Schools with Grades 6-12, Describe the Plan to Ensure the Responsibility of Teaching Reading for Every Teacher

NA

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Upgrade & replacement maintenance for computers	Accountability Funds	\$3,000.00
Renaissance Place Subscriptions	PTA	\$3,826.00
Classroom Newspapers	PTA	\$2,200.00
Total: \$9,026.00		
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Final Total: \$9,026.00		

End of Reading Goal

Mathematics Goal

Needs Assessment: Based on School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:

Did the total percent proficient increase or decrease? What is the percent change?

What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed decrease in proficiency?

Did all student subgroups meet AYP targets? If not, which subgroups did not meet the targets?

Did 50% or more of the lowest 25% make learning gains? What is the percent of the lowest 25% of students making learning gains?

Did 50% or more of the total number tested make learning gains? What is the percent of students making learning gains?

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement	
Low strands: Grade 3: Meas. (70%) Geom/Spac Sense (75%) Grade 4: Meas. (76%) Decrease from '08 Alg Thinking (77%) Increase from '08 Grade 5: Data Anal & Prob (63%) Decrease from '08 Geom/Spac Sense and Meas. (64%) Decrease from '08 • All student subgroups met AYP. • 83% of the lower 25% made learning gains. • 75% of the students made learning gains. • Proficiency maintained at 91%.		By June 2010, 78% of 4th and 5th grade students inclusive of all sub-groups will make learning gains on the 2010 FCAT Math Assessment.	
Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness	Evaluation Tool

		Action Step	of Action Step	
1	Students not meeting AYP criteria, inclusive of all subgroups, will participate in differentiated instructional interventions using the 9 High Yield Strategies.	Team Leader Principal AP ESE Support Facilitator	Monthly Team Meetings CWT	Mini-Assessments Chapter Tests CWT Database
2	Students will use Math manipulatives (including calculators), website activities, and instructional software for mathematics activities integrated with Social Studies and Science.	Team Leader	Monthly Team Meetings CWT	Student work samples CWT Database
3	FCAT Dailies and Mountain/Calendar Math implemented in K-5 to provide practice with grade level benchmarks.	Team Leader	Monthly Team Meetings CWT	CWT Database
4	Students in the lowest 30% will participate in Math Score online course to remediate and reteach.	SAI Teacher	Student Reports, data chats with classroom teachers.	Chapter Test Mini-Assessments

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
By June 2010, 78% of 4th and 5th grade students inclusive of all subgroups will make learning gains on the 2010 FCAT Math Assessment.	Math w/ Manipulatives	Grade Level Rep (Train the Trainer model)	K- 3/26/10 1- 1/19/10 2- 1/19/10 3- 3/26/10 4- 4/22/10 5- 4/22/10	Team presentations and time allotted for creation of materials/activities	Team Leaders
By June 2010, 78% of 4th and 5th grade students inclusive of all subgroups will make learning gains on the 2010 FCAT Math Assessment.	Multiplication	District Trainer	10/20/2009	CWT Mini Benchmarks	Team Leader Math Chair
By June 2010, 78% of 4th and 5th grade students inclusive of all subgroups will make learning gains on the 2010 FCAT Math Assessment.	Fractions	District Trainer	11/5/2009	CWT Mini Benchmarks	Team Leader Math Chair
By June 2010, 78% of 4th and 5th grade students inclusive of all subgroups will make learning gains on the 2010 FCAT Math Assessment.	Algebra	District Trainer	1/20/2010	CWT Mini Benchmarks	Team Leader Math Chair

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Math Score Licenses	Accountability Funds	\$300.00
Total: \$300.00		
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

Training for New Standards/Release Time to Collaborate 4th and 5th	Accountability Funds	\$2,295.00
		Total: \$2,295.00
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Math Manipulatives	Accountability Funds	\$160.00
		Total: \$160.00
Final Total: \$2,755.00		

End of **Mathematics** Goal

Science Goal

Needs Assessment: Based on School Grade Data:
 Did the total percent proficient increase or was the percent proficient maintained?
 What clusters/strands showed decrease in proficiency?

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement			Objective Linked to Area of Improvement	
Lowest strand: Scientific Thinking (62%) 61 % of fifth grade students were proficient on the 2009 FCAT SSS Science Assessment. This is an increase from 59% in 2007-08.			By June 2010, 64% of fifth grade students will be proficient on the FCAT SSS Science Assessment.	
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	All students will be introduced to the scientific method presented at the beginning of the year and integrated throughout all science strands consistently throughout the school year.	Team Leader Science Chair	Monthly Team Meetings CWT Science Committee Meetings	Science Fair School Database Mini Benchmark Assessments
2	Science content, including vocabulary, will be integrated throughout reading, writing, and math curriculum areas K-5.	Team Leader Science Chair	Monthly Team Meeting CWT Science Committee Meetings	Mini Benchmark Assessments
3	All students will use multimedia tools and programs to enhance classroom instruction, practice, and application of skills.	Team Leader	Monthly Team Meetings CWT	Mini Benchmark Assessments
4	All students including all AYP subgroups will use science manipulatives to reinforce skills and concepts.	Team Leader	Monthly Team Meetings	Mini Benchmark Assessments
5	Fifth grade class departmentalization will provide all students with 75 minutes of uninterrupted science instruction on a daily basis.	Team Leader	CWT Master Schedule	Mini Benchmark Assessments FCAT 2010
6	Students inclusive of all AYP subgroups (Grades K-4) will participate in the school science fair by submitting either a class or individual project. Fifth graders will complete an individual science project.	Science Committee Chair	Science Committee Meetings	Science Fair Display

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
---------------------	---------------	-------------	-------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

By June 2010, 64% of fifth grade students will be proficient on the FCAT SSS Science Assessment.	Scientific Thinking	Science Chair Grade level reps	5/28/2010	CWT	Science Chair
By June 2010, 64% of fifth grade students will be proficient on the FCAT SSS Science Assessment.	Promethean - Scientific Thinking	Science Chair	Sept-June - monthly	CWT	TLC

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Delta Kit Replenishment	Accountability Funds	\$600.00
Total: \$600.00		
Final Total: \$600.00		

End of Science Goal

Writing Goal

Needs Assessment: Based on School Grade Data:
 Did the total percent proficient increase or was the percent proficient maintained?
 What clusters/strands showed decrease in proficiency?

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 94% of 4th grade students scored 4.0 and above on the 2009 FCAT expository prompt. 91% of 4th grade students scored 4.0 and above on the 2009 FCAT narrative prompt. 99% demonstrated proficiency. (3.5 and above) 93% scored 4.0 and above. All subgroups improved performance in writing by at least 1%. 		By February 2010, 96% of fourth grade students will score 4.0 and above on the FCAT Writing Assessment.		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	All students will participate in monthly grade level developed writing prompts which will include social studies and science content area.	Writing Chair AP Team Leaders	CWT Team Collaboration Data Chats	Student Portfolio
2	Small group instruction will be provided by classroom teachers to 3rd and 4th grade lower quartile students to reinforce writing skills.	Admin Team Leaders	CWT Team Meetings Data Chats	Student Portfolio School Database
3	ELL/SWD strategies and supplemental materials will be used to provide	ESE Specialist ESE Support Facilitator, ESOL	Team Meetings Professional Learning Communities	Student Portfolio School Database

	instruction for ELL/SWD students	Support Facilitator		
4	All students, inclusive of all AYP sub groups, will use technology to publish a document.	Writing Chair Writing Committee Members	Writing Committee Meetings Team Meetings	Parent Tech/ Academic Night
5	All students in grades 2nd, 3rd, and 5th will participate in a mock writing prompt aligned with the FCAT Writing Assessment.	Team Leaders Writing Chair	Grade Level Meetings	Student Portfolio

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
By February 2010, 96% of fourth grade students will score 4.0 and above on the FCAT Writing Assessment.	Writing Rubrics/Scoring Expository Writing Narrative Writing	Team Leaders	10/20/2009	CWT Team Meetings Review Student Portfolios	Team Leaders Writing Chair Admin
By February 2010, 96% of fourth grade students will score 4.0 and above on the FCAT Writing Assessment.	Expository Writing	Team Leaders	1/19/2010	CWT Team Meetings Review Student Portfolios	Team Leaders Writing Chair Admin
By February 2010, 96% of fourth grade students will score 4.0 and above on the FCAT Writing Assessment.	Narrative Writing	Team Leaders	4/22/2010	CWT Team Meetings Review Student Portfolios	Team Leaders Writing Chair Admin
By February 2010, 96% of fourth grade students will score 4.0 and above on the FCAT Writing Assessment.	Expository/Narrative Writing	Team Leaders	1/2 day Oct. 2009 Gr 1 and 2	CWT Team Meetings	Team Leaders Admin
By February 2010, 96% of fourth grade students will score 4.0 and above on the FCAT Writing Assessment.	Expository/Narrative Writing	Gr 3 Team Leader	Sept. 6 days (1 hr) Feb 6 days (1 hr)	CWT Team Meetings	Gr 3 Team Leader Admin

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1st grade writing training	Accountability Funds	\$425.00
2nd grade writing training	Accountability Funds	\$510.00
3rd grade writing training	Accountability Funds	\$1,170.00
Total: \$2,105.00		
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
(118) 3 prong folders with pockets	Accountability Funds	\$60.00
(118) black pens	Accountability Funds	\$25.00
Total: \$85.00		
Final Total: \$2,190.00		

Parent Involvement Goal

Needs Assessment: Based on information from School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:
 Were parent involvement activities and strategies targeted to areas of academic need?
 Based on information from surveys, evaluations, agendas, or sign-ins:
 Was the percent of parent participation in school activities maintained or increased from the prior year?
 Generally, what strategies or activities can be employed to increase parent involvement?

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
Parent involvement activities and strategies were targeted to areas of academic need, the percent of parent participation in school activities increased from the prior year. 38% parent participation in our event, when technology tools are introduced, parents involvement increases.		By June 2010, we will have 44% participation in Parent Night.		
Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool	
1 All parents will be invited to attend a tech training night introducing current technology tools used to increase student achievement.	Admin	Sign-In sheets	Survey	

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
By June 2010, we will have 44% participation in Parent Night.	Tech Training	Admin	First semester	survey	Admin

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Planning (6) presenters, 1 hr ea.	Accountability	\$90.00
Total: \$90.00		
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Final Total: \$90.00		

Other Goals

No Other Goals were submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00
Technology			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Upgrade & replacement maintenance for computers	Accountability Funds	\$3,000.00
Reading	Renaissance Place Subscriptions	PTA	\$3,826.00
Reading	Classroom Newspapers	PTA	\$2,200.00
Mathematics	Math Score Licenses	Accountability Funds	\$300.00
			Total: \$9,326.00
Professional Development			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Training for New Standards/Release Time to Collaborate 4th and 5th	Accountability Funds	\$2,295.00
Writing	1st grade writing training	Accountability Funds	\$425.00
Writing	2nd grade writing training	Accountability Funds	\$510.00
Writing	3rd grade writing training	Accountability Funds	\$1,170.00
Parental Involvement	Planning (6) presenters, 1 hr ea.	Accountability	\$90.00
			Total: \$4,490.00
Other			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Math Manipulatives	Accountability Funds	\$160.00
Writing	(118) 3 prong folders with pockets	Accountability Funds	\$60.00
Writing	(118) black pens	Accountability Funds	\$25.00
Science	Delta Kit Replenishment	Accountability Funds	\$600.00
			Total: \$845.00
			Final Total: \$14,661.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Intervene
 Correct II
 Prevent II
 Correct I
 Prevent I
 NA

No Attached school's Differentiated Accountability Checklist of Compliance

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.

✓ **Yes. Agree with the above statement.**

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
To support the School Improvement Plan.	11000

Describe the Activities of the School Advisory Council for the Upcoming Year

Data Analysis, Training, Monitor of the school improvement plan, approving budget items, creation of the 2010-2011 plan.

SAC Members

Members

- 1) Rosemary Lester, Principal
- 2) Gail Perrott, SAC Chair
- 3) Jackie Benedit, Teacher
- 4) Evelyn Evans, Teacher
- 5) Danielle Villano, Teacher
- 6) Domenic Franconi, Teacher
- 7) Nova Palmer, Business Member
- 8) Terri Cole, Parent
- 9) Alvaro Dangond, Parent
- 10) Nicole Chevres, Parent
- 11) Jeazette Vazquez, Parent
- 12) Renee Boyle, Parent
- 13) Sandra Garcia, Parent
- 14) Traci Smith, Parent
- 15) Lisa Villaran, Parent
- 16) Stacy Gutierrez, Parent
- 17) Anthony Richiez, Parent
- 18) Maria Lozano, School Support Personnel
- 19) Carole Cohen, Union Steward

AYP DATA

2008-2009 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2													Broward PEMBROKE LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2661															
Number of students enrolled in the grades tested: Click here to see Number of students in each group													Read: 404 Math: 404		2008-2009 School Grade ¹ : A		Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress? YES											
This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c ²).													This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b ²).						This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model.									
Group	Reading Tested 95% of the students?		Math Tested 95% of the students?		65% scoring at or above grade level in Reading?		68% scoring at or above grade level in Math?		Improved performance in Writing by 1%?		Increased Graduation Rate ³ by 1%?		Percent of Students below grade level in Reading		Safe Harbor Reading		Percent of Students below grade level in Math		Safe Harbor Math		% of students on track to be proficient in reading		Growth model reading		% of students on track to be proficient in math		Growth model math	
	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2008	2009	Y/N	2007	2008	Y/N	2008	2009	Y/N	2008	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N
TOTAL ⁴	100	Y	100	Y	82	Y	86	Y			Y			NA	16	18	NA	14	14	NA	80	NA	83	NA				
WHITE	100	Y	100	Y	90	Y	92	Y			Y			NA	11	10	NA	8	8	NA	86	NA	85	NA				
BLACK	100	Y	100	Y	74	Y	82	Y			NA			NA	26	NA		18	NA	71	NA	81	NA					
HISPANIC	100	Y	100	Y	78	Y	84	Y			Y			NA	20	22	NA	17	16	NA	78	NA	83	NA				
ASIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA						NA						NA								
AMERICAN INDIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA						NA						NA								
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	100	Y	100	Y	75	Y	79	Y			Y			NA	21	25	NA	19	21	NA	77	NA	80	NA				
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	100	Y	100	Y		NA		NA						NA						NA								
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	100	Y	100	Y		NA		NA						NA						NA								

2007-2008 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2													Broward PEMBROKE LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2661															
Number of students enrolled in the grades tested: Click here to see Number of students in each group													Read: 389 Math: 389		2007-2008 School Grade ¹ : A		Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress? NO											
This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c ²).													This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b ²).						This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model.									
Group	Reading Tested 95% of the students?		Math Tested 95% of the students?		58% scoring at or above grade level in Reading?		62% scoring at or above grade level in Math?		Improved performance in Writing by 1%?		Increased Graduation Rate ³ by 1%?		Percent of Students below grade level in Reading		Safe Harbor Reading		Percent of Students below grade level in Math		Safe Harbor Math		% of students on track to be proficient in reading		Growth model reading		% of students on track to be proficient in math		Growth model math	
	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2007	2008	Y/N	2006	2007	Y/N	2007	2008	Y/N	2007	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N
TOTAL ⁴	100	Y	100	Y	84	Y	86	Y			Y			NA	17	16	NA	13	14	NA	77	NA	81	NA				
WHITE	100	Y	100	Y	89	Y	92	Y			Y			NA	13	11	NA	10	8	NA	81	NA	83	NA				
BLACK	100	Y	100	Y		NA		NA			NA			NA						NA								
HISPANIC	100	Y	100	Y	80	Y	83	Y			Y			NA	20	20	NA	15	17	NA	74	NA	80	NA				
ASIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA						NA						NA								
AMERICAN INDIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA						NA						NA								
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	100	Y	100	Y	79	Y	81	Y			Y			NA	27	21	NA	17	19	NA	75	NA	77	NA				
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	100	Y	100	Y		NA		NA						NA						NA								
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	100	Y	100	Y	67	Y	60	N						NA		33	NA		40	NA	63	NA	60	N				

2006-2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2													Broward PEMBROKE LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2661															
Number of students enrolled in the grades tested: Click here to see Number of students in each group													Read: 400 Math: 400		2006-2007 School Grade ¹ : A		Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress? YES											
This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c ²).													This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b ²).						This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model.									
Group	Reading Tested 95% of the students?		Math Tested 95% of the students?		51% scoring at or above grade level in Reading?		56% scoring at or above grade level in Math?		Improved performance in Writing by 1%?		Increased Graduation Rate ³ by 1%?		Percent of Students below grade level in Reading		Safe Harbor Reading		Percent of Students below grade level in Math		Safe Harbor Math		% of students on track to be proficient in reading		Growth model reading		% of students on track to be proficient in math		Growth model math	
	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2006	2007	Y/N	2005	2006	Y/N	2006	2007	Y/N	2006	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N
TOTAL ⁴	100	Y	100	Y	83	Y	87	Y			Y			NA	17	19	NA	13	13	NA	75	NA	77	NA				
WHITE	100	Y	100	Y	87	Y	90	Y			Y			NA	17	13	NA	13	10	NA	76	NA	77	NA				
BLACK	100	Y	100	Y		NA		NA			NA			NA						NA								
HISPANIC	100	Y	100	Y	80	Y	85	Y			Y			NA	16	23	NA	11	15	NA	74	NA	79	NA				
ASIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA						NA						NA								
AMERICAN INDIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA						NA						NA								
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	100	Y	100	Y	73	Y	83	Y	94	Y				NA	19	28	NA	17	17	NA	70	NA	82	NA				
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	100	Y	100	Y		NA		NA						NA						NA								
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	99	Y	98	Y		NA		NA						NA						NA								

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

Broward School District PEMBROKE LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2008-2009					
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	91%	99%	61%	339
% of Students Making Learning Gains	72%	75%			147
Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 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.					
3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 					

						1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	62% (YES)	83% (YES)			145	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.
Points Earned					631	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District PEMBROKE LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2007-2008						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	87%	91%	97%	59%	334	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	70%	71%			141	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	66% (YES)	67% (YES)			133	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.
Points Earned					608	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District PEMBROKE LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2006-2007						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	87%	89%	95%	52%	323	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 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	67%	69%			136	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	62% (YES)	74% (YES)			136	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
Points Earned					595	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested