# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SOMERSET NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Athena Guillen

SAC Chair: Aileen Delgado

Superintendent: Mr. Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 11/7/2012

# PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

## ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Shannine Sadesky-Hunt | B.A. in Elementary Education from American University. M.S. in Educational Leadership | 5 | 10 | 2009-2010: Somerset Miramar Academy Grade A Reading : Learning Gains: 73% Lowest 25%: 65% AYP : Yes Mathematics : Learning Gains: 76% Lowest 25%: 62% AYP: NO: Science: 59% 2008-2009: Somerset Academy Grade: A, Math Mastery: 78%, Math Mastery: 78%, Science52% Mastery: 60%, Writing 100%: AYP: Yes 2007-2008: Somerset Miramar Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 72%, Math Mastery: 64% Writing Mastery 95 %, Science 43% Mastery: AYP: The following subgroups did not make AYP in Math Black, Hispanic, Eco Disadvantaged but all of the subgroups made AYP in Reading. 2006-2007: Somerset Miramar Grade: No grade data available Under the A+ Plan |

| Assis Principal | Alexandria Prieto | B.A. in Pre-K Primary Education from Barry University; M.S. in Reading from Barry University; ED. Specialist in Educational Leadership from Nova University | 2 | 2 | 2009-2010:Somerset Miramar Academy Grade A Reading :Learning Gains:73% Lowest 25%:65% AYP :Yes Mathematics :Learning Gains:76% Lowest 25%:62% AYP: NO: Science:59% 2008-2009: Somerset Academy Grade: A, Math Mastery: 78%, Math Mastery: 78%, Science52% Mastery: 60%, Writing 100%: AYP: Yes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assis Principal | Donyale McGhee | B.A. in Criminal Justice/Social Work from Florida A+M University M.S. in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University | 2 | 4 | 2009-2010:Somerset Miramar Academy Grade A Reading :Learning Gains:73% Lowest 25%:65% AYP :Yes Mathematics :Learning Gains:76% Lowest 25%:62% AYP: NO: Science:59% 2008-2009: Somerset Academy Grade: A, Math Mastery: 78%, Math Mastery: 78%, Science52% Mastery: 60%, Writing 100%: AYP: Yes 2008-2009: Somerset Academy Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 76 %, Math Mastery: 80%, Science Mastery: 52% ,Writing 100%: AYP: Yes 2007-2008: Somerset Miramar Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 74%, Math Mastery: 74% Writing Mastery 97 %, Science 52% Mastery: AYP: No. The following subgroup did not make AYP Eco Disadvantaged in Reading but all of the subgroups made AYP in Mathematics. |

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Math and Science | Celeste Goltz | B.S. Elementary Education | 3 | 2 | 2009-2010:Somerset Miramar Academy Grade A Reading :Learning Gains:73% Lowest 25%:65% AYP :Yes Mathematics :Learning Gains:76% Lowest 25%:62% AYP: NO: Science:59% 2008-2009: Somerset Academy Grade: A, Math Mastery: 78%, Math Mastery: 78%, Science52% Mastery: 60%, Writing 100%: AYP: Yes |
| Reading | Anthony Marruci | B.S. Elementary | 1 | 1 | 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teach in Florida web-site | Principal and Assistant Principal | Ongoing | |
| 2 | Teacher will have the opportunity to participate in Merit Pay. | Principal and Assistant Principal | Ongoing | |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

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

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 75.0%(3) | 0.0%(0) | 25.0%(1) | 0.0%(0) | 100.0%(4) | 100.0%(4) | 0.0%(0) | 0.0%(0) | 100.0%(4) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tina Guandalini | Tina Guandalini | By Subject Area and Teaching expertise | Observation, Walkthroughs, Bi-Weekly meetings, Professional Development, Data Chats, and Mentee Observations |

# 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

Somerset Miramar Charter School is a Title I school, many programs are offered to the students. The Title I program requires a Teacher Assistant with sufficient credits to be hired at the school and offer assistance to struggling students. School Resource Officers(SROs) offer safety and violence prevention workshops for students and parents. Bullying, especially cyber-bullying, are topics that are discussed monthly by teachers to avoid any possible situations that may arise throughout the year.

The school is part of National School Lunch Program and students are provided high-quality meals each day. Nutritional information is disseminated in the cafeteria and students are informed of proper cleanliness techniques that should be used routinely.Somerset Miramar Charter School also informs the parents of adult education opportunities through informational flyers
developed at both the school and the facility where the classes are held.

The Somerset Miramar Charter School will incorporate the Continuous Improvement Model. This model involves an eight step process to
regularly access students. Step one is the breakdown of data, to identify students and teachers strengths and weakness. Step two is the development of instructional timeline. Step three will direct the instructional focus based on targeted skills. Step four is the assessment which will mimic the format of state standardized testing. During step five and six, tutorials and enrichment, teachers will provide quality instruction and additional assessments if necessary. Step seven is maintenance during which time teachers will continuously reinforce skills and knowledge base. Finally, step eight will consist of monitoring

practices to include, classroom visits, one on one meetings, evaluations and celebrating successes. All students will be administered quarterly pre-tests and post-tests in core subjects to help attain this information. Data from these assessments,

the 2009-10 FAIR,. This data will aid the staff in providing students with the
additional instruction needed to become proficient in their deficient areas. Additionally, the implementation of pacing guides will ensure that all students will be exposed to the same instructional focus within a specific time frame.

Along with the above-mentioned process, Somerset Miramar Charter School will offer an after-school tutoring program to target the
specific area of need of each individual student. In this tutoring program, the students will be exposed to small group and one-on-one instruction. Additionally, the program will also offer an enrichment curriculum such as FCAT Coach and Measure Up

to provide challenging and innovative instruction to students. The teacher will also use strategies such as CRISS strategies and differentiated instruction to guide lessons.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

## School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

> Shannine-Hunt Sadesky-Principal
> Alex Prieto-Assistant Principal
> Donyale McGhee-Assistant Principal
> Anthony Marucci-Reading Coach
> Celeste Goltz-Math/Science Coach
> Ofelia Barcelo-ESE Specialst
> Samantha Franconeri- Guidance Counselor
> Tina Guandalini-K Team Leader
> Annelle Thonpson-Team Leader 1st Grade
> Angela Calvacca-Team Leader 3rd Grade
> Michelle Rojas-Team Leader 4th Grade
> Marisol Tapia-Team Leader for 5th Grade
> Nicole Lamkin-Social Science Department Chair
> Henry Norton-Math Department Chair
> Thelisia Wilcher-Science Department Chair

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?

> Principal:
> Provides a common vision for the use of data-driven decision-making.
> Communicates with parents and staff about the early intervention programs.
> Ensures implementation of RtI model.
> General Education Teachers (Reading and Math):
> Participate in student data collection; provides information and data about core instruction; and maintains communication with staff for input and feedback. Develop intervention strategies for failing students.
> Exceptional Student Education Teacher (ESE): Participate in student data collection; provides information and data about core instruction; maintains communication with general education teacher; and collaborates with teachers, counselors, and resource psychologist. Counselors: Monitor student achievement; set-up parent-teacher conferences; develop academic contracts; and communicate with all stake-holders.

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 Leadership Team will focus its meetings around questions pertaining to the implementation of instruction and intervention strategies.
> The team will meet on a bi-weekly basis to engage the following activities:
> Monitor progress of Level 1 and 2 students in Intensive Reading, Intensive Reading+ and Intensive Math classes. Monitor the implementation of the Comprehensive Reading Plan throughout the Intensive Reading classes, regular curriculum classes, and developmental ELL classes. Develop and monitor the FCAT morning tutoring that will be offered to all Level 1 and Level 2, ELL students. Review progress of all students using FCAT Explorer as a supplement to the instruction. Use data from in-house Interim Assessments to determine mastery of benchmarks for all students in Reading, Mathematics and Science. Ensure that the FCAT reading benchmarks will be taught across the curriculum by all teachers throughout the school year. Ensure that the Strategies Benchmark calendar is evident within the teacher's lesson plans. The use of instructional delivery strategies such as; the Socratic Method, reciprocal teaching, teacher model, fluency instruction, reading across the content area curriculum, and concept mapping are evident within the teacher's lesson plans as well as throughout the professional development calendar. Based on all of the information gathered above, the Leadership team will determine the professional development and resources needed to optimize instruction and intervention.

## 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.

> Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.
> The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data. It will also monitor the fidelity of instructional delivery.Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), School-wide Diagnostic Assessment

Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
Progress Monitoring: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Mini-assessments
Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR) End of Year: Florida
Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
Frequency of Data Days: Once a quarter for data analysis
Jamestown, Success maker, Carnegie, Stop Drop and Test
Teacher made test

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during first week of school. Small
sessions are planned throughout the year.Professional development sessions
entitled "What is RtI?" and "How can we meet the challenges of implementing data driven instruction?" will be infused into
the professional development calendar.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Shannine-Hunt Sadesky-Principal
Alex Prieto-Assistant Principal
Donyale McGhee-Assistant Principal
Anthony Marucci-Reading Coach
Celeste Goltz-Math/Science Coach
Ofelia Barcelo-ESE Specialst
Samantha Franconeri- Guidance Counselor
Tina Guandalini-K Team Leader
Annelle Thonpson-Team Leader 1st Grade
Angela Calvacca-Team Leader 3rd Grade
Michelle Rojas-Team Leader 4th Grade
Marisol Tapia-Team Leader for 5th Grade
Nicole Lamkin-Social Science Department Chair
Henry Norton-Math Department Chair
Thelisia Wilcher-Science Department Chair

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will focus its meetings around questions pertaining to the implementation of instruction and
intervention strategies. The team will meet on a monthly basis to engage the following activities: Monitor progress of Level 1
and 2 students in Intensive Reading classes. Monitor the implementation of the Comprehensive Reading Plan throughout the
Intensive Reading classes, regular curriculum classes, and developmental ELL classes. Develop and monitor the FCAT morning
tutoring that will be offered to all Level 1, Level 2, ELL, and SWD students. Review progress of all students using Reading
Plus, FCAT Explorer and Florida Focus, as a supplement to the instruction. Use data from in-house Interim Assessments to
determine mastery of benchmarks for all students in Reading. Ensure that the FCAT reading benchmarks will be taught across
the curriculum by all teachers throughout the school year. Ensure that the Grade A Strategies Benchmark calendar is evident
within the teacher's lesson plans. The use of instructional delivery strategies such as; the Socratic Method, reciprocal
teaching, teacher model, fluency instruction, reading across the content area curriculum, differentiated instruction and
concept mapping are evident within the teacher's lesson plans as well as throughout the professional development calendar.
Based on all of the information gathered above, the Literacy Leadership team will determine the professional development
and resources needed to optimize instruction and intervention. The Literacy Leadership will focus on the revised goals for
writing in across the curriculum.

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

Increase understanding of differentiated instruction and continue to apply best
practices.Teachers will implement internal assessments to identify student's
strengths and areas of growth in order to tailor instruction.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

## *Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Students are provided with the opportunity to meet their Kindergarten
teacher in August during the school's Open House before school begins to alleviate first day jitters for Kindergarten students, as well as making the process of going to school every day less scary. The Florida Kindergarten Readiness Survey (FLKRS)is also administered to the students during their first month in school to identify areas of weakness. Results are shared withparents promptly.Utilizing the FAIR (Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading) assessments, a baseline for students' print/letter knowledge and phonological awareness will be determined, as well as instructions planned utilizing the resulting data. the FAIR assessment will be utilized at the beginning, middle, and end of year, in accordance with the District and State guidelines, and recorded on the Progress Monitoring Reading Network. Social Skills instruction can be also planned in part by using the FLKRS.

## *Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

## *High Schools Only

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

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

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

## Postsecondary Transition

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

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

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

*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.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | Given instruction based on the Florida Assessment in Reading 95% of the students will score profient in the area of Reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Given instruction based on the Florida Assessment in Reading 88% of the students scored profient in the area of Reading. | Given instruction based on the Florida Assessment in Reading 95% of the students will score Daily focus lessons for students practice mastery of knowledge of the profient in the area of Reading. |

| | 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 | Center-based instruction offering enrichment for students to increase opportunities for higher level thinking experiences. | Daily differentiated instruction and cooperative learning groups to allow students to successfully master the Sunshine State Standards. Thematic projects to help students connect to the relevance of other academic areas and real life. Interdisciplinary instruction and teaching of reading across the curriculum to increase opportunities for reading skills development, exposure to multiple genres, and experiences with varying types of literature. | Team Leader and Administration | Daily focus lessons for students practice mastery of knowledge of the benchmarks. | Mini assessments and Teacher observations |

| 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:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #1b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | |
|---|---|

| Reading Goal #3a: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

| No Data Submitted |
| --- |

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

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

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

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br><br> Reading Goal #5B: |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|  |  |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
| --- |

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

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

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
| --- |

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

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

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | |
| --- | --- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

| | | | | Target Dates | | |

| 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) | (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 | | | | | | |

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 |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $0.00 |

*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.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | |
| | |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| No Data Submitted | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.<br><br>CELLA Goal #2: | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br><br>CELLA Goal #3: | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

CELLA Budget:

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | **Grand Total: $0.00** |

*End of CELLA Goals*

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | Given instruction on the End of the Year Math test 95% of the students will show mastery for the 2011 school year. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | Given instruction on the End of the Year Math test 95% of the students will show mastery. |

| 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:

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

| | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : |
|---|---|

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

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black,

Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5B:

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5C:

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5D:

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

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

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

| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal E: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

Mathematics Budget:

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

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

*End of Mathematics Goals*

# Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | Science Content will collaborate with teams to embed effective science instructional strategies for the 2011 school year |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Science Content will collaborate with teams to embed effective science instructional strategies for the 2010 school year | Given instruction based on the mini assessments will improve their science mastery by 50%. |

| 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 | Increase the lack of Science Learning communities in Kindergarten. | Increase Science effective practices and differentiating instruction. | Team Leader and Administration. | Analyzing Pre and Post Test | Formal Observation |

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:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Science Budget:

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

*End of Science Goals*

# Writing Goals

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

| 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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1a: | By May 2009, 95% of the kindergarten students will meet the required status in Policy 6001. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 95% of students will show mastery in writing. | By May 2009, 95% of the kindergarten students will meet the required status in Policy 6001. |
| 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 | Student writing progress will be monitored throughout the year using writing samples to maintain an instructional focus | Students will receive daily hands-on/center activities in the classroom to reinforce and enhance lessons taught by classroom teachers. | Teachers,Administration and Team Leader | Creative/Phonetic spelling will be taught during writing lessons. | Daily differentiated instruction and cooperative learning groups to allow students to assist each other in developing writing proficiency. |

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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

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

| Technology | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |

| Professional Development | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |

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

*End of Writing Goals*

## 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<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | Our attendance rate was 98% for the 2010 school year. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| Our attendance rate was 98% for the 2010 school year. | Decrease school attendance rate by 1% |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| N/A | N/A |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 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 | Icrease the attendance rate by incorporating an Attendance Review Committee | Random attendance monitoring by attendance clerk | Attendance Clerk | Attendance Data | Annual attendance reports |

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

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

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

Attendance 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 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<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| | |

| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
|---|---|
|  |  |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
|  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
|  |  |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |||||
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted |||||

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |

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

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Parent Involvement<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>*\*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. STEM  STEM Goal #1: | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g. , frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

No Data Submitted

---

STEM Budget:

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

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

# Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| jn Priority | jn Focus | jn Prevent | jn NA |
|---|---|---|---|

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment

# School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

| Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
|---|---|
| No data submitted | |

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

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found

| Broward School District<br>SOMERSET NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL<br>2009-2010 | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 69% | 75% | 81% | 35% | 260 | 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 | 48% | 48% | | | 96 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 48% (NO) | 48% (NO) | | | 96 | 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 | | | | | 452 | |
| Percent Tested = 97% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |