FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: GATEWAY ENVIRONMENTAL K-8 LEARNING CENTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: Carmen Gutierrez

SAC Chair: Kathiria Diaz

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

Gerard Robinson, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Carmen G. Gutierrez	BS in Mentally Handicap & Emotionally Disturbed, MS in TESOL, Specialist in Administration	4	16	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C C B * C AMO N N N * N High Standards Rdg. 48 65 63 * 43 High Standards Math 43 63 67 * 55 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 57 63 * 53 Lrng Gains-Math 56 44 68 * 72 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 50 59 * 55 Gains-Math-25% 47 58 59 * 87 *Worked at MDCPS Region
Assis Principal	Nicole Benitez	BS in Elementary Education w/ ESOL, MS in Educational Leadership	2	2	' 12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C B * B C AMO N N * N N High Standards Rdg. 48 65 * 66 49 High Standards Math 43 63 * 67 61 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 57 * 67 56 Lrng Gains-Math 56 44 * 67 60 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 50 * 64 58 Gains-Math-25% 47 58 * 69 69 * Worked at FLDOE BSI

Assis Principal	Barbara Cicilia	BS in Special Education, MS in Special Education w/ ESOL, Specialist in Educational Leadership	3	3	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C C * * * AMO N N High Standards Rdg. 48 65 High Standards Math 43 63 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 57 Lrng Gains-Math 56 44 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 50 Gains-Math-25% 47 58 *Worked at MDCPS District
Assis Principal	Maritza Correa	BS in Elementary Education, MS in Educational Leadership	4	6	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C C B C C AMO N N N N N High Standards Rdg. 48 65 63 57 51 High Standards Math 43. 63 67 62 58 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 57 63 32 62 Lrng Gains-Math 56 44 68 59 70 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 50 59 50 61 Gains-Math-25% 47 58 59 61 71

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	Maydelin Perez	BS in Elementary Ed. & Early Childhood Masters in Reading K-12	4	9	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C C B A C AMO N N N N N High Standards Rdg. 48 65 63 68 51 High Standards Math 43 63 67 80 66 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 57 63 65 53 Lrng Gains-Math 56 44 68 77 65 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 50 59 61 45 Gains-Math-25% 47 58 59 90 67
Reading	Kathiria Diaz	BS in Elementary Education w/ ESOL, Certification in Social Science 6-12, MS in Educational Leadership	4	1	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C C B C C AMO N N N N N High Standards Rdg. 48 65 63 63 65 High Standards Math 43 63 67 59 53 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 57 63 53 68 Lrng Gains-Math 56 44 68 64 60 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 50 59 46 58
Mathematics	Aline Rodriguez	AS in Child Development, BS in Primary Education w/ ESOL, MS in Primary Education w/ Gifted	3	1	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C C A A B AMO N N N N N High Standards Rdg. 48 65 67 71 64 High Standards Math 43 63 74 78 68 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 57 67 76 62 Lrng Gains-Math 56 44 59 72 65 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 50 72 67 54 Gains-Math-25% 47 58 66 69 NA

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	1. Professional Development	Instructional Coaches	June 2013	
2	2. Professional Learning Communities	Grade Level Chairpersons	June 2013	
3	3. Common Grade Level Planning Time	Administration	August 2012	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Number of instructional staff teaching out-of-field is 32 (28.1%). The number of teachers who are less than effective is 0 (0%)	Instructional staff teaching out-of-field will sign waiver to attend and complete classes for certification within 3 years.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
114	6.1%(7)	34.2%(39)	46.5%(53)	13.2%(15)	36.8%(42)	71.9%(82)	9.6%(11)	2.6%(3)	57.0%(65)

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
No data submitted			

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Gateway Environmental K-8 Learning Center provides services to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities, such as after-school programs, Saturday Academy or summer school. Instructional Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

The District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with District

Drop-out Prevention programs.

Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:
• training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
• training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL
training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols

Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

Staff is trained in District bullying policy procedures. Students are trained to identify and react to bullying situations. Anti-bullying awareness activities are implemented school-wise and in the classroom by guidance counselors along with conflict resolution strategies.

Nutrition Programs

The school adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.
3) The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Grade 7 Civics course is integrated with Career Development. Career Day with community leaders and local business people to introduce students to various career opportunities.

Job Training

N/A

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, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, Guidance Counselors

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

The members of the MTSS Leadership team will meet with the principal, EESAC, and the Literacy Leadership Team to review and develop the SIP. The MTSS team will compile and provide the data from all areas of progress monitoring. The MTSS Team identifies students who need support and interventions. Next, the team collects data to identify areas of needed interventions. A plan will be developed to implement the interventions with fidelity and rigor in the areas of weakness. We will evaluate and modify with progress monitoring. Review the outcomes for individual students and make determinations at that point. The MTSS team works with the other teams in the school through professional development and meetings to coordinate efforts to meet student needs.

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 members of the MTSS Leadership team will meet with the principal, EESAC, and the Literacy Leadership Team to review and develop the SIP. The MTSS team will compile and provide the data from all areas of progress monitoring.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

The following data sources and management systems will be used:
Reading: Edusoft, PMRN, Reading Plus, Renaissance, SuccessMaker, District and Monthly Assessments, CELLA
Mathematics: Edusoft, SuccessMaker, District and Monthly Assessments
Science: Edusoft, District and Monthly Assessments
Writing: Edusoft, District and Monthly Assessments, CELLA
Behavior: Counselor's Logs, Teacher Parent Communication Logs, Weekly Student Reports, FAB/BIP, SCMs
Attendance: Daily attendance bulletin, Truancy reports

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

A training/refresher is provided on the first Professional Development day of the school year where data binders are distributed to each teacher.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Monitor intervention programs by utilizing student data reports. Use strategies to address weaknesses.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Carmen G. Gutierrez, Principal ; Maritza Correa, Assistant Principal; Nicole Benitez, Assistant Principal; Barbara Cicilia, Assistant Principal; Maydelin Perez, Reading Coach; Kathiria Diaz, Reading Coach, Griselda Camejo, Media Specialist

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

The LLT meets monthly in the principal's office to discuss monthly data, interims and progress monitoring.

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

The LLT will compile and distribute data to teachers on a timely basis to make it useable in the classroom. The LLT will also look for school wide and individual classroom patterns in data. The LLT will analyze the data to drive all decision-making while infusing school-wide literacy. The LLT is guided by and supports the K-12 CRRP.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/2/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Gateway is actively involved in assisting preschool children with the transition of early childhood programs to elementary school programs by offering all students academic experiences, even in our Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) classes. The Florida VPK Education Standards include the eight domains: Physical Health, Approaches to Learning, Social and Emotional Development, Language and Communication, Emergent Literacy, Mathematical and Scientific Thinking, Social Studies and The Arts, and Motor Development. The curricula used in our VPK general education classrooms are the High/Scope curriculum framework and Houghton-Mifflin-Harcourt (HMH). Role Model students have been added to our Pre-K Special Education classroom to increase inclusion of children with disabilities. High/Scope and BELL/Wright Skills are used by the Special Education (SPED) Prekindergarten Program with role model VPK students. Role Model Students benefit from this type of program because it creates a more positive attitude towards people with disabilities, while increasing social skills and enhances developmental progress for all students.
Transition from VPK to Kindergarten is facilitated by the collaboration of our VPK and Kindergarten teachers. VPK and Kindergarten activities are developed for parents and students throughout the year. In May students from private Early Education Schools, are invited to participate in an annual field trip to our school. Pre-K students are given the opportunity to spend a day with kindergarten classes, and participated in the daily activities of a typical kindergarten classroom. In addition, parents of registered kindergartners are invited to an orientation prior to the first day of school. Incoming Kindergarten students are given FLKRS (kindergarten screenings) and the FAIR. The assessment results will drive all instruction within the classroom.

*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.

Following the Baseline and District assessments, data will be analyzed to develop an FCIM calendar identifying weak benchmarks, resources to supplement the teaching of those benchmarks and the strategies used in the classroom to facilitate the remediation of those benchmarks. All teachers will implement research-based reading strategies.

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicate that 23% of students achieved proficiency by scoring a Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 28%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (171)	28% (211)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading was reporting category 2 – Reading Application due to limited exposure to reciprocal teaching and incorporation of technology.	Emphasize reading strategies such as Reciprocal Teaching and CRISS strategies. Incorporate Success Maker technology into the elementary learning routine as a daily rotation schedule. Provide computer lab time to secondary to utilize Reading Plus.	Administration Reading Coaches	Following the FCIM model, the reading coaches and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instructions as needed.	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessment, District Interim Assessments and District computer assisted reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Reading indicate that 4% of students scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Levels 4, 5 and 6 by 5 percentage points to 9%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4% (1)	9% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading was reading	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine using a daily rotation schedule.	Reading Coaches SPED Coordinator	Utilize iReady reports to track student progress.	Formative: Unique learning reading tests

1	comprehension due to limited exposure to daily incorporation of technology programs to into the learning routine.				Summative: 2013 FAA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicate that 23% of students scored at or above achievement Level 4. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above achievement Level 4 by 3 percentage points to 26%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (177)	26% (196)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was reporting category 3 – Literary Analysis due to limited exposure to incorporation of the use of exemplar texts in the curriculum.	Incorporate the use of Exemplar texts in the curriculum once per nine-weeks, with a focus on adding rigor.	Administration Reading Coaches	Following the FCIM model, the reading coaches and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instructions as needed.	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessment, District Interim Assessments and District computer assisted reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Reading indicate that 70% of students scored at or above Level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 by 3 percentage points to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (16)	73% (17)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading was reading comprehension due to limited exposure to daily	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine. Use a daily rotation schedule.	Leadership Team Reading Coaches	Utilize iReady reports to track student progress.	Formative: Unique learning reading tests Summative: 2013 FAA

	incorporation of technology programs to into the learning routine.				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicate that 68% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (315)	73% (338)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was reporting category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process due to limited exposure to utilizing assessment data.	Utilize assessment data to regroup students monthly for small-group, skill-based instructions.	Administration Reading Coaches MTSS Team/RtI Team	Following the FCIM model, the reading coaches and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instructions as needed.	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generatec assessment, District Interim Assessments and District computer assisted reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Reading indicate that 63% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (11)	68% (12)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Reading was reading comprehension due to limited exposure to daily incorporation of technology programs to into the learning routine.	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine. Use a daily rotation schedule.	Reading Coaches	Utilize iReady reports to track student progress. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Unique learning reading tests Summative: 2013 FAA

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicate that 71% of students in the lowest 25% quartile made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students from the lowest 25% quartile making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 76%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (86)	76% (92)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was reporting category 1 – Vocabulary due to limited exposure to interventions based on weakness.	Students in this quartile will be identified for intervention. Useful instructional strategies will include instruction in differences in meaning due to context and engaging affix or root word activities.	Administration Reading Coaches MTSS Team/RtI Team	Following the FCIM model, the reading coaches and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instructions as needed.	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessment, District Interim Assessments and District computer assisted reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient by 50%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	51	56	60	65	69	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicate that 56% of students in the White subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase satisfactory progress of students in the White subgroup by 12 percentage points to 68%. Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicate that 43% of students in the Black subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase satisfactory progress of students in the Black subgroup by 1 percentage points to 53%. Additionally, results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicate that 50% of students in the Hispanic subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase satisfactory progress of students in the Hispanic subgroup b

	7 percentage points to 57%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 56% (29) Black: 43% (113) Hispanic: 50% (209) Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 68% (35) Black: 53% (139) Hispanic: 57% (238) Asian: NA American Indian: NA

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	The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0 was reporting category 4- Informational Text and Research Process due to limited exposure to informational texts such as newspapers and magazines.	Incorporate newspapers and magazines into classroom instruction. Assign research projects and presentations to students.	Reading Coaches Literacy Leadership Team	Benchmark Test and student engagement in follow-up research.	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessment, District Interim Assessments and District computer assisted reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicate that 42% of students in the ELL subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ELL subgroup making satisfactory progress by 4 percentage points to 46%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (42)	46% (46)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0 was reporting category 4- Informational Text and Research Process due to limited exposure to research-based reading strategies in Bilingual Education classes.	Provide Bilingual Education teachers with research-based reading strategies to implement in Bilingual Education classes.	Literacy Leadership Team	Observations of Bilingual classes and results of Bilingual assessments	Formative: District Interim Assessments and Monthly Benchmar Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicate that 30% of students in the SWD subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the SWD subgroup making

	satisfactory progress by 13 percentage points to 43%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (25)	43% (36)

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	The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2011 Reading FCAT 2.0 was Reading Reporting Category 4- Informational Text and Research Process due to limited exposure to real-world documents to identify text features.	Use how-to articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to identify text features. Subscribe to the electronic Sun Sentinel and Miami Herald newspapers.	Literacy Leadership Team Administration	Ongoing progress monitoring of student data will be conducted through the administration of classroom assessments and monthly benchmark assessments.	Formative: District Interim Assessments and Monthly Benchmar Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading indicate that 45% of students in the ED subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ED subgroup making satisfactory progress by 9 percentage points to 54%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (299)	54% (359)

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	The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0 was Reading Reporting Category 4- Informational Text and Research Process due to limited exposure to informational texts such as newspapers and magazines.	Incorporate newspapers and magazines into classroom instruction. Assign research projects and presentations to students.	Reading Coaches Literacy Leadership Team	Benchmark Test and student engagement in follow-up research.	Formative: District Interim Assessments and Monthly Benchmar Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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 fo Monitoring
Utilizing Data to Drive Instruction	K-7 LA/Reading Teachers	PD Liaison Reading Coaches	K-7 LA/Reading Teachers	Teacher Planning Day August 17th, 2012	The results will be evident through data driven instruction in small and whole group.	Administration and Reading Coaches
Best Practices of CRISS Strategies	K-7 LA/Reading Teachers	PD Liaison Reading Coaches	K-7 LA/Reading Teachers	PD Day February 1, 2013	Observations and walk-throughs	Administration and Reading Coaches
Research Based Reading Strategies	Bilingual/ Special Area Teachers	PD Liaison Reading Coaches	Bilingual and Special Area Teachers	PD Day November 6th, 2012	Observations and walk-throughs	Administration and Reading Coaches
Utilizing Success Maker in the Classroom	K-5 Reading and Math	Reading Coaches	Grade K-5 Teachers SPED Teachers	PD Day November 6th, 2012	Tracking student progress through Cumulative Data Reports	Administration and Reading Coaches
Utilizing Reading Plus in the Classroom	3-7 Reading	Reading Coaches	Grade 3-7 Teachers SPED Teachers	PD Day November 6th, 2012	Tracking student progress through Cumulative Data Reports	Administration and Reading Coaches
iReady	Grades K-7	Reading Coaches SPED Coordinator	SPED Grades K-7	October 10, 2012	Walk-throughs, teacher data chats, review of technology reports	Math Coach, SPE Coordinator
Reciprocal Teaching	K-7 LA/Reading Teachers	PD Liaison Reading Coaches	K-7 LA/Reading Teachers	PD Day November 6th, 2012	Observations and walk-throughs	Administration and Reading Coaches

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incorporate newspapers and magazines into classroom instruction.	National Geographic Magazines	EESAC	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

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)).*

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	Results of the 2012 CELLA Listening/Speaking indicate that 48% of students attained a level of proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students attaining a level of proficiency by 3 percentage points to 51%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

48% (130)

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	The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 CELLA was listening and speaking due to limited opportunities to speak and listen to spoken English.	Teachers will use books on tapes for Cooperative Learning Groups and engage students in group discussions	ESOL Coordinator, Literacy Leadership Team	Oral language presentations.	Formative: Quarterly Listening and Speaking assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	Results of the 2012 CELLA Reading indicate that 27% of students attained a level of proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students attaining a level of proficiency by 3 percentage points to 30%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

27% (73)

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	The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 CELLA was reading comprehension due to limited exposure to vocabulary skills.	ESOL classes will engage in utilizing research-based vocabulary strategies for context clues.	ESOL Coordinator, Literacy Leadership Team	Quarterly read aloud reading assessments taken from Scaffolded FAIR passages and Voyager fluency books.	Formative: Monthly reading assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Results of the 2012 CELLA Writing indicate that 19% of students attained a level of proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students attaining a level of proficiency by 3 percentage points to 22%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:
19% (52)

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	The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 CELLA was writing due to limited exposure to grammar strategies.	ESOL classes will utilize grammar and writing strategies within the reading block, such as daily edit and journal entries.	ESOL Coordinator, Literacy Leadership Team	Writing assessment in writing for reader's response question.	Formative: Quarterly writing assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 24% of students achieved proficiency by scoring a Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 27%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (181)	27% (204)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 3rd – 5th grade was Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure of manipulatives and technology.	Provide use of manipulatives and opportunities for practice. Engage students in activities to use technology (such as Gizmos, Riverdeep or the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives) that include visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of measurement and students' geometry and spatial sense. Utilize a rotation schedule for use of technology programs in the classroom.	Mathematics Coach, Administration	Ongoing classroom assessments, consistent student self evaluations, and assessments that target application of the skills being taught such as benchmark assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 3rd– 5th grade was Content Focus 3-Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to higher order thinking.	Use a Higher Order Thinking (HOT) question from the Go Math series as an opening routine in the instructional process.	Mathematics Coach	Mini Benchmark Assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Mathematics indicate that 26% of students scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Levels 4, 5 and 6 by 5 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (6)	31% (7)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics was multiplication and division due to the limited exposure to technology.	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine using a daily rotation schedule.	Mathematics Coach, SPED Coordinator	Use iReady reports to track student progress. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Unique learning mathematics tests Summative: 2013 FAA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 17% of students achieved above proficiency by scoring Levels 4and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Levels 4 and 5 by 1 percentage point to18%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (128)	18% (136)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 3rd– 5th grade was Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to project based instruction.	Incorporate Math based projects at least once per nine week period utilizing Webb's levels of complexity to achieve a higher understanding of the math concepts eventually completing a math portfolio.	Mathematics Coach	Ongoing classroom monitoring of student portfolio, student self reflection, and assessments that target application of the skills being taught such as benchmark assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Mathematics indicate that 48% of students scored at or above Level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 by 3 percentage points to 51%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (11)	51% (12)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics was multiplication and division due to the limited exposure to technology.	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine using a daily rotation schedule.	Mathematics Coach, SPED Coordinator	Utilize iReady reports to track student progress. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Unique learning mathematics tests Summative: 2013 FAA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 56% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 66%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (262)	66% (309)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 3rd- 5th grade was Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to the FCIM Calendar.	Mathematics Department Teams will develop the FCIM Calendar across all grade levels to facilitate instruction with a particular emphasis on any areas of deficiency that are encountered throughout the year, while paying close attention to geometry and measurement.	Mathematics Coach, MTSS/RtI Team	Conduct ongoing progress monitoring of student data to provide focus on the weakest benchmarks for re-teaching. Student-self monitoring will be conducted through the administration of classroom assessments and bi-weekly benchmark assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Mathematics indicate that 45% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (8)	55% (10)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics was multiplication and division due to the limited exposure to technology.	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine using a daily rotation schedule.	Mathematics Coach, SPED Coordinator	Utilize iReady reports to track student progress.	Formative: Unique learning mathematics tests Summative: 2013 FAA

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 47% of students in the lowest 25% quartile made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students from the lowest 25% quartile making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 57%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47% (61)	57% (74)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 3rd – 5th grades was Content Focus 3-Geometry and Measurement due to the inconsistent implementation of interventions.	Implement intervention programs such as tutoring and computer based programs using Success Maker and Riverdeep. Every week, provide tutoring for students who did not pass the benchmark test the week prior.	Mathematics Coach, Administration	Bi-weekly Success Maker Cumulative Performance Reports and On-going student progress reports from River deep and Compass Learning. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	43	48	54	59	64	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 56% of students in the White subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase satisfactory progress of students in the White subgroup by 3 percentage points to 59%. Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 38% of students in the Black subgroup made satisfactory progress.

Mathematics Goal #5B:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase satisfactory progress of students in the Black subgroup by 8 percentage points to 46%. Additionally, results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 44% of students in the Hispanic subgroup mad satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase satisfactory progress of students in the Hispanic subgroup b 6 percentage points to 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 56% (29) Black: 38% (100) Hispanic: 44% (184) Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 59% (31) Black: 46% (121) Hispanic: 50% (209) Asian: NA American Indian: NA

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 3rd – 5th was Content Focus 3-Geometry and Measurement due to the lack of student data chats. As a result, students in the Black and Hispanic subgroups did not meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO).	Create custom groups on Edusoft to consistently monitor students' progress. Conduct student data chats after each Interim Assessment and allow students to monitor their own data after each classroom assessment.	Mathematics Coach, MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing progress monitoring of student data will be conducted through the administration of classroom assessments and monthly benchmark assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 40% of students in the ELL subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ELL subgroup making satisfactory progress by 6 percentage points to 46%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (40)	46% (46)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 3rd – 5th grade was	Develop hands-on activities and create learning stations to help facilitate student understanding of	Mathematics Coach, Administration	Mini Benchmark Assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark

1	Content Focus 3-Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to hands-on activities. As a result, students in the ELL subgroup did not meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO).	mathematical concepts.			Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 29% of students in the SWD subgroup made satisfactory progress Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the SWD subgroup making satisfactory progress by 9 percentage points to 38%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (24)	38% (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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 3rd – 5th grade was Content Focus 3-Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to technology. As a result, students in the SWD subgroup did not meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO).	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine using a daily rotation schedule.	Mathematics Coach, SPED Coordinator	Utilize iReady reports to track student progress. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 40% of students in the ED subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ED subgroup making satisfactory progress by 7 percentage points to 47%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (266)	47% (312)

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
	The area of deficiency as	Incorporate Monthly	Mathematics	Ongoing progress	Formative:

1	noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 3rd – 5th grade was Content Focus 3- Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to student data chats. As a result, students in the ED subgroup did not meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO).	Benchmark Exams, Go Math benchmark exams, topic tests, and District Exams throughout the school year and conduct student data chats after each assessment.	Coach, MTSS/RtI Team	monitoring of student data will be conducted through the administration of classroom assessments and monthly benchmark assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goa

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 24% of students achieved proficiency by scoring a Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 27%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (181)	27% (204)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 6th grade was Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to hands-on experiences and use of Riverdeep.	Provide opportunities for students to find the perimeters and areas of composite two-dimensional figures, including non-rectangular figures (such as semicircles) using various strategies. Use virtual manipulatives to explore area and perimeter of two-dimensional figures, National Library of Virtual Manipulatives. Utilize a rotation schedule for use of technology programs like Riverdeep in the classroom.	Mathematics Coach, Administration	Ongoing classroom assessments, consistent student self evaluations, and assessments that target application of the skills being taught such as benchmark assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Mathematics indicate that 26% of students scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Levels 4, 5 and 6 by 5 percentage points to 31%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (6)	31% (7)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics was multiplication and division due to the limited exposure to technology.	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine using a daily rotation schedule.	Mathematics Coach SPED Coordinator	Utilize iReady reports to track student progress. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Unique learning mathematics tests Summative: 2013 FAA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 17% of students achieved above proficiency by scoring Levels 4and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Levels 4 and 5 by 1 percentage point to 18%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (128)	18% (136)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 6th grade was Content Focus 3-Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to project based instruction.	Incorporate Math based projects at least once per nine week period utilizing Webb's levels of complexity to achieve a higher understanding of the math concepts eventually completing a math portfolio.	Mathematics Coach	Ongoing classroom monitoring of student portfolio, student self reflection, and assessments that target application of the skills being taught such as benchmark assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Mathematics indicate that 48% of students scored at or above Level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 by 3 percentage points to 51%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (11)	51% (12)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics was multiplication and division due to the limited exposure to technology.	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine using a daily rotation schedule.	Mathematics Coach, SPED Coordinator	Utilize iReady reports to track student progress. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Unique learning mathematics tests Summative: 2013 FAA

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 56% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 66% .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (262)	66% (309)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 6th grade was Content Focus 3-Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to the FCIM Calendar.	Mathematics Department Teams will develop the FCIM Calendar across all grade levels to facilitate instruction with a particular emphasis on any areas of deficiency that are encountered throughout the year, while paying close attention to geometry and measurement.	Mathematics Coach, MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing progress monitoring of student data, student-self monitoring will be conducted through the administration of classroom assessments and bi-weekly benchmark assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Mathematics indicate that 45% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 55% .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (8)	55% (10)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Mathematics was multiplication and division due to the limited exposure to technology.	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine using a daily rotation schedule.	Mathematics Coach, SPED Coordinator	Utilize iReady reports to track student progress. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Unique learning mathematics tests Summative: 2013 FAA

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 47% of students in the lowest 25% quartile made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students from the lowest 25% quartile making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 57%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47% (61)	57% (74)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 6th grade was Content Focus 3-Geometry and Measurement due to the inconsistent implementation of interventions.	Use the Intensive Math class to re-teach concepts based on test data for each individual student's weakness. Utilize Compass Learning and Riverdeep technology program.	Mathematics Coach, Administration	Bi-weekly Performance Reports and On-going student progress reports from Compass Learning. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	43	48	54	59	64	

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

	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 56% of students in the White subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase satisfactory progress of students in the White subgroup by 3 percentage points to 59%.

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 38% of students in the Black subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase satisfactory progress of students in the Black subgroup by 8 percentage points to 46%. Additionally, results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 44% of students in the Hispanic subgroup mad satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase satisfactory progress of students in the Hispanic subgroup b 6 percentage points to 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 56% (29) Black: 38% (100) Hispanic: 44% (184) Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 59% (31) Black: 46% (121) Hispanic: 50% (209) Asian: NA American Indian: NA

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 6th grade was Content Focus 3-Geometry and Measurement due to the lack of student data chats. As a result, students in the Black and Hispanic subgroups did not meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO).	Create custom groups on Edusoft to consistently monitor students' progress. Conduct student data chats after each Interim Assessment and allow students to monitor their own data after each classroom assessment.	Mathematics Coach, MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing progress monitoring of student data will be conducted through the administration of classroom assessments and monthly benchmark assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 40% of students in the ELL subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ELL subgroup making satisfactory progress by 6 percentage points to 46%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (40)	46% (46)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012	Develop hands-on activities and create	Mathematics Coach,	Mini Benchmark Assessments	Formative: District

1	administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 6th grade was Content Focus 3- Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to hands-on activities. As a result, students in the ELL subgroup did not meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO).	learning stations to help facilitate student understanding of mathematical concepts.	Administration	Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 29% of students in the SWD subgroup made satisfactory progress Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the SWD subgroup making satisfactory progress by 9 percentage points to 38%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (24)	38% (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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 6th grade was Content Focus 3- Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to technology. As a result, students in the SWD subgroup did not meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO).	Incorporate iReady technology into the learning routine using a daily rotation schedule.	Mathematics Coach, SPED Coordinator	Utilize iReady reports to track student progress. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics indicate that 40% of students in the ED subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ED subgroup making satisfactory progress by 7 percentage points to 47%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (266)	47% (312)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics for 6th grade was Geometry and Measurement due to the limited exposure to student data chats. As a result, students in the ED subgroup did not meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO).	Conduct student data chats after each Interim Assessment and allow students to monitor their own data after each classroom assessment.	Mathematics Coach, MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing progress monitoring of student data will be conducted through the administration of classroom assessments and monthly benchmark assessments. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Assessments , Topic tests and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

No Data Submitted

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A :

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

No Data Submitted

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Algebra EOC Goa

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A :

Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Procedures in Mathematics	Grades 3-7 Mathematics	Math Coach	Grades 3-7 Mathematics SPED and General Ed. teachers	August 16, 2012	Walk-throughs, teacher data chats, review of technology reports	Math Coach, Administration
Technology in Mathematics	Grades 3-7 Mathematics	Math Coach	Grades 3-7 Mathematics SPED and General Ed. teachers	September 17, 2012	Walk-throughs, teacher data chats, review of technology reports	Math Coach, Administration
iReady	Grades K-7	Math Coach SPED Coordinator	SPED Grades K-7	October 10, 2012	Walk-throughs, teacher data chats, review of technology reports	Math Coach, SPED Coordinator

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

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science indicate that 26% of students achieved proficiency by scoring a Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (49)	31% (58)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science was the Nature of Science due to limited exposure of the scientific method.	Provide students opportunities to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze and explain science concepts during hands-on lab activities and journal writing on a weekly basis to expand use of the scientific method.	Leadership Team	Weekly lab reports.. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim assessments. School site monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science was the Nature of Science due to limited exposure of supplemental services.	Provide after school science enrichment opportunities once a week for two hours.	Leadership Team Administration	Weekly enrichment science reports. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim assessments. School site monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	sults of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Science indicate that 9% of students scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6.

Science Goal #1b:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Levels 4, 5 and 6 by 5 percentage points to 14% .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9% (1)	14% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science was Physical Science due to limited exposure of the scientific method.	Provide students opportunities to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze and explain science concepts during hands-on lab activities and journal writing on a weekly basis to expand use of the scientific method.	Leadership Team	Weekly lab reports. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Unique learning science tests Summative: 2013 FAA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science indicate that 4% of students achieved above proficiency by scoring Levels 4and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Levels 4 and 5 by 2 percentage points to 6% .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4% (7)	6% (11)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science was Nature of Science due to limited exposure of technological laboratory activities	Provide advanced science opportunities to that will engage students in real-world science experiences by incorporating SECME activities and strategies. Staff will utilize NGSSS resources to present material in a variety of modalities by utilizing FCAT Explorer, Discovery Videos, and Explore Learning on a weekly basis during lab time to enhance learning by allowing students to analyze, draw appropriate conclusions, and apply	Leadership Team	Students tracking own progress. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim assessments. School site monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

		key instructional concepts.			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Science indicate that 64% of students scored at or above Level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 by 3 percentage points to 67%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (7)	67% (7)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Science was Physical Science due to limited exposure of the scientific method.	Provide students opportunities to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze and explain science concepts during hands-on lab activities and journal writing on a weekly basis to expand use of the scientific method as it applies to physical science.	Leadership Team	Weekly lab reports. Use data to adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Unique learning science tests Summative: 2013 FAA

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
Utilizing lab kits to successfully implement labs.	K-7 Science Teachers	PD Liaison Science Chair	K-7 Science Teachers	November 6, 2012	Hands-on lessons inquiry forms	Administrators
Inquiry-Based Learning	3-7 Science Teachers	Science Chair	3-7 Grade Science Teachers	November 6, 2012	Science Lab Journals	Administration & Science Chair

Science Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science Fair	Awards	EESAC	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
			Grand Total: $500.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing indicate that 85% of students achieved proficiency by scoring a Level or above. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 4 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 87%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (174)	87% (177)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing was focus and conventions due to limited exposure to grammar strategies.	Teachers will utilize revising/editing chart, conferencing with students for capitalization, punctuation, subject/verb and pronoun agreement in simple and compound sentences.	Literacy Leadership Team	Biweekly the Reading coach will assist classroom teachers in analyzing students' writing in order to determine their needs and adjust instruction.	Formative: Biweekly writing samples District Pre and Post Writing Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Writes

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	Results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Writing indicate that ___of students scored at or above Level 7.

Writing Goal #1b:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 by ___ percentage points to ___.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
TBA	TBA

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA Writing was revising and editing due to limited exposure to grammar strategies.	Teachers will incorporate a Daily Edit where students will correct the mistakes of a sentence written on the board on a daily basis. Conventions and punctuation will be addressed in the Daily Edit.	Literacy Leadership Team	Student journal	Formative: Unique learning writing tests Summative: 2013 FAA

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
Grammar in Writing	Grade 4	District Reading CSS	Grade 4 Reading & Language Arts Teachers	October 10, 2012	Monthly Writing Assessments	Literacy Leadership Team

Writing Budget:

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	Results of the 2012 Civics Baseline Assessment indicate that 0% of students scored at or above proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency by 30 percentage points to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	30% (38.7)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 Civics Baseline assessment was Organization and Function of Government due to limited exposure of civics resources.	Utilize District-published lesson plans with assessments aligned to End of Course benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content.	Literacy Leadership Team	Monthly school generated assessments will be administered and scored in order to monitor students' progress and to adjust the instructional focus.	Formative: Monthly assessments Summative: 2013 Spring District Interim Assessment

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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	Results of the 2012 Civics Baseline Assessment indicate that 0% of students scored above proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring above proficiency by 10 percentage points to 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (13)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 Civics Baseline assessment was Organization and Function of Government due to limited exposure	Track the development of local and state government elections, while incorporating those practices in establishing a Student Government in school	Literacy Leadership Team	Monthly school generated assessments will be administered and scored in order to monitor students' progress and to adjust the instructional focus.	Formative: Monthly assessments Summative: 2013 Spring District Interim

	of civics resources.				Assessment

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						

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the daily average of 94.43% attendance rate to 94.93%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:

94.43% (1625)	94.93% (1634)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
625	594
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
427	406

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	Attendance rates will vary throughout the school year due to the constant change mobility rate at the school.	Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of truancy to Attendance Review Committee (ARC) for intervention. Students with 5 unexcused absences will receive a letter home. At 10 unexcused absences parent conference will take place or a home visit.	Attendance Review Committee, Community Liaison Specialist	Monthly review of student attendance records	COGNOS Attendance Records
2	Attendance rates will vary throughout the school year due to the constant change mobility rate at the school.	Implementation of a monthly attendance race among PreK-7th grade classes. Incentives will be given to classes as well as individual students with a 100% attendance.	Attendance Review Committee, Community Liaison Specialist	Monthly review of student attendance records	COGNOS Attendance Logs
3	Tardy rates will vary throughout the school year due to students living out-of-area.	Identify and refer students with excessive tardies to Attendance Review Committee (ARC) for intervention. Students with 5 unexcused tardies will receive a letter home. At 10 unexcused tardies parent conference will take place or a home visit.	Attendance Review Committee, Community Liaison Specialist	Monthly review of student tardy records	Tardy report through Principal Portal
4	Tardy rates will vary throughout the school year due to limited positive reinforcement for being on time.	Conduct a daily raffle on the morning announcements to reward 5 students present, on time and in uniform.	Attendance Review Committee, Community Liaison Specialist	Monthly review of student tardy records	Tardy report through Principal Portal

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incentive for students and classes with 100% attendance.	Pins, pencils, medals, certificates, treats, field trip, etc...	EESAC	$500.00
Incentives for students present, on time and in uniform.	Pins, pencils, medals, certificates, treats, field trip, etc...	EESAC	$500.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of students suspended in -school by one. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of students suspended out-of -school by 33.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
6	5
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

6	5
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
330	297
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
153	138

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	The total number of outdoor suspensions was 330 during the 2011-2012 school year due to limited positive reinforcements.	Implement District's Spot Success program monthly to recognize students' positive behavior. Reward students at end of school year.	Counselors, Administration	Spot Success Reports, Number of Student Case Management (SCM) forms	COGNOS quarterly suspension reports
2	The total number of outdoor suspensions was 330 during the 2011-2012 school year due to limited exposure of Code Student of Conduct.	Update the School Wide Discipline Plan and utilize the Code of Student Conduct. Provide incentives by conducting a raffle for student Caught Being Good. Teachers will contact parents and attempt to resolve minor issues in the classroom.	Counselors, Administration	Number of Student Case Management (SCM) forms	COGNOS quarterly suspension reports
3	The total number of outdoor suspensions was 330 during the 2011-2012 school year due to staff and students not being trained on Anti-Bullying.	Schedule police officers for student presentations on bullying. Teach bullying lessons and sign bullying pledges for faculty, students and parents.	Counselors, Administration	Number of bullying cases, Number of Student Case Management (SCM) forms	COGNOS quarterly suspension reports
4	The total number of indoor suspensions was 6 during the 2011-2012 school year due to limited positive reinforcements.	Implement District's Spot Success program monthly to recognize students' positive behavior. Reward students at end of school year.	Counselors, Administration	Spot Success Reports, Number of Student Case Management (SCM) forms	COGNOS quarterly suspension reports

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
Bullying	All	Counselors	All	September 25, 2012	Number of Bullying cases	Administration and Counselors
School's Discipline Plan and Code of Student Conduct	All	Administration	All	August 17, 2012	Number of SPOT Success awards, Analyze SCM forms written and Student Infraction Logs	Administration

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	During the 2011-2012 school year, parent participation in school wide activities was 38%. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase parent participation by 5% from 38% to 43%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
38% (281.2)	39.9% (295.26)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Increase opportunities for STEM applied learning by increasing opportunities for students to participate in career and technical skill competitions (i.e CTSO, U.S. FIRST Robotics League, and SECME).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers not trained in competitions, such as: Miami- Dade County Science Fair, NFTE, Fairchild Challenge or other district-approved competition curriculum.	Align curriculum to appropriate CTSO, and/or other competitions, such as: Miami- Dade County Fair, NFTE, Fairchild Challenge or other district-approved competition curriculum.	Administration	Number of students participating in Miami-Dade County Fair, NFTE, Fairchild Challenge or other district-approved competition curriculum. Monitor the implementation of the guidelines and timeline for the teacher training and the progress of the CTE student competition projects.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim assessments. School site monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
2	Deficient in STEM integration of engineering.	Offer a Robotics Engineering after school club.	Administration	Track student progress on STEM assessments	Formative: District Baseline and Interim assessments. School site monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
3	Teachers must be trained in facilitating Virtual Learning Labs	Open Virtual Learning Labs to give students the opportunity to advance in course requirements and to facilitate meeting class-size requirements.	Administration	Student monthly progress reports	Formative: District Baseline and Interim assessments. School site monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
4	A program specializing in science and technology is needed.	Establish medical health courses in the fields of pharmaceuticals and physical therapy. Make connections with community health organizations.	Administration	Number of students successful in the program and number of community connections	Formative: District Baseline and Interim assessments. School site monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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
Fairchild Challenge Environmental Action Workshop	6th-7th	Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden	Professional Learning Community	September 26, 2012	Enrollment in Fairchild Challenge	Administration

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Fairchild Challenge	Supplies	EESAC	$500.00
Miami- Dade County Fair	Supplies	EESAC	$500.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Virtual Learning Labs	Headphones with microphones, telephones, printer ink and paper	EESAC	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,000.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	Increase the rigor in our curriculum and offer more electives for students in career development.

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	CTE teacher is not certified with industry certification.	CTE Teachers implement CTE program state curriculum standards, program sequence of courses, including pacing of activities for industry	Administration MTSS	In-class assessments	Formative: District Baseline and Interim assessments. School site monthly assessments.

		certification as outlined within CTE professional development activities.			Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
2	Student courses are not geared towards career development	Incorporate career development into the Civics course so that all 7th grade students create their personal education plan when planning for their future. Offer career development courses through Virtual Learning Labs and electives in health sciences.	Administration MTSS	Final student projects	Formative: District Baseline and Interim assessments. School site monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
3	Students had limited exposure to a platform were they can acquire more information about local community careers.	Host a Career Day so that community representatives may showcase their duties out in the workforce.	Administration Community Team	Participation rate of presenters	Formative: District Baseline and Interim assessments. School site monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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						

CTE Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Career Day	Hourly pay for teachers, incentives for community representatives	EESAC	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Incorporate newspapers and magazines into classroom instruction.	National Geographic Magazines	EESAC	$1,000.00
Attendance	Incentive for students and classes with 100% attendance.	Pins, pencils, medals, certificates, treats, field trip, etc…	EESAC	$500.00
Attendance	Incentives for students present, on time and in uniform.	Pins, pencils, medals, certificates, treats, field trip, etc…	EESAC	$500.00
STEM	Fairchild Challenge	Supplies	EESAC	$500.00
STEM	Miami- Dade County Fair	Supplies	EESAC	$500.00
CTE	Career Day	Hourly pay for teachers, incentives for community representatives	EESAC	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $4,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
STEM	Virtual Learning Labs	Headphones with microphones, telephones, printer ink and paper	EESAC	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $1,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	Science Fair	Awards	EESAC	$500.00
				Subtotal: $500.00
				Grand Total: $5,500.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

( ) Priority ( ) Focus (•) Prevent ( ) NA

Are you a reward school: ( ) Yes (•) No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/7/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the

statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Reading-National Geographic subscription	$1,000.00
Science-Laboratory Experiment equipment	$4,500.00
Attendance and Tardies Incentives for students and classes	$1,000.00
STEM-Equipment and supplies for Robotics, Virtual Learning Labs, Fairchild Challenge and Fair competitions	$8,000.00
CTE-Career Day and hourly pay	$1,000.00

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

The purpose of the Gateway Environmental K-8 Learning Center's Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) is to work to ensure improved student achievement. One of the ways the EESAC will do this is by developing, monitoring and evaluating the School Improvement Plan as required by Blueprint 2000. The group may also address issues that include curriculum, student discipline, staffing, safety, technology, student support services, textbook adoptions, professional development, and budget, as they apply to the School Improvement Plan and the District's strategic planning goals. Recommendations adopted by the EESAC shall be presented to the principal for presentation to the school staff.

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

Dade School District GATEWAY ENVIRONMENTAL K-8 LEARNING CENTER 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	65%	63%	90%	49%	267	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	57%	44%			101	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?	50% (YES)	58% (YES)			108	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					476	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District GATEWAY ENVIRONMENTAL K-8 LEARNING CENTER 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	63%	67%	85%	50%	265	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	63%	68%			131	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?	60% (YES)	59% (YES)			119	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					515	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested