

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: RENAISSANCE MIDDLE CHARTER SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Ana Cordal

SAC Chair: Elizabeth Canchola

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Ana Cordal	Master of Science in Education from Florida International University Educational Leadership all grades – from Florida Atlantic University Bachelor of Science in Communication from Florida International University Master of	11	11	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08' School Grade A A A A A High Standards Rdg. 76 85 95 96 92 High Standards Math 73 74 95 97 97 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 82 76 74 77 75 Lrng Gains-Math 80 62 66 80 85 Gains-Rdg-25% 90 77 88 86 81 Gains-Math-25% 81 60 82 86 86____

Assis Principal	Paul Thompson	Science in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University Bachelor of Fine Arts in Theater from Florida International University	6	11	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A High Standards Rdg. 76 85 95 96 92 High Standards Math 73 74 95 97 97 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 82 76 74 77 75 Lrng Gains-Math 80 62 66 80 85 Gains-Rdg-25% 90 77 88 86 81 Gains-Math-25% 81 60 82 86 86____
-----------------	---------------	---	---	----	--

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)
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. We recruit teachers locally, out-of state, as well as out of the country. CSUSA continuously participates in local job fairs and national teacher job fairs. We are committed to developing a diverse group of teachers, therefore offering them several opportunities for staff development.	CSUSA/Leadership Team	ongoing	
2	2. RMCS administration collaborates with the Leadership Team of Charter Schools USA (CSUSA). We are committed to hiring the best candidates for our teaching positions.	CSUSA/Leadership Team	ongoing	
3	3. The leadership team reviews resumes of potential candidates. After choosing the best candidates for the positions available, we interview and we select the best candidate for the position.	Leadership Team	ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

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

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

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
24	8.3%(2)	54.2%(13)	33.3%(8)	4.2%(1)	12.5%(3)	87.5%(21)	4.2%(1)	0.0%(0)	87.5%(21)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Ms. Elizabeth Benamor	Ms. Negron	Ms. Benamor has extensive experience in the teaching field and has attended various trainings which provide her with the skills to assist any new or veteran teacher.	The teacher will mentor the mentee on an ongoing basis with Classroom Management, Student information System, Data Analysis, etc.
Elena Barros	Ms. Jean-Gilles, Mr. Perez	Ms. Barros has extensive experience in the teaching field and has attended various trainings which provide her with the skills to assist any new or veteran teacher.	The teacher will mentor the mentee on an ongoing basis with Classroom Management, Student Information System, Data Analysis, etc.
Alexis Franco	Mr. Hermida, Ms. Tabares	Ms. Franco has extensive experience in the teaching field and has attended various trainings which provide her with the skills to assist any new or veteran teacher.	The teacher will mentor the mentee on an ongoing basis with Classroom Management, Student information System, Data Analysis, etc.

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

NA

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

NA

Title III

NA

Title X- Homeless

NA

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

NA

Violence Prevention Programs

NA

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

NA

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

RMCS RtI Team is made up of:

- Principal- The principal provides leadership through a process of problem solving issues and concerns that arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.
- Assistant Principal - The assistant principal works with the team to ensure commitment to the goals set forth at the meetings. Along with the principal and teachers, the assistant principal works on building staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time.
- Curriculum Specialist -The curriculum specialist works with the administration and teachers to share the common goal of improving instruction for all students.
- Class Teachers - Each department selects a teacher to represent their grade level on the RtI. That teacher is Johna Zapata, Social Studies Teacher.
- Special Area Teachers - This team of dedicated teachers meet and select 2/3 teachers to represent them on the RtI.

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 RtI team meets two times a week to discuss proven strategies that work in the classroom. The mentor teachers review quarterly and weekly data to meet our goals. In an effort to utilize teacher expertise to its fullest potential we make sure that they have common planning times, which continues to prove a successful strategy to leave no child behind. The RtI Team analyzes data on all students and gives suggestions for student achievement.

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

The RtI team assists in the development of the School Improvement Plan, along with the EESAC committee by analyzing data and establishing clear school wide goals

MTSS Implementation

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

Data is reviewed and monitored for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students on a weekly basis. Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) Assessment and FAIR are also reviewed. CSUSA benchmark tests are used for review and make adjustments to the curriculum. The RtI team monitors data and adjustments are made to curriculum based on it's findings during our weekly cluster meetings to ensure an ongoing total quality approach. Gifted students' data is also reviewed to ensure that the curriculum is challenging.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional Development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. In addition, one faculty meeting a month will be devoted to professional development. Best Practices will be shared at faculty meetings. At the beginning of the school year a survey will be completed by teachers indicating needs for professional development. The RtI Team will evaluate additional professional development needs.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Describe plan to support MTSS. The MTSS/RtI Team will meet on a biweekly basis to determine the progress of students. Administration will be part of the decision making. Data from various sources will be looked at and instructional focus will be adjusted accordingly.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

- Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Ana Cordal, Principal- The principal provides the team leadership through a process of problem solving issues and concerns that arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.
- Paul Thompson, Lead Assistant Principal and Elaine Castellanos, Dean of Students - The team works to ensure commitment to the goals set forth at the meetings. Along with the principal and teachers, they work on building staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time.
- Class Teachers - Each department selects a teacher to represent their grade level on the LLT. These teachers are: Sixth Grade – Elizabeth Benamor, Seventh Grade- Elena Barros, Eighth Grade-Alexis Franoc.
- Special Area Teachers - This team is lead by L. Aschenbrenner.

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

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

Professional Development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. In addition, one faculty meeting a month will be devoted to professional development. Best Practices will be shared at faculty meetings. A survey will be completed by teachers indicating needs for professional development. Teachers will meet

with department colleagues and grade level colleagues to review delivery of instruction.

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

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

Instructional focus lessons are developed through grade level meetings, vertical planning in conjunction with FAIR and Interim Assessments. Teachers will determine which lessons to implement according to student data results and needs. Teachers will include lessons in their lesson plans and will determine whether to apply lessons as class openers and/or supplemental resources. Content area teachers will teach focus lessons by applying benchmarks and lessons needed to develop student skills according to data results. The Literacy Leadership Team will be responsible for data analysis at the grade level and will be responsible for assisting in the dissemination of modifications and changes to be made. On a monthly basis, curricular adjustments/changes will be reviewed and determined if necessary during grade level and literacy team meetings. Special attention will be given to special needs populations such as migrant, homeless, neglected and delinquent students. Grade Level/Department Leads will play a vital role in the development of Instructional Focus. Their responsibilities will include sharing BEST Practices with teachers, modeling lessons, providing support to teachers and monitoring student progress through student assessments.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

NA

*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.

Literacy is an important focus in every subject at the middle school level. Teachers integrate literacy throughout all subjects including electives, mathematics, language arts and content areas. Monthly literacy meetings develop themed projects along with classroom novels which are integrated in the curriculum. The Reading Plus program is also integrated throughout the Language Arts and Social Studies classes. Classroom libraries are available in all Language Arts classes. Weekly walkthroughs are conducted to monitor implementation.

*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?

NA

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

NA

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 32%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (91)	32% (95)

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	1.1. An area of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test was Reading Application.	1.1. Students will utilize grade-level appropriate text that includes identifiable author's purpose and perspective for reading, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood through specific language or persuading. Include STAR and Accelerated Reader activities in grades 6-8.	Rtl Team	1.1. Weekly classroom assessments will be used to determine appropriate differentiated instruction. Data analysis will be used to measure improvement and adjust instruction as necessary.	1.1. Formative: Ongoing Assessments including CSUSA Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 45%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%(164)	45% (167)

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	2.1. An area of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test is the content cluster of Literary Analysis Fiction and Non-Fiction	2.1. Ensure the implementation of appropriate classroom strategies including: •Graphic organizers – Character and Plot •Concept maps- Conflict Resolution •Signal/key words •Vocabulary-Descriptive and figurative language development activities •Availability of a wide variety of reading material representing various genres and styles •Include Reading Plus, SuccessMaker, and Study Island activities in grades 6-8	2.1. Administration, Grade Level/Department Chairs	2.1. Weekly classroom assessment will be used to determine appropriate differentiated instruction. Data analysis will be used to measure improvement and adjust instruction as necessary.	2.1. Formative: Ongoing Assessments including CSUSA Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

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

No Data Submitted

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Student achievement Learning Gains by 5 percentage points to 87%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82%(282)	87%(299)

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	3.1. An area of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test was the content cluster of Informational Text Research Process	3.1. Utilize real-world documents such as reference books, appropriate text, brochures, fliers, articles, and websites so students can draw on text features/structure to locate, interpret, and organize information. Include Reading Plus, Cambium Learning Voyager, FCAT 2.0 Task cards.	3.1. Rtl Team	3.1. Weekly classroom assessments will be used to determine appropriate Differentiated Instruction. Data analysis will be used to monitor progress and measure improvement and adjust instruction as necessary.	3.1. Formative: Ongoing Assessments including CSUSA Benchmark Assessments, Reading Plus & Cambium Learning Voyager. Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

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

No Data Submitted

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 90% of students in the lowest 25 % made Learning Gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving Learning Gains by 5 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90%(73)	95%(77)

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	4.1. An area of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was the content cluster of Vocabulary.	4.1. Expand the implementation of vocabulary development activities across grade levels, including word games, word walls, and other grade level appropriate activities. Include Reading Plus, Cambium Learning Voyager, FCAT 2.0 Task cards . Use NGSSS Access Points for additional support.	4.1. Rtl Team	4.1. Weekly classroom assessment will be used to determine appropriate Differentiated Instruction. Data analysis will be used to monitor progress, measure improvement and adjust instruction as necessary.	4.1. Formative: Ongoing Assessments including CSUSA Benchmark Assessments, Reading Plus & Cambium Learning Voyager. Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	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

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:

	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 69% of students in the Black student sub group achieved proficiency.
--	--

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 19 percentage points to 88 %. The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 74% of students in the Hispanic sub group achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 78 %.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: NA Black: 69%(10) Hispanic: 74%(221) Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: NA Black: 88%(13) Hispanic: 78%(232) 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	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Black and Hispanic student subgroup: As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test, the Hispanic subgroup did not make sufficient progress. Appropriate placement of students in interventions has been a challenge.	5B.1. Identify Tier 2 and 3 students and place in appropriate interventions within the first two weeks of the 2012-2013 school year. Monitor student progress using data Bi-weekly	5B.1. Administration, RTI and LLT Teams	5B.1. Review monthly reports generated from computer programs such as Reading+ and Voyager Intervention.	5B.1. Formative: CAP – Computer-Assisted Programs reports generated from Reading Plus Bi-weekly assessments, Mini-assessments, Interim 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 need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Na	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
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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 62% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 13 percentage points to 75 %
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62%(92)	75%(112)

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	5E.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not achieve proficiency.	5E.1. Students' progress will be monitored weekly. Appropriate interventions using Cambium Learning Voyager and Reading Plus will be used with students in this subgroup.	5E.1. LLT Leadership Team	5E.1. LLT Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data.	5E.1. FAIR, Cambium Learning Voyager and Reading Plus CSUSA benchmarks, and School-site assessment data. Summative 2013 FCAT Reading 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
Differentiated Instruction	All Subjects	PD Facilitator	School-wide	September 2012-December 2013	Independent activities and classroom observations (both formal/informal)	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs
Cambium Learning	Reading All grades	Reading PD Facilitator	Reading Teacher PD Facilitator School-wide	September 2012-December 2013	Check reports on management system	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs
ESOL Strategies	All Subjects School-Wide	Administration	Administration All Teachers	September 2012-December 2013	Independent activities and classroom observations (both formal/informal)	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Sadlier	Reading Materials/Vocabulary	FTE	\$1,899.00
Prestwick House	Reading Materials \$	FTE	\$373.00
Cambium Learning Voyager	Reading InterventionProgram	FTE	\$16,000.00
			Subtotal: \$18,272.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading Plus	Reading Program	FTE	\$4,560.00
Study Island	Reading Strategies	FTE	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$6,560.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$24,832.00

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:			Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 59% of students were proficient in Oral Skills (Listening and speaking).		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
59%(24)					
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	1.1. Students' limited language understanding would be an anticipated barrier.	1.1. Implement the Language experience Approach in the classroom such as: Provide students with the Experience/Motivation- An experience story is based on an experience the teacher and student share.	1.1. Administration, Lead Team and ESOL Coordinator	1.1. Implementing the FCIM by reviewing data found on computer-based programs such as Acieve3000 , Reading + and District Interim reports.	1.1. Formative: District and School-site assessment data. Summative 2013 FCAT Reading and CELLA Assessment

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:			Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 41 % of students were proficient in Reading.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
41%(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
	2.1. Accessing prior knowledge from students is a barrier since students come from diverse background and	2.1. Students need to be provided with meaningful activities to relate to existing prior knowledge. Teachers must plan activities to	2.1. Administration, Lead Team and ESOL Coordinator	2.1. Implementing the FCIM by reviewing data found on computer-based programs such as Reading Plus, English in a Flash and District	2.1. Formative: CELLA, District and School-site assessment data.

1	knowledge levels.	provide students relevant context.		Interim reports.	Summative 2013 FCAT Reading and CELLA Assessment
---	-------------------	------------------------------------	--	------------------	--

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:			Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 41 % of students were proficient in Writing.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					
41%(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	3.1. Students have limited writing skills and backgrounds.	3.1. Teachers will provide students with several visual writing models such as: Venn diagrams, story maps and picture books to develop their writing skills	3.1. Administration, Lead Team and ESOL Coordinator	3.1. Implementing the FCIM by reviewing monthly writing prompts (schoolwide writing program) and CSUSA pre-post Writing Tests using the stateWriting rubric.	3.1. Formative: CELLA, District and School-site assessment data. Summative 2013 FCAT Reading and CELLA Assessment

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
English In A Flash	Computer Based Language Program	FTE	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
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 CELLA Goals

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 need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicated that 37% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 38%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37%(139)	38%(141)

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	1.1. The area of deficiency noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 administration is number operations.	1.1. Provide context for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of number operations. Provide FCAT Levels 3 students with online resources such as FCAT Explorer and Gizmos to challenge and stimulate higher order thinking skills. Math connects and Study Island	1.1. Administration, Lead team and RtI Team	1.1. Weekly classroom assessments will be used to determine appropriate Differentiated Instruction. Data analysis will be used to monitor progress, measure improvement and adjust strategies as needed.	1.1. Formative: Ongoing Assessments , CSUSA Benchmark Assessments Math connects Gizmos, and Study Island Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 34% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency at 35%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (126)	35% (127)

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	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Geometry and Measurement.	2.1. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometry by supporting the implementation of hands-on activities.	2.1. Administration, Lead team and RtI Team	2.1. Weekly classroom assessments will be used to determine appropriate Differentiated Instruction. Data analysis will be used to measure improvement and adjust strategies as needed.	2.1. Formative: Ongoing Assessments , CSUSA Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
No Data Submitted				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 80% of students made Learning Gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the number of students making Learning Gains by 5 percentage points to 85%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (274)	85% (292)

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	3.1. The area of deficiency on the 2011 FCAT mathematics assessment is data analysis.	3.1 Provide students with meaningful opportunities to experience analysis of data. This will include but not be limited to the following: newspaper articles, Internet exploration, and cooperative learning groups. Strategies will be adjusted if needed.	3.1 Administration, Team leads, RtI Team	3.1. Ongoing classroom assessments will be used to determine appropriate Differentiated Instruction. Data reports will be analyzed and used to measure improvements and adjust strategies as needed.	3.1. Formative: Ongoing Assessments , CSUSA Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Na	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
---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicate that 81% of students in the lowest 25% made Learning Gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 5 percentage points to 86%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81% (70)	86% (75)

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	4.1 The area of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Geometry.	4.1. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometry by supporting the implementation of hands-on activities. Before and after school mathematics tutoring program	4.1. Administration, Grade Level/Department Chairs, Rtl	4.1. Weekly classroom assessments will be used to determine appropriate Differentiated Instruction. Data analysis will be used to measure improvement and adjust strategies as needed.	4.1. Formative: Ongoing Assessments , CSUSA Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Na	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
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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	NA
--	----

Mathematics Goal #5E:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
NA		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
No Data Submitted				

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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 need of improvement for the following group:

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC Test indicated that 57% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 58%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (17)	58% (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	1.1. The area of deficiency applicable to all Mathematical content areas is ability to solve Applications problems; where needed reading comprehension skills to understand the Math processes limit ability to solve the problems.	1.1 Implement CSUSA exams which address the benchmarks indicated in the Curriculum Maps. Facilitate technology assistance programs such as the Florida's Continuous Improvement Model FOCUS site which provides Benchmark specific assessments; FCAT 2.0 Explorer and Gizmos to strengthen benchmarks needing to be addressed.	1.1 Administration, Leads And RTI	1.1. Weekly classroom assessments will be used to determine appropriate Differentiated Instruction. Data analysis through Discovery Education will be used to measure improvement and adjust strategies as needed.	1.1. Formative: Ongoing Assessments , CSUSA Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 ALGEBRA I EOC.

	Provide all students opportunities to explore and apply the use of a system of equations in the real-world		
	To write, interpret, and use mathematical expressions and equations, use inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities.		

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 Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC Test indicated that 37% of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 38%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (11)	38% (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	2.1. Maintaining high level of performance will be a barrier for the 2013 Algebra EOC.	2.1. Following the FCIM, students will be provided with the opportunities to explore and apply the use of a system of equations in the real world.	2.1. Administration, Team Leads, Department Heads	2.1. During Department meetings, results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.	2.1. Formative: Biweekly assessments and CSUSABenchmark Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra EOC assessment

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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the non-proficient students by 50%. 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 need of improvement for the following subgroup:

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	NA
--	----

Algebra Goal #3B:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
NA		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
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 Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:		NA		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
NA		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
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 Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:		NA		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
NA		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
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 Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Na	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
No Data Submitted				

End of Algebra EOC Goals

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 : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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				

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
Voyager	Grades 6,7,8 Mathematics	PD Facilitator Mathematics Liaison	School-wide All Mathematics Teachers	September 17, 2012 Ongoing	Check reports on management system Independent activities and classroom observations (both formal/informal)	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs
Go-Math	Mathematics	PD Facilitator Mathematics Liaison	All Mathematics Teachers	September 17, 2012 Ongoing	Independent activities and classroom observations (both formal/informal)	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs
Differentiated Instruction	All Subjects	PD Facilitator Mathematics Liaison	School-wide	September 17, 2012 Ongoing	Independent activities and classroom observations (both formal/informal)	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Triumph Learning	Math Materials	FTE	\$2,472.00
Glencoe Math Connects	Math Materials	FTE	\$2,082.00
			Subtotal: \$4,554.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Study Island	Oline Math Program	FTE	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Math Across the curriculum	Workshop/areas we use math In House staff development	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutorial Program	Stipends	SAC	\$4,000.00
			Subtotal: \$4,000.00
			Grand Total: \$10,554.00

* 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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 54% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring FCAT Level 3 by 3 percentage points to 57 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (43)	57% (45)

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	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test was Scientific Thinking.	1.1 Provide students enhanced opportunities to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze, and explain scientific concepts during hands on laboratory activity and classroom discussion to reinforce higher-order thinking skills.	1.1. Administration, Science Liaison, Grade Level/Department Chairs, RtI	1.1. Review the results of weekly assessments data to monitor progress and adjust strategies as necessary. Lab reports will be available and used to determine the effectiveness of strategies	1.1. Formative: Ongoing Assessments CSUSA Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 14% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring FCAT Level 3 by 1 percentage point to 15 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (282)	15% (299)

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	2a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test was Life/Environmental Science.	2a.1 Provide students additional opportunities to practice hands-on science activities. Students will also be exposed to challenging interactive activities on the Internet using Discovery Education	2a.1 Administration, Science Liaison, Grade Level/Department Chairs	2a.1 Review the results of assessment data to monitor progress and adjust strategies as necessary.	2a.1 Formative: Ongoing Assessments CSUSA Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
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
Data Analysis in Science	All grades all Subjects	Science PD Facilitator	Science PD Facilitator Science 6-8 Teachers	September 25, 2012 Ongoing	Independent Activities, Classroom Observation, Data Chats, Planning Meetings	Administration, PD Facilitator, Science Liaison, Grade Level/Department chairs
Discovery Education	Science All grades	Administration	All Science Teachers	September 25, 2012 Ongoing	Independent activities and classroom observations (both formal/informal)	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs
Differentiated Instruction	All grades all Subjects	PD Facilitator Science Liaison	School-wide	September 25, 2012 Ongoing	Independent activities and classroom observations (both formal/informal)	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs
Hands-On Science	All grades all Subjects	Science PD Facilitator, Region/District Personnel	Science Teachers 6-8	September 25, 2012 Ongoing	Independent Activities, Classroom Observation, Data Chats, Planning Meetings	Administration, PD Facilitator, Science Liaison, Grade Level/Department chairs

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Pearson Comprehensive Science 1,2,3	Physical Science Science Curriculum Materials	FTE	\$3,930.00
			Subtotal: \$3,930.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Discovery Streamline	Online resource	FTE	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science Tutorial	Teacher Stipends	SAC	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
			Grand Total: \$6,930.00

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 93% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 1 percentage point in writing to 94 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
93% (47)	93% (47)

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	1a1. The area of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Writing Is proper use of conventions.	1a1. Expand the implementation of use of proper conventions across grade levels, including word games, word walls, and other grade level appropriate activities.	1a1 Administration, Leads and RTI team	1a1. Review the results of assessments data to monitor progress and adjust strategies as necessary.	1a1. Formative: Ongoing assessments Monthly prompts will be used to evaluate writing improvements. Assessment of writing conventions Summative: FCAT 2013

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
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
Differentiated Instruction	All Subjects	PD Facilitator Reading/Writing Liaison	School-wide	September 17, 2012 Ongoing	Independent activities and classroom observations (both formal/informal)	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs
Rubric Training	6-8 Teachers	PD Facilitator Language Arts Liaison	School-wide	September 17, 2012 Ongoing	Independent activities and classroom observations (both formal/informal)	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs
Writing for All Subjects	All Students	PD Facilitator Reading/Writing Liaison	PD Facilitator All Teachers	September 17, 2012 Ongoing	Instruction and then independent scoring of writing	Administration/Facilitator, Grade Level/Dept Chairs

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Oxford University Press	Writing Materials	FTE	\$6,930.00
			Subtotal: \$6,930.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$6,930.00

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. Our goal for the 2012-2013 is to increase proficiency in

Civics Goal #1:	Civics by 1 percentage point to 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (153) This is based on Baseline 2012 Pretest of Grade 7 Civics.	1% (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	Students do not have the prior knowledge to score at acceptable levels.	<p>Institute regular, on-going common planning sessions for Civics teachers to ensure that the Civics curriculum is taught with fidelity and is paced so as to address all state and district benchmarks and curricular requirements.</p> <p>Provide classroom activities which help students develop an understanding of the content-specific vocabulary taught in government/civics.</p> <p>Provide opportunities for students to strengthen their abilities to read and interpret graph, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons, and other graphic representations.</p>	Grade Level/Team Leaders, Social Studies/Civics Department Head	Weekly classroom assessment will be used to determine appropriate differentiated instruction. Data analysis will be used to measure individual improvement and modify instruction as necessary. Formal and informal assessments as well as teachers' observation.	<p>Formative: Ongoing Teacher Assessments; modified to individual students. District Pre/Post tests will be compared and analyzed.</p> <p>Summative: District Spring Assessment 2013 Assessment</p>

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Glencoe Civics Economics And Geography	Curriculum Materials	FTE	\$12,024.00
			Subtotal: \$12,024.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$12,024.00

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 this year is to increase attendance to 95.99% and decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more), and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 1%
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:

95.49% (294)	95.99% (296)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
84	80
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
32	30

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	1.1. Parents understanding the importance of regular attendance and the correlation of success in school.	1.1. Continue to have open communication with parents regarding attendance requirements using SIS, PTO, Parentlink. Parental contract indicates attendance requirements.	1.1. Administration, Registrar and CSUSA team	1.1. Monitor the overall attendance weekly.	1.1. SIS Report Daily Attendance Report

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
Parent Workshops	All Students	Administration/Grade level leads	Parents/Administration Team Leads	September 25, 2012 Ongoing	Monitor Attendance and Tardies	Administration, Team Leads

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attendance Workshop/study habits/Cyber Safety	Copies of handouts	SAC	\$100.00

Subtotal: \$100.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Grand Total: \$100.00			

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 suspensions by %.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
1		0			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
0		0			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
1		0			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
0		0			
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
	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.

1	Maintain high expectations for student behavior and parent involvement and communicate clearly to parents and students expected behavior.	Continue current behavior management plan which sets clear expectations and communicate such to parents through parent contract. Parental contract indicates behavioral guidelines and expectations.	Administration.	Monitor number of discipline referrals	SIS Suspension Report.
---	---	---	-----------------	--	------------------------

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
Discipline strategies for staff	All grades	Administration, 8th Team Lead	All Faculty and Staff	September 17, 2012 Ongoing	SIS Reports	Administration

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Behavioral Strategies Workshop	Materials copied from powerpoint	FTE	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$100.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	During the 2011-2012 school year, there were 10 parent activities for which parents signed in. Parent participation in school-wide activities was 80%. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase parent participation by 5 percentage points.				
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:				
80%	85%				
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	1.1. Parent work schedules conflict with activities.	1.1. Schedule more family-oriented activities and events to invite parents to join PTO. Vary time schedules for activities throughout the year that are more to parent schedules.	1.1. Administration and PTO	1.1. Review sign in sheets/logs to determine the number of parents participating in activities and events.	1.1. Sign in sheets

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		<p>Earth and Space Honors course was offered for the 2011-2012 school year for high achieving students. Twenty two students (30%) 8th grade students were enrolled in the 2011-2012 school year.</p> <p>Physical Science Honors will replace the Earth and Space Honors course for the 2-12-2013 school year. Twenty two students (15%) 8th grade students will be enrolled for the 2012-2013 school year.</p> <p>Students participated in the District Science Fair Contest for the 2011-2012 school year and will participate in the 2012-2013 school year.</p> <p>Students participated in the Fairchild Tropical Challenge for the 2011-2012 school year and will participate in the 2012-2013 school year.</p>			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Limited resources are a barrier as well as transitioning from Earth and Space curriculum to Physical Science.	1.1. Science Teachers will work with students to integrate the scientific process.	1.1. Administration, Department Head (Science)	1.1. The Science department will use CSUSA Benchmark reports to monitor student progress. Instruction will be adjusted as necessary.	1.1. Formative: Biweekly assessments will be administered. CSUSA Benchmarks will be administered quarterly. Summative: The 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science 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						

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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:		Involving students in project-based and articulation activities to prepare for CTE courses in high school.			
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
	1.1. Limited opportunities to	1.1. CTE Teachers	1.1. Administration,	1.1. Administrators monitor	1.1. District Reports

1	provide CTE related electives.	implement CTE program state curriculum standards, program sequence of courses, including pacing of activities for industry certification as outlined within CTE professional development activities. Integrate the EPEP at the 8th grade level and infuse projects to increase articulation.	Guidance Counselor	the effective implementation of lessons and timely instruction in the CTE classrooms through common planning, review of test data including baseline, practice or readiness tests.
---	--------------------------------	--	--------------------	--

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
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

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	Sadlier	Reading Materials/Vocabulary	FTE	\$1,899.00
Reading	Prestwick House	Reading Materials \$	FTE	\$373.00
Reading	Cambium Learning Voyager	Reading InterventionProgram	FTE	\$16,000.00
Mathematics	Triumph Learning	Math Materials	FTE	\$2,472.00
Mathematics	Glencoe Math Connects	Math Materials	FTE	\$2,082.00
Science	Pearson Comprehensive Science 1,2,3	Physical Science Science Curriculum Materials	FTE	\$3,930.00
Writing	Oxford University Press	Writing Materials	FTE	\$6,930.00
Civics	Glencoe Civics Economics And Geography	Curriculum Materials	FTE	\$12,024.00
Attendance	Attendance Workshop/study habits/Cyber Safety	Copies of handouts	SAC	\$100.00
Suspension	Behavioral Strategies Workshop	Materials copied from powerpoint	FTE	\$100.00
				Subtotal: \$45,910.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading Plus	Reading Program	FTE	\$4,560.00
Reading	Study Island	Reading Strategies	FTE	\$2,000.00
CELLA	English In A Flash	Computer Based Language Program	FTE	\$2,000.00
Mathematics	Study Island	Oline Math Program	FTE	\$2,000.00
Science	Discovery Streamline	Online resource	FTE	\$1,000.00
Writing				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$11,560.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
Mathematics	Math Across the curriculum	Workshop/areas we use math In House staff development	NA	\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
Mathematics	Tutorial Program	Stipends	SAC	\$4,000.00
Science	Science Tutorial	Teacher Stipends	SAC	\$2,000.00
Writing				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/14/2012)

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
Tutoring in Reading and Math.	\$2,000.00

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

The EESAC meets quarterly at the school site. Teachers, parents, student representative, educational support employees and community members are involved and offer their assistance developing and monitoring the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The EESAC recommends and reviews compliance with the School Improvement Plan.

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District RENAISSANCE MIDDLE CHARTER SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	85%	74%	90%	60%	309	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	76%	62%			138	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	77% (YES)	60% (YES)			137	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					584	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District RENAISSANCE MIDDLE CHARTER SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	85%	97%	60%	330	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	77%	67%			144	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	73% (YES)	74% (YES)			147	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					621	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested