

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: MIAMI LAKES EDUCATIONAL CENTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: James V. Parker

SAC Chair: Jose Fernandez

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending Approval

Last Modified on: 10/31/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------|-----------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Principal | James V. Parker | Bachelor of Science, 1977 Salisbury State College, Maryland; Masters, 1990 Florida International University, Florida; Local Directors Certification; Florida International University, Florida, Executive Development Program Leadership; Miami-Dade County Public Schools Executive | 8 | 18 | Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2004-2012 School Grade: Pending (2012) A (2011) A (2010) A(2009) A(2008) High Stds R. Pending (2012) 59 (2011) 62(2010) 57 (2009) 53(2008) High Stds.M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 85(2010) 87(2009) 85 (2008) Lrng Gains-R. Pending (2012) 58 (2011) 62(2010) 61(2009) 62(2008) Lrng Gains-M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 81 (2010) 84(2009) 83(2008) Gains-R.25% Pending (2012) 56(2011) 55(2010) 54 (2009) 62(2008) Gains-M.-25% Pending (2012) 78 (2011) 74(2010) 79(2009) 82 (2008) |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--|----|----|---|
| | | Training Program; and Miami-Dade Public Schools Leo-T Program. | | | |
| Assis Principal | Dr. Ana Maria Lopez-Ochoa | Nova Southeastern University, Florida, Doctor of Education, 2002. Nova Southeastern University, Florida. Certificate in Educational Leadership, 2002. Florida International University Florida. Masters (MS) in Guidance & Counseling, 1984 Florida International University, Florida. Bachelor in mathematics 1974 | 7 | 21 | Vice Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2009-2012 Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2004-2009 Administrative Director – Instructional Supervision from 1999 -2004 School Grade: Pending (2012) A (2011) A (2010) A(2009) A(2008) High Stds R. Pending (2012) 59 (2011) 62(2010) 57 (2009) 53(2008) High Stds.M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 85(2010) 87(2009) 85 (2008) Lrng Gains-R. Pending (2012) 58 (2011) 62(2010) 61(2009) 62(2008) Lrng Gains-M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 81 (2010) 84(2009) 83(2008) Gains-R.25% Pending (2012) 56(2011) 55(2010) 54 (2009) 62(2008) Gains-M.-25% Pending (2012) 78 (2011) 74(2010) 79(2009) 82 (2008) |
| Assis Principal | Dr. Beverly Carter-Rémy | Bethune-Cookman University. Bachelor of Science in Elementary, Nova Southeastern University. Master of Science Degree in Reading Education. Nova Southeastern University. Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership. | 2 | 16 | Vice Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center 2011-2012 Assistant Principal of Lindsay Hopkins Technical Education Center from 2006-2011 School Grade: Pending (2012) A (2011) A (2010) A(2009) A(2008) High Stds R. Pending (2012) 59 (2011) 62(2010) 57 (2009) 53(2008) High Stds.M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 85(2010) 87(2009) 85 (2008) Lrng Gains-R. Pending (2012) 58 (2011) 62(2010) 61(2009) 62(2008) Lrng Gains-M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 81 (2010) 84(2009) 83(2008) Gains-R.25% Pending (2012) 56(2011) 55(2010) 54 (2009) 62(2008) Gains-M.-25% Pending (2012) 78 (2011) 74(2010) 79(2009) 82 (2008) |
| Assis Principal | Juan R. Gonzales | Florida International University, Florida. Bachelors in Elementary Education, 1992 St Thomas University, Florida. Masters in Guidance and Counseling, 1997. Nova Southeastern, Florida. Certification in Educational Leadership ,2000 | 11 | 11 | Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2004-2012 School Grade: Pending (2012) A (2011) A (2010) A(2009) A(2008) High Stds R. Pending (2012) 59 (2011) 62(2010) 57 (2009) 53(2008) High Stds.M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 85(2010) 87(2009) 85 (2008) Lrng Gains-R. Pending (2012) 58 (2011) 62(2010) 61(2009) 62(2008) Lrng Gains-M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 81 (2010) 84(2009) 83(2008) Gains-R.25% Pending (2012) 56(2011) 55(2010) 54 (2009) 62(2008) Gains-M.-25% Pending (2012) 78 (2011) 74(2010) 79(2009) 82 (2008) |
| Assis Principal | Thomas W. Jenkins | Florida International University, Florida. Masters (MS) Vocational Industrial Education, 1999 Florida Atlantic University, Florida. Bachelor of Arts in Art ,1982 Broward Community College, FL. Associate of Arts in Commercial Art ,1980 | 10 | 13 | Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2004-2012 School Grade: Pending (2012) A (2011) A (2010) A(2009) A(2008) High Stds R. Pending (2012) 59 (2011) 62(2010) 57 (2009) 53(2008) High Stds.M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 85(2010) 87(2009) 85 (2008) Lrng Gains-R. Pending (2012) 58 (2011) 62(2010) 61(2009) 62(2008) Lrng Gains-M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 81 (2010) 84(2009) 83(2008) Gains-R.25% Pending (2012) 56(2011) 55(2010) 54 (2009) 62(2008) Gains-M.-25% Pending (2012) 78 (2011) 74(2010) 79(2009) 82 (2008) |
| | | Florida International University, Florida .Bachelors | | | Senior Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2008-2012 Assistant Principal of Lawton Chiles Middle school from 2005-2008 School Grade: Pending (2012) A (2011) A |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Assis Principal | Michael Tandlich | of Science in Physical Education, 1979 Nova Southeastern University, Florida. Masters in Educational Leadership, Jan 1999. | 4 | 7 | (2010) A(2009) A(2008) High Stds R. Pending (2012) 59 (2011) 62(2010) 57 (2009) 53(2008) High Stds.M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 85(2010) 87(2009) 85 (2008) Lrng Gains-R. Pending (2012) 58 (2011) 62(2010) 61(2009) 62(2008) Lrng Gains-M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 81 (2010) 84(2009) 83(2008) Gains-R.25% Pending (2012) 56(2011) 55(2010) 54 (2009) 62(2008) Gains-M.-25% Pending (2012) 78 (2011) 74(2010) 79(2009) 82 (2008) |
| Assis Principal | Tammy R. Thomas | Bachelor of Science. Political Science, Clark Atlanta University. Master of Science. Science Education, Florida State University. Educational Specialist Leadership. Nova Southeastern University. English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Endorsement. Certification in Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) | 2 | 7 | Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2011-2012 Assistant Principal of Doral Middle School 2011-2007 School Grade: Pending (2012) (2011) A (2010) A (2009) A(2008) High Stds R. Pending (2012) 59(2011) 78(2010) 73 (2009) 71(2008) High Stds.M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 58(2010) 78(2009) 75 (2008) Lrng Gains-R. Pending (2012) 58 (2011) 71(2010) 68(2009) 71(2008) Lrng Gains-M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 81 (2010) 80(2009) 80(2008) Gains-R.25% Pending (2012) 56(2011) 71(2010) 76 (2009) 74(2008) Gains-M.-25% Pending (2012) 78(2011) 84(2010) 78(2009) 79 (2008) |
| Assis Principal | Ana M. Varona | Florida International University, Florida Bachelors in Education, 2001. Certification in Specific learning Disabilities (K-12) Florida International University, Florida Master's Degree, 2003. Certification in Specific Learning Disabilities (K-12). | 3 | 4 | Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2009-2012 Temporary Adult Assistant Principal of Southwest Senior Adult from 2008-2009 Teacher at Southwest Miami Senior High School from 2002-2008 School Grade: Pending (2012) A (2011) A (2010) A(2009) A(2008) High Stds R. Pending (2012) 59 (2011) 62(2010) 57 (2009) 53(2008) High Stds.M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 85(2010) 87(2009) 85 (2008) Lrng Gains-R. Pending (2012) 58 (2011) 62(2010) 61(2009) 62(2008) Lrng Gains-M. Pending (2012) 87(2011) 81 (2010) 84(2009) 83(2008) Gains-R.25% Pending (2012) 56(2011) 55(2010) 54 (2009) 62(2008) Gains-M.-25% Pending (2012) 78 (2011) 74(2010) 79(2009) 82 (2008) |

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) |
|--------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| N/A | | | | | |

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) |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| | Principal, Vice Principal, Assistant | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------|--|
| 1 | Regular meetings with new teachers | Principals, Academy Leaders, and Department Heads | June, 2013 | |
| 2 | Provide opportunities for leadership within the academies | Principal, Vice Principal, Assistant Principals | June, 2013 | |
| 3 | Provide opportunities for Professional Development | PD Liaison | June, 2013 | |
| 4 | Partnering new teachers with veteran staff | Vice Principal, Assistant Principals | June, 2013 | |

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 |
| 1 | Instructor is currently finishing his Reading Endorsement. |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 75 | 0.0%(0) | 6.7%(5) | 42.7%(32) | 48.0%(36) | 41.3%(31) | 98.7%(74) | 8.0%(6) | 8.0%(6) | 9.3%(7) |

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 |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| N/A | | | |

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

The focus of the Title I program at Miami Lakes Educational Center is to provide services to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school or summer school programs. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to secondary students to aid in

mastering the materials in the State academic content standards. Miami Lakes Educational Center provides instructional literacy assistance to students while also providing technical assistance to teachers in implementing the reading plan at the school level. A high-quality and comprehensive educational program is in place to meet the rigorous and challenging State academic standards. Title I coordinated programs ensure the effective utilization and fidelity of research-based reading materials, the effective implementation of differentiated instruction, and the analysis and utilization of student assessment data to drive instruction for the lower-achieving students. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program includes a Parental Program and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and delinquent students.

Miami Lakes Educational Center works with different agencies to meet the needs of our students. These agencies are as follows: The Alliance for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning (GLBTQ) youth provides groups for our sexual minority students on a weekly basis. The school partners with Jewish Community Services to provide all our incoming ninth graders with a comprehensive dating and violence program. Additionally, Students Against Destructive Decisions (SADD), a national organization educating other on drug prevention, provides information and presentations to our school. The school also partners with the American Lung Association (TATU).

MLEC receives assistance from several agencies to provide services for students and their families. Bruce Heinken Fund is an organization that assists needy students in acquiring eyeglasses. The Children's Trust Fund is a referral network for parents that provide resources in such areas as medical, financial social, after school and special needs.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the educational Alternative Outreach Program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.

Title II

We are a Title I district that 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

N/A

Title X- Homeless

Miami Lakes Educational Center will provide:

- The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.
- All schools are eligible to receive services and will do so upon identification and classification of a student as homeless.
- Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assists schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students.
- The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and are provided with all entitlements.
- Project Upstart provides a homeless sensitivity, awareness campaign to all the schools - each school is provided a video and curriculum manual, and a contest is sponsored by the homeless trust-a community organization.
- Project Upstart provides tutoring and counseling to twelve homeless shelters in the community.
- Project Upstart will be proposing a 2011 summer academic enrichment camp for students in several homeless shelters in the community, pending funding.
- The District Homeless Student Liaison continues to participate in community organization meetings and task forces as it relates to homeless children and youth.
- Each school will identify a school based homeless coordinator to be trained on the McKinney-Vento Law ensuring appropriate services are provided to the homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Miami Lakes Educational Center has partnered with the Jewish Community Services / Dating and Violence Program and the Miami Coalition for Christian and Jews (MCCJ) Heritage Panel to teach students how to improve their communication skills and prevent violence. The MCCJ Heritage Panel is a human relations program designed to explore diversity among Americans of

different races, ethnicities and religions. MCCJ Heritage Panel teaches a process as well as a program to foster those values which support the importance of understanding and appreciating individual differences. Select staff members were trained on how to facilitate student panelists. These panelists act as student advocates to eliminate discrimination.

Nutrition Programs

- Miami Lakes Educational Center adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness policy.
- Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.
- 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

High School completion courses are available to all eligible Miami Lakes Educational Center students in the evening based on the senior high school's recommendation. Courses are taken for credit recovery, promotion, remediation, or grade forgiveness purposes.

Career and Technical Education

By promoting career pathways and programs of study students may earn Occupational Completion Points (OCPs) and have a better understanding and appreciation of the postsecondary opportunities available and a plan for how to acquire the skills necessary to take advantage of those opportunities. Articulation agreements allow students to earn university, college and postsecondary technical credits in high school, providing more opportunities for students to complete 2 and 4 year postsecondary degrees. Students will gain expertise by participating in career and technical curriculum that enables them to obtain industry-recognized credentials (CAPE). Readiness for postsecondary will continue to strengthen with the integration of academic and career technical components and a coherent sequence of courses.

Job Training

By promoting Career Pathways and Programs of Study students are eligible to receive Occupational Completion Points (OCP) and have a better understanding and appreciation of the postsecondary opportunities available and a plan for how to acquire the skills necessary to take advantage of those opportunities.

Articulation Agreements allow students to earn university, college and postsecondary technical credits in high school providing more opportunities for students to complete 2 and 4 year postsecondary degrees.

Other

Parental Involvement Program Description

Involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extend an open invitation to our school's parent resource center in order to inform parents regarding available programs, their rights under No Child Left Behind and other referral services.

Increase parental engagement/involvement through: developing (with on-going parental input) our Title I School-Parent Compact for all students; continuing the Title I Parental Involvement Policy; scheduling the Title I Orientation Meeting (Open House); and other documents/activities necessary to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements.

Conduct informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents. Schedule workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents' schedules, as part of our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.

Complete Title I Administration Parental Involvement Monthly School Reports (FM-6914 Rv. 06-08) and the Title I Parental Involvement Monthly Activities Report (FM-6913 03-07), and submit to Title I Administration by the 5th of each month as documentation of compliance with NCLB Section 1118.

School Improvement Grant Fund/ School Improvement Grant Initiative

Miami Lakes Educational Center receives funding under the School Improvement Grant Fund/School Improvement Grant Initiative in order to increase the achievement of the lowest performing subgroups through comprehensive, ongoing data analysis, curriculum and instruction alignment, and specific interventions such as extended day remedial tutorial instruction, differentiated instruction/intervention, classroom libraries, evidenced-based strategies, and web-based programs. Additionally, Title I School Improvement Grant/Fund support funding and assistance to schools in Differentiated Accountability

based on need.

The Voluntary Public School Choice Program (I Choose!) a federally funded grant, is a district wide initiative designed to assist in achieving the Miami-Dade County Public Schools' District's Strategic Plan goal to expand the availability of access to high quality public school choice options for all parents in Miami-Dade County. Voluntary Public School Choice grant funds are used to evaluate programs, inform parents of educational options, and re-culture teaching practices to establish quality school environments.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

- Administrators
- Teachers (Department and Academy)
- TRUST Counselor
- Special Education Personnel
- School Guidance Counselors
- School Psychologist
- School Social Worker
- Members of Advisory Group
- Community Stakeholder

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?

Monthly meetings are held to discuss instructional decisions necessary based on input from the monthly Academy and Department data discussions. Progress is monitored through various student achievement indicators. The team identifies professional development and resources necessary in order to meet identified goals. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team recognizes needed implementations. Therefore, the MTSS/RtI Leadership team, in turn, meets as necessary to carry out these functions.

Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:

- Adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students by developing and implementing the guidelines addressed in the School Improvement Plan (SIP)
- Adjust the delivery of behavior management system
- Create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions
- Adjust the allocation of school-based resources
- Drive decisions regarding targeted professional development

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 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team makes recommendations to the School Advisory Council for the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Members of the RtI Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 goals; academic and social areas that need to be addressed, and set clear goals for instruction as evidenced on the School Improvement Plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

Academic

- FCAT
- Interim Assessments
- FAIR Assessment
- Student Grades

Behavior

- Student Case Management System

- Detentions, Suspensions/Expulsions
- Referrals by Student Behavior
- Climate Surveys
- Attendance

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:

1. training for all administrators in the MTSS/RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
2. providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures; and
3. providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:

1. training for all administrators in the MTSS/RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
2. providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures; and
3. providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

James V. Parker, Principal Site-based administrator
 Dr. Ana Lopez-Ochoa, Vice Principal Site-based administrator
 Michael Tandlich, Senior Assistant Principal Site-based administrator
 Tammy R. Thomas, Assistant Principal Site-based administrator
 Erica Evans, Cambridge Academy Career/Technical Education (CTE) Academy Leader
 Matais Oxidine, Communication Entertainment Academy Career/Technical Education (CTE) Academy Leader
 Glenda Algaze, Health Academy Career/Technical Education (CTE) Academy Leader
 Marlon Vernon, Information Technology Academy Career/Technical Education (CTE) Academy Leader
 John Moffi, Social Studies Department Chair
 Michael Sanchez, Science Department Chair
 Neyda Borges, Reading and Language Arts Department Chair
 Jose Fernandez, Math Department Chair
 Luz Escobar, Special Education Department Chair
 Charles Green, Media Specialist Department Chair
 Ana Tigerino, Student Services Department Chair
 Beatriz Ambrosio, Test Chair
 Helena Castro Activities Director

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

1. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following important questions:
 - What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
 - How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments)
 - How will we respond when students have not learned? (Response to intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
 - How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (enrichment opportunities)
2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
3. Hold regular team meetings.
4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, and updating them on procedures and progress.
5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate daily instruction and specific interventions.
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

Mathematics Initiatives

1. Suggestions for improving non-mastery target areas include:
 - Align instruction with the district pacing guide to allow for testing on common material.
 - Promote after school tutoring, E2020 tutoring, or Saturday FCAT tutoring for low-achieving students.
 - Use inquiry based instruction, discovery learning, cooperative group instruction, technology, manipulative and other strategies with all subgroups to increase achievement to high level.

Reading Initiatives

1. Suggestions for improving non-mastery target areas include:
 - Promote common research-based reading strategies including Reciprocal Teaching and graphic organizers across all grade levels and disciplines.
 - Provide in depth, explicit instruction in word analysis skills aimed at the lower 25% of students by developing focused Bell Ringer activities.
 - Explore supplemental materials and online technologies to enhance high-order reasoning strategies that include activities to synthesize and evaluate the information from multiple sources.
 - Promote recreational reading to increase time spent with print.
 - Use of multiple books and sources to provide wide experiences with print genres, and create regular opportunities across academic and career/ technical (CTE) curriculum for content-focused reading and writing.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

*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.

N/A

*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.

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is based on a cross section of the faculty and administrative team that represents highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum. Reading strategies will be implemented in all academic and CTE classrooms with the assistance of the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Common reading strategies will be supported throughout the school. Progress monitoring will occur quarterly through the Interim Assessments.

The LLT is charged with cultivating the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by being active participants in all Literacy Leadership Team meetings and activities.

*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?

Miami Lakes Educational Center (MLEC) has a unique history in Miami-Dade County Public Schools; it was designed to house academies and career based technical programs. Students apply to MLEC, indicating their technical pathway of choice. Upon admission to MLEC students are placed into their selected Career Technical Academy. To support students' efforts, Career Technical Educators (CTE) and core academic teachers provide an interdisciplinary curriculum within the academy holding the students greatest interest, resulting in core academic instruction related to their grade level class with an emphasis on their future careers. MLEC has six career-technical academies: Cambridge, Entrepreneurship, Health, Communications/Entertainment, Trade/Industry and Information Technology. This model will create a highly qualified

future workforce by offering state-of-the-art academic, career, and technical education to all our students.

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?

The ACT Online Prep Program allowed students the opportunity to receive individualized preparation and feedback in preparation for the ACT and post secondary endeavors. Every student received an individual password and instructions to access the ACT Online Prep Program from home and /or school.

The Student Services Team provides MLEC students and parents with information on post-secondary institutions, transition and readiness. The counselors attend all annual State University System, College Board, ACT and district meetings to keep up with current issues. Information on post secondary schools, scholarships, state and federal financial aid, and college transition is disseminated via individual student and parent conferences, classroom presentations, phone contact, parent nights, student academy meetings, I.E.P. conferences (as requested), and through our schools web site.

Students at MLEC start from their CTE classes in 9th grade organizing their personal portfolios and resumes and are taught how to keep track of important documents and information. Students must plan, organize, and understand how to seek guidance, form formal and informal study groups, and set priorities. Cambridge and Informational Technology (IT) academies will initiate an Introduction to Technology course while the remaining academies will utilize introduction to Career Pathway courses. As students progress through to senior year, each is asked to present a mandatory CAPSTONE project which is the culmination and planned presentation of "all" key concepts they have learned throughout high school, specifically their chosen career pathway which helps lead into post secondary education.

In the 2011-2012 all graduates from Miami Lakes Educational Center (MLEC) will complete elective courses correlating to their career pathway. These courses assist them in preparing for industry certification exams and transitioning into post secondary education.

In the 2011-2012 school year, Miami Lakes Educational Center will continue to offer its Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) and advanced placement (AP) courses, as well as numerous dual enrollment courses available. MLEC recognizes the importance of college readiness exams such as the PSAT, SAT, and ACT. All tenth graders will comply with the district's mandate to take the PSAT. Student scores will be provided by winter break and given explanations how to interpret scores and instructed how to access "My College Road" provided by College Board. Additionally, the ASVAB is available. Furthermore, students are urged to take the SAT and ACT junior and/or senior year. Waivers are available.

In 2011-2012 MLEC will continue to encourage students to take AP, AICE, and/or dual enrollment classes. In addition, the counselors will continue to conduct classroom visits, to share information and requirements for post secondary institutions as well as scholarship information available through Florida Bright Futures and any other scholarships available.

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](#)

Analysis of college readiness is based on the latest data available – from the High School Feedback Report. The percent of graduates who were eligible for the FL Gold Seal Vocational award exceeds both the district and state percentage (2.48%) The percent of graduates who completed at least one AP, AICE or Dual Enrollment course is 42.9% which is above both district and state averages. The percent of graduates with standard high school diploma who took the SAT/ ACT / CPT and scored at or above college-level cut scores is 60.6% in math, 81.8% in reading, and 85.5% in writing. The reading and writing scores exceed both district and state averages. Finally the percent of graduates enrolled in a Florida public postsecondary institution was 56.7% which exceeds both district and state averages. Miami Lakes Educational Center has identified the following as school-wide priorities. As new federal and state guidelines are introduced under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), secondary students and staff must adapt to an increasing rigorous curriculum that stresses career- and college-readiness.

- Increase participation in public postsecondary readiness in reading, writing, and mathematics skills; the school offers elective courses for College Placement Test (CPT) preparation.
- Teachers will be given the opportunity to modify methods of instruction to suit the changing postsecondary requirements of student's college readiness.
- A more concerted effort needs to be made to assure all instructional personnel will become well versed and knowledgeable in the integration of traditional academic subjects with the career-technical curriculum.
- Arrange for CTE students to prepare for and take industry certification exams through their career and technical classes.
- MLEC will recognize the importance of college readiness exams by increasing the percentage of students participating in the ACT. MLEC will continue to be a test center and provide numerous administrations of the ACT exam.

MLEC met seven out of eight of the Perkins Secondary Performance Targets:

MLEC met the Reading Attainment Performance Target of 50%, obtaining 63.21%;

MLEC met the Math Attainment Performance Target of 69.53%, obtaining 86.48%;
MLEC met the Technical Skills Performance Target (including CAPE and Industry Certification exams), and of 86.38%, obtaining 95.82%;
MLEC met the Completion Performance Target of 89.53%, obtaining 98.74%;
MLEC met the Graduation Rate Performance Target of 90.74%, obtaining 96.58%;
MLEC approached, though did not meet, the Placement Performance Target of 85.50%, obtaining 81.34%;
MLEC met the Non-Traditional Enrollement Performance Target of 19.69%, obtaining 24.18%; and
MLEC met the Non-Traditional Completion Target of 94.40%, obtaining 98.15%.

MLEC Post-Secondary met four out of six of the Perkins Secondary Performance Targets:
MLEC Post-Secondary met the Technical Skills Performance Target of 74%, obtaining 81.55%;
MLEC Post-Secondary approached, though did not meet, the Completion Performance Target of 44%, obtaining 36.84%;
MLEC Post-Secondary met the Retention Performance Target of 53%, obtaining 55.19%;
MLEC Post-Secondary did not meet, the Placement Performance Target of 83%, obtaining 68.87%;
MLEC Post-Secondary met the Non-Traditional Enrollment Performance Target of 9%, obtaining 11.79%;
MLEC Post-Secondary met the Non-Traditional Completion Performance Target of 19.23%, obtaining 25.74%.

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. | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 29% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. |
| Reading Goal # 1a: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 proficiency to 33%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 29% (222) | 33% (249) |

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 Reading Test was Reporting Category 4- Informational Text/Research Process. Students need to synthesize texts and determine the validity and reliability of information. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Report Category 4: Provide high-order reasoning strategies that include activities to synthesize and evaluate the validity and reliability of information from multiple sources to draw conclusions about a variety of text structures and explain their impact on meaning in text. | The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) along with administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies. | Review formative biweekly Assessment Data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment |
| 2 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2- Reading Application. Students need to determine the main idea or essential message through inferring, paraphrasing and summarizing. Students also need to identify cause-effect relationships in text. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Report Category 2: Provide opportunities for students to identify and interpret stated and implied main idea. Use graphic organizers to identify cause-effect relationships to interpret information. | Administration, LLT | Review formative biweekly Assessment Data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |

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: | N/A |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A | | | | |

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: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 38% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency to 39%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 38% (284) | 39% (295) |

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 that showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 4 – Informational text/Research Process. Students struggle with organizational skills necessary to organize text information and features. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Report Category 4: Provide high-order reasoning strategies that include activities to synthesize and evaluate the validity and reliability of information from multiple sources to draw conclusions about a variety of text structures and explain their impact on meaning in text. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, LLT | Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 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:

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

| N/A | | N/A | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | N/A | | | | |

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: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 75% 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 80%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 75% (555) | 80% (592) |

| 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 2.0 was Reporting Category 4- Informational Text/Research Process. Students need to synthesize texts and determine the validity and reliability of information. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Report Category 4: Provide high-order reasoning strategies that include activities to synthesize and evaluate the validity and reliability of information from multiple sources to draw conclusions about a variety of text structures and explain their impact on meaning in text. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, LLT | Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 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:

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|-----------------|--|
| | | | Person or | Process Used to | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A | | | | |

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 Reading 2.0 Test indicate that 78% of students in the Lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 83%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 78% (155) | 83%(165) |

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 2.0 was Reporting Category 2-Reading Application. Students need to determine the main idea or essential message through inferring, paraphrasing and summarizing. Students also need to identify cause-effect relationships in text | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Report Category 2: Provide opportunities for students to identify and interpret stated and implied main idea. Use graphic organizers to identify cause-effect relationships to interpret information. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, LLT | Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Reading 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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%, using 2010-2011 as the baseline year. 5A : | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 69 | 72 | 75 | 77 | 80 | |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: | Our goal is to increase the proficiency of the White subgroup to 83%, Black subgroup to 67%, Hispanic subgroup to 72% and Asian subgroup to 100% points. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | |
|---|---|
| White: 72% (21) Black: 62%(110) Hispanic: 68% (362) Asian: 93%(14) American Indian: N/A | White: 83%(24) Black: 67%(119) Hispanic: 72%(384) Asian: 100% (15) American Indian: N/A |
|---|---|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 was Reporting Category 2- Reading Application. Students need to determine the main idea or essential message through inferring, paraphrasing and summarizing. Students also need to identify cause-effect relationships in text. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Report Category 2: Provide opportunities for students to identify and interpret stated and implied main idea. Use graphic organizers to identify cause-effect relationships to interpret information. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, LLT | Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0 Assessment |
| 2 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 Test was Reporting Category1: Vocabulary – Identify and understands the meaning of conceptually advanced prefixes, suffixes, and root words. | Provide students with need more practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms, Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word relationships from context, as well as provide additional instruction on word meanings. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, LLT | Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Reading 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: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase proficiency to 41%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 24% (7) | 41% (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 Reading 2.0 Test was Reporting Category1: Vocabulary – Identify and understands the meaning of conceptually advanced prefixes, suffixes, and | Provide students with need more practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms, Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word relationships from context, as well as | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, LLT | Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment |

| | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|
| root words. | provide additional instruction on word meanings. | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|

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: | The results of the FCAT Reading 2.0 test indicate that the SWD subgroup is making satisfactory progress. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 37% (24) | 38% (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 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 was Reporting Category 2- Reading Application. Students need to determine the main idea or essential message through inferring, paraphrasing and summarizing. Students also need to identify cause-effect relationships in text. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Report Category 2: Provide opportunities for students to identify and interpret stated and implied main idea. Use graphic organizers to identify cause-effect relationships to interpret information. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, LLT | Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0 Assessment |
| 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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 FCAT Reading 2.0 test indicate that the ED subgroup is making satisfactory progress. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 65% (364) | 68% (381) |

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 Reading 2.0 was Reporting Category 2- Reading Application. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Report Category 2: Provide opportunities for students to identify and | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, LLT | Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | Students need to determine the main idea or essential message through inferring, paraphrasing and summarizing. Students also need to identify cause-effect relationships in text. | interpret stated and implied main idea. Use graphic organizers to identify cause-effect relationships to interpret information. | | Results from the 2013 FCAT Reading 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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Reading Across the Curriculum | 9-12 | DeVry University | 9-12 Instructors | November 6, 2012 | Student work folder, classroom walkthroughs | Administration |

Reading 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 |
| Tutoring | Part-time hourly funding | Small Learning Community Grant | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$1,000.00 |

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: | | The results of the 2012 CELLA Listening/Speaking assessment indicate that 64% of students achieved proficiency. | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | | | | | |
| 64% (29) | | | | | |
| 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 CELLA Listening/Speaking Assessment, was paraphrasing and retelling. The students had difficulty in understanding text when asked to read, retell or paraphrase what they read. | The students will use brief excerpts or passages from text and paraphrase what they have read, accounting for the vocabulary words and concepts that are important to the excerpt. | LLT/ESOL Instructor | Student Work Folders Teacher Made Assessments | 2013 CELLA Listening/Speaking 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: | | The results of the 2012 CELLA Reading assessment indicate that 51% of students achieved proficiency. | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | | | | | |
| 51% (23) | | | | | |
| 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 CELLA Reading Assessment was comprehending text on grade level. The students had difficulty in understanding text when asked to read, grade level text independently. | The students will use the Reciprocal Teaching steps (predicting, questioning, clarifying and summarizing) to comprehend grade level text. | LLT/ESOL Instructor | Student Work Folders Teacher Made Assessments | 2013 CELLA Reading 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: | | The results of the 2012 CELLA Writing assessment indicate that 38% of students achieved proficiency. | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | | | | | |
| 38% (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 CELLA Writing Assessment was the writing process The students had difficulty in understanding the necessary steps to respond to a writing prompt. | The students will write in the following steps: planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing according to their individual writing level; additionally, they will share and respond to other pieces of writing. | LLT/ESOL Instructor | Student Writing Journals Teacher Made Assessments | 2013 CELLA Writing 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 |
| 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 |

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1: | N/A |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2: | N/A |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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:

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3: | N/A |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

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%. | | Mathematics Goal # Our goal is to reduce the percentage of non-proficient by half by 2016-2017, using 2010-2011 as the baseline year. 5A : | | | | |
|--|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | |

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: | The results of the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Test indicate that all subgroups are making satisfactory progress. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: N/A Black: 64%(22) Hispanic: 72%(81) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A | White: N/A Black: 68%(23) Hispanic: 75%(85) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | The lowest scores were in: Body of Knowledge-Algebra Standard: 2 (Polynomials). Students have difficulty with dividing polynomials by monomials and polynomials with various techniques, including synthetic division. | Design effective strategies for integrating technology using inquiry based activities to improve connections between multiple representations of equations. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, MTSS-RTI Team | Review assessment to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. | Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Test |

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: | The results of the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Test indicate that ELI subgroup is making satisfactory progress. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 53%(6) | 56%(6) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | The lowest scores were in: Body of Knowledge-Algebra Standard: 2 (Polynomials). Students have difficulty with dividing polynomials by monomials and polynomials with various techniques, including synthetic division. | Design effective strategies for integrating technology using inquiry based activities to improve connections between multiple representations of equations. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, MTSS-RtI Team | Review assessment to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. | Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Test |

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: | The results of the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Test indicate that the SWD subgroup is making satisfactory progress. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 77%(8) | 79%(8) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | The lowest scores were in: Body of Knowledge-Algebra Standard: 2 (Polynomials). Students have difficulty with dividing polynomials by monomials and polynomials with various techniques, including synthetic division. | Design effective strategies for integrating technology using inquiry based activities to improve connections between multiple representations of equations. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, MTSS-RtI Team | Review assessment to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. | Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Test |

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:

| | |
|--|---|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E: | The results of the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Test indicate that ED subgroup is making satisfactory progress. |
|--|---|

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 72%(89) | 75%(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 lowest scores were in: Body of Knowledge-Algebra Standard: 2 (Polynomials). Students have difficulty with dividing polynomials by monomials and polynomials with various techniques, including synthetic division. | Design effective strategies for integrating technology using inquiry based activities to improve connections between multiple representations of equations. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, MTSS-RtI Team | Review assessment to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. | Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Test |

End of High 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 1 EOC Test indicate that 53% of the students achieved levels in the middle and upper 3rd. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to continue making satisfactory progress. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 53% (83) | 54% (84) |

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 results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC exam revealed that the lowest scores were in: Body of Knowledge-Algebra Standard: 2 (Polynomials) Students have difficulty with multiple representations (graphical to symbolic). | Develop departmental guidelines for all students learning notebooks designed to increase student achievement. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, MTSS-RtI Team | Review assessment to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. | Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Test |

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 1 EOC Test indicate that 7% of the students achieved levels in the middle and upper 3rd. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to continue making satisfactory progress. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 7% (11) | 7% (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 lowest scores were in: Body of Knowledge-Algebra Standard: 2 (Polynomials). Students have difficulty with dividing polynomials by monomials and polynomials with various techniques, including synthetic division. | Design effective strategies for integrating technology using inquiry based activities to improve connections between multiple representations of equations. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, MTSS-RTI Team | Review assessment to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. | Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Test |

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: | The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC Test indicate that 37% of the students achieved proficiency levels. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 39%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 37% (139) | 39% (146) |

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 | Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 EOC Geometry exam was Two-Dimensional Geometry. Students have difficulties with using methods of direct to indirect proof and determining whether a | Increase the use of Geometry's Sketchpad and manipulatives to increase retention of key concepts in two dimensional geometry. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, MTSS-RTI Team | Review assessment to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. | Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|----------|
| short proof is logically valid. | | | | EOC Test |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|----------|

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: | The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC Test indicate that 34% of the students achieved proficiency levels. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 35%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 34% (128) | 35% (131) |

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 | Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 EOC Geometry exam was Two-Dimensional Geometry. Students have difficulties with geometric proofs, including proofs of contradiction and proofs involving coordinate geometry. | Assigned students to cooperative student teams and require that the students explain to their peers in both verbal and written form the process used to arrive to a solution. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, MTSS-RtI Team | Review assessment to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. | Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC Test |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Use of Technology | 9-12 | Mrs. Chaves | Course-alike Learning Teams | November 6, 2012 | Evidence of technology use in grade level planning sessions | Administrators |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s) /Material(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |

| Professional Development | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Tutoring | Part-time hourly funding | Smaller Learning Community Grant | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$1,000.00 |

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | N/A | | |
| Science Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| 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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | | | | | |
| Science 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 |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

Biology 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 Biology. Biology Goal #1: | The results of the 2012 Biology EOC Exam indicate that 35 % of the students achieved proficiency in the middle third. Expected level of performance for 2013 is 37 % proficiency for the middle third. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 35% (125) | 37%(129) |

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 | <p>Areas of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 Biology EOC exam was The Big Idea: The Practice of Science. A concept woven throughout all science ideas and topics.</p> <p>Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities that are linked to increased rigor through inquiry-based learning in Life Science.</p> <p>Students need support in developing and analyzing independent projects and to incorporate inquiry-based virtual science experiments.</p> | <p>Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase their scientific thinking. Develop and implement inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypothesis, data analysis, and explanation of variable and experimental design in Life Science which incorporates Mathematical concepts and skills.</p> <p>Utilize various reading and writing strategies (Power Writing, use of probes and/or reading resource material)</p> <p>Students may demonstrate the Scientific methods by participation in the Science Fair and/or other STEM competitions and activities.</p> | Administration, MTSS-RtI Team | The MTSS-RtI Team will review students work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor school base assessment and Interims to ensure adequate intervention. | <p>Formative – District Baseline Data and school based assessment.</p> <p>Summative 2013 – EOC Biology Evaluation</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 Biology. | The results of the 2012 Biology EOC Exam indicate that 46 % of the students achieved proficiency in the upper third |
|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Biology Goal #2: | | Expected level of performance for 2013 is 47 % proficiency for the upper third. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 46% (164) | | 47%(166) | | | |
| 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 | Areas of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2012 Biology EOC exam was The Big Idea: Molecular and Cellular Biology Students need exposure to strategies that allow them to conceptualize the unseen microscopic world and examine relationships to structure and function. | Provide a variety of hands-on inquiry-based (H.O.T. labs) learning opportunities for students to analyze, draw appropriate conclusion, and apply key instructional concepts as to the origin, development, and classification of major life forms. Utilize reading and writing strategies (i.e. Power writing, use of reading probes/resource material). | Administration, MTSS-RtI Team | The Administrative team will review student work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor school based assessment and interims to ensure adequate progress and to adjust instruction. | Formative - District Base-line data and school based assessment, projects entered at the Regional Science and Engineering fair. Summative - 2013 Biology EOC |

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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| PLC - Rigor through Inquiry-based learning – focus Biology (HOT Labs) | 9-12 | Grade level teachers | All Science teachers | Early Release– September and October, 2012. | Student work folders, walk-throughs, and assessments. | Administration, Chairperson |
| Use of Hand-held interactive devices | 9-12 | Grade level teachers | All Science teachers | Early Release– October and December, 2012. Professional Development Day | Student work folders, walk-throughs, and assessments. | Administration, Chairperson |
| Technology – develop and use file sharing web-site (Edumoto, Wiki, Group Fusion, Drop bucket, etc) | 9-12 | Grade level teachers | All Science teachers | Early Release– October and December, 2012. Professional Development Day | E-mails, comments left on site by students, teacher/parent e-mails, sample page of site | Administration, Chairperson |
| Hands on Use of | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------|----------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Physical Science equipment (Presented by MDC College Professor) | 9-12 | Grade level teachers | All Science teachers | Early Release–October and December, 2012. Professional Development Day | Student work folders, walk-throughs, and assessments. | Administration, Chairperson |
|---|------|----------------------|----------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Creating of visual content review sheets and diagram bank of visual cues for discussion – teacher produced for strategic reviews | Teacher produced – visual diagrams – hard copy and visual diagram bank | Smaller Learning Community Grant | \$300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$300.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Use of Hand-held interactive devises | In-House (teacher facilitated)/PD | Smaller Learning Community Grant | \$100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$100.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Hands on Use of Physical Science equipment | Presented by MDC College Physics Professor | Smaller Learning Community Grant | \$50.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$50.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Student created Biology content review sheets | Biology content review sheets | Smaller Learning Community Grant | \$300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$300.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$750.00 |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test indicate that 89% of students scored a level 3 or higher. | | | |
| Writing Goal # 1a: | | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher by 1 percentage point to 90%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| 89% (363) | | | 90% (367) | | |
| 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 Writing FCAT 2.0 was in the elaboration of persuasive essays. Students need to develop and demonstrate understanding of persuasive writing techniques that is used for the purpose of influencing the reader. | During writing instruction, students will write essays that state a position or claim, present detailed evidence, examples, and reasoning to support effective arguments and emotional appeals, and acknowledge and refute opposing arguments. Also, peer editing and anchor papers will also be used throughout the lesson. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson, MTSS-RTI and LLT Teams | Administer and score monthly students' writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust focus. | Formative: District Baseline data and writing prompts. Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test. |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|

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: | N/A |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Writing Across the Curriculum | 9 - 12 | DeVry University | 9-12 Instructors | November 6, 2012 | Student work folders, classroom walkthroughs | Administration |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Writing Goals

U.S. History 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 U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1: | The U.S. History baseline data revealed that 100% of the students are non-proficient. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0%(1) | 10%(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 | Students have limited understanding and knowledge of the U.S. Constitution. | Students will engage in project based activities which emphasize an understanding of democratic principles. Activate prior knowledge to engage students in understanding the U.S. Constitution by utilizing Discovery Channel programs. | Administration, MTSS- RtI | Data analysis of assessments, comparing benchmarks to evaluations. | Bi-weekly site generated assessments. 2013 US History EOC |

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 U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2: | The U.S. History baseline data revealed that 100% of the students are non-proficient. |
|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| 0%(1) | | | 10%(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 | Students have limited understanding and knowledge of the U.S. Constitution. | Opportunities will be provided for students to participate in a mock Congressional hearing. | Administration, MTSS-Rtl | Students will participate in District competitions. Rubrics and placement in mock hearing will determine effectiveness. | Bi-weekly site generated assessments 2013 US History EOC |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Discovery Channel PD | 11th Grade | Discovery Channel Staff | 11th Grade U.S. History teachers | November 6, 2012 | Included in Lesson Plans | Administration |

U.S. History Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| 1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase attendance to 96.93% by minimizing absences Our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more), and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 96.43% (1414) | 96.93%(1421) |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 309 | 294 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 449 | 427 |

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 rate from previous year decreased due to truancy. The trancies were associated student's failure to submit notes from home and absences related to personal/emotional and family conflicts. | <p>Conduct grade level/academy assemblies in order to address school/district attendance policy.</p> <p>Provide parents/students with information on school procedures for submitting documentation in order to excuse absences.</p> <p>Students with excessive absences are referred to School Social Worker.</p> <p>Implement and enforce an after school detention program for students with excessive tardiness.</p> | Assistant Principal | Weekly updates to administration and to entire staff during monthly faculty meetings and sign-in logs. | <p>Use monthly/daily attendance rosters to monitor attendance and evaluate progress using COGNOS reports.</p> <p>Attendance Review Committee</p> |

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 |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Truancy Prevention | 9-12 Attendance and Tardiness | Staff from Attendance Services | All teachers, counselors, and attendance clerk | November 6, 2012 | A Truancy Intervention Monitoring Program will be developed during the PD. An assistant Principal will monitor the implementation of this program. | Assistant Principal and designee |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| 1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10%. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 0 | 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 |
| 22 | 20 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 20 | 18 |

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 | As a school of choice, Miami Lakes Educational Center does not exercise indoor suspension due to satisfactory conduct requirement for admission. Outdoor suspensions are based on level of offence as per the Code of Student Conduct. | <p>Academy orientation to review the Code of Student Conduct/ Spot Success Program with teachers, parents, and students for appropriate behavior.</p> <p>Provide students with an agenda which includes the Code of Student Conduct.</p> <p>As an alternative to outdoor suspension, implement an after school detention program.</p> <p>Provide counseling sessions for parents and students as an alternative to outdoor suspension.</p> | Administrative Team MTSS-Rtl | Monitor Spot Success report by grade level and monitor COGNOS report on student outdoor suspension rate. Discuss progress during administrative meetings | <p>COGNOS Reports, Daily Attendance, and Monthly SCAM reports.</p> <p>Spot Success Report</p> |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Student Code of Conduct | 9-12 | Martha Chavez | School Wide | November 6, 2012 | Workshop to review classroom management strategies with teachers | Administration |

Suspension Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School - F.S., Sec. 1003.53

* 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. Dropout Prevention | | | | | |
| Dropout Prevention Goal #1: | | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease our dropout rate by 0.5 percentage points and to maintain our current graduation rate. | | | |
| <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i> | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Dropout Rate: | | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate: | | | |
| 0.13% (2) | | 0% | | | |
| 2012 Current Graduation Rate: | | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate: | | | |
| 94.97% (340) | | 94.97% (340) | | | |
| 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 |
| | Maintain the same dropout rate in the 2012-2013 school year. | Identify and meet with At-Risk students and discuss the Student Progression Plan, | School Counselor | Monitor enrollment log of At-Risk students, referring students to alternative programs. | Enrollment Logs Graduation Rate Report |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | | options and credit recovery programs, and other programs available in an effort to enroll the student in alternative educational options. | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Graduation Requirements | 9-12 | Guidance Counselor | School Wide | November 6, 2012 | Monitor Parent Sign-In Roster | Guidance Counselor |
| Graduation Requirements | 9-12 | Guidance Counselor | School Wide | November 6, 2012 | Monitor Parent Sign-In Roster | Guidance Counselor |

Dropout Prevention Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Dropout Prevention 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:

During the 2011-2012 school year, parent participation in

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | school wide activities was (3.2%). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase parental participation by 10% from 3.2% to 13%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 3.2% | 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 | 1.1. Lack of participation in school wide activities by parents. | 1.1. Provide parents with advanced notification of school events and activities via Connect Ed messages. Stager events and times to provide parents with multiple opportunities to attend events. Inform parents of events using Connect Ed (phone and emails). | 1.1. Administration | 1.1. Utilize Sign-In sheets, rosters and logs to determine the number of parents attending school community events. | 1.1. School Sign-In Sheets, rosters, telephone logs, and Connect Ed |
| 2 | 1.2. Parent limited access to resources available through the Parent Portal | 1.2. Provide Professional Development in the Parent Resource Center on the use of the Parent Portal | 1.2. Administration | 1.2. Utilize Sign-In sheets, rosters and logs to determine the number of parents attending school community events. | 1.2. School Sign-In Sheets, rosters, and telephone logs. |

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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Effectiveness of the on-line Parent Portal | 9-12 | Selected School Staff | Parent Academy/Portal Workshop | November 6, 2012 | Effectiveness will be determined by event attendance and staff feedback. | Administration |

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$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 the overall participation of MLEC High School students at STEM activities at a local and state level. | | |
| 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 will be encouraged to join either a Career Technical Student Organization or service organization or club, i.e., SECME. | Encourage students through lessons, YouTube videos and classroom demonstrations to justify the student's participation. Students will be informed of the direct connection between being involved in a CTSO, club and organization and being accepted to a post-secondary school of their choice. | CTSO Sponsor and organization officers | Collect lesson plans or agenda, advertisement (s) of CTSO, Clubs and service organizations to verify that the students are being informed of this opportunity. | Record the total number of CTSOs, Clubs and service organizations members. |
| 2 | Students will be encouraged to join a CTSO, Clubs and service organizations if funds are available. | Fund raising- breakfast sells, car washes and sponsorship via a related professional organization, if available or relevant. | CTSO Sponsor and organization officers | Track fund raising activities submitted through the school treasurer. | Fund Raising Logs |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Club Organizational Meeting | 9-12/all clubs and CTSO's | Activities Director | School wide Club, Service Organizations and CTSO Sponsors | After school 1st quarter of the year. | Require that each Career Technical Student Organization or service organization or club submit their data per quarter of the school year. | Activities Director or Assistant Principal responsible for Career Technical Student Organization or service organization or clubs. |

STEM Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Advertisement of each organization | Signs for each CTSO/Club/organization | Fund Raising Activities | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$500.00 |

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: | <p>Increase opportunities for STEM applied learning by increasing opportunities for students to participate in CTSO (HOSA) skill competitions by 5%.</p> <p>Increase the number of CTE programs within the Academy of Information Technology to meet the demands of the evolving IT industry within our community.</p> <p>Increase enrollment in all IT career pathways within the Academy of Information Technology.</p> <p>Increase the number of students that sit and successfully pass relative industry certification exams within the Computer Systems Technology (Cisco) career pathway.</p> <p>Research and obtain the appropriate industry certification exam for students within the Electronic Technology</p> |

career pathway
 Increase the number of internship /externships as well as on-the-job training (OJT) opportunities for 11th and 12th grade students within the Academy of Information Technology in all career pathways.

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 | <p>Identification of individuals or industry partners who will be able to mentor students.</p> <p>Identification of CTE Academy instructors that will mentor students.</p> <p>Identifying and securing funding for the procurement and training of qualified IT instructors.</p> <p>Possible funding limitations to visit stakeholders in middle schools and career exploration activities.</p> <p>Purchasing of exam vouchers encourage student participation.</p> <p>Secure funding for certification preparatory materials and additional instruction due to rigor of these examinations. There is no current local certification organization for Electronics.</p> <p>Identification of industry partners to accommodate students for relevant externships and OJT opportunities has been a challenge.</p> <p>Identifying and scheduling of qualified students has been a challenge.</p> | <p>Meet with students monthly to identify concerns about skill competitions and increase mentors by involving partnerships with industry.</p> <p>Increase the percentage of CTE students who are actively participating in CTE organization and research grant opportunities</p> <p>Seek other district funding opportunities and identify which program(s) can be added.</p> <p>Seek funding opportunities through grants and EESAC.</p> <p>Previously funded by MDCPS, Dept. of Industrial Education.</p> <p>Research and seek national /international organizations for Electronic certification.</p> <p>Procure time for instructors and/or academy team members to visit local Miami-Dade County partners, and IT organizations to seek such opportunities.</p> <p>Establish and offer in-house internship opportunities through IT club and school-site technician under the supervision of Information Technology Services (ITS).</p> | <p>Academy Leader</p> <p>Advisory Board</p> <p>CTE Academy</p> <p>Instructors</p> | <p>Review of student applications submitted for competition.</p> <p>Advisement during application process by academy leader and CTE instructors.</p> <p>Communication with industry partners to identify barriers.</p> <p>Once funding is secured, seek and train qualified personnel</p> <p>Student interest, success and adoption of new programs</p> <p>Monitor and evaluate student interest through the number of applications broken down by academy and career pathway</p> <p>Track student achievement based on scores (pass/fail) on certification exams.</p> | <p>2013 CTE students' participation in CTE (HOSA) competitions</p> <p>Outcomes of 2013 CTE competitions</p> <p>Program(s) offered in master schedule with qualified teacher</p> <p>Final number of students accepted for the Academy of IT by pathway verified by school registrar</p> <p>Track student achievement based on scores (pass/fail) on certification exams</p> <p>Addition of certification exam as verified through the CAPE academy</p> <p>Report the number of internships, externships and OJT candidates</p> |

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 |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Know and apply core concepts, and principles of math, science, and the arts, social studies integrated with the CTE classes | All Grades 9-12 | Martha Chavez | Academy members | Early Release and Academy Meetings | Capstone Project | Assistant Principals |

CTE Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

N/A Goal:

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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. N/A Goal N/A Goal #1: | | | N/A | | |
| 2012 Current level: | | | 2013 Expected level: | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | N/A | | | | |

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 | | | | | | |

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 N/A Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Mathematics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Science | Creating of visual content review sheets and diagram bank of visual cues for discussion – teacher produced for strategic reviews | Teacher produced – visual diagrams – hard copy and visual diagram bank | Smaller Learning Community Grant | \$300.00 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| U.S. History | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$300.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Mathematics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Science | Use of Hand-held interactive devises | In-House (teacher facilitated)/PD | Smaller Learning Community Grant | \$100.00 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| U.S. History | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$100.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Mathematics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Science | Hands on Use of Physical Science equipment | Presented by MDC College Physics Professor | Smaller Learning Community Grant | \$50.00 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| U.S. History | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$50.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Tutoring | Part-time hourly funding | Small Learning Community Grant | \$1,000.00 |
| Mathematics | Tutoring | Part-time hourly funding | Smaller Learning Community Grant | \$1,000.00 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Science | Student created Biology content review sheets | Biology content review sheets | Smaller Learning Community Grant | \$300.00 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| U.S. History | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| STEM | Advertisement of each organization | Signs for each CTSO/Club/organization | Fund Raising Activities | \$500.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$2,800.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$3,250.00 |

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 10/12/2012)

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 |
|--|------------|
| EESAC activities will support implementation of SIP. The EESAC Committee will meet on a monthly basis to address concerns raised by the Literary Leadership Team to provide support and enhance student achievement. | \$3,250.00 |

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

The Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) at Miami Lakes Educational Center provides an unbiased forum for professional and community collaboration among all stakeholders in order to foster a learning environment that supports the school's vision and mission. The EESAC is the sole governing and decision-making body for the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The purpose of the EESAC is to work to insure improved student achievement. In order to meet these goals, EESAC engages in the following activities: prepares and evaluates the School Improvement Plan (SIP); assists in the preparation of the school's annual budget; assists in the preparation and delivery of necessary and appropriate educational programs and services; supports all stakeholders in their interests related to the improvement of student achievement. Decisions on courses of action result from discussion of issues and the arrival at group consensus as the primary function of EESAC Members monthly meetings which are advertised and open to the public. During these sessions, the progress of the SIP goals and available resources are discussed and analyzed in order to facilitate school-wide success. All recommendations or decisions made by the EESAC shall be consistent with the FCIM, the Competency Based Curriculum (CBC), the State vocational/business standards, pertinent Academy curricula, and the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards strands and benchmarks, to ensure continuity, alignment, and achievement. The EESAC convenes once a month. All issues and requests brought before it for consideration must be justified as items necessary for enhancing and improving the goals and objectives of the School Improvement Plan, and thus the services provided to our students. The EESAC and the administration work cooperatively in the funding of requested items, particularly when the requests necessitate large expenditures of money, such as for technology and instructional materials; other issues such as

enhancements for student services and school safety are considered; and, the EESAC is kept apprised of the staffing allocation considerations as well. Everything that the EESAC considers is tied to resource allocation for the purpose of enhancing student achievement.

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 MIAMI LAKES EDUCATIONAL CENTER 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 59% | 87% | 83% | 47% | 276 | 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 | 58% | 87% | | | 145 | 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? | 56% (YES) | 78% (YES) | | | 134 | 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 | | | | | 565 | |
| 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 MIAMI LAKES EDUCATIONAL CENTER 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 62% | 85% | 94% | 36% | 277 | 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 | 62% | 81% | | | 143 | 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? | 55% (YES) | 74% (YES) | | | 129 | 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 | | | | | 549 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |