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

School Name: MATER GROVE ACADEMY

District Name: Dade

Principal: Robert Blanch

SAC Chair: Vivian Del Valle

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvhalo

Date of School Board Approval: PENDING

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

## 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 | Sheila Caleo Gonzalez | Early Childhood Ed. B.A. Elementary Ed. B.A. ESOL Endorsement Educational Leadership M.A. | 1 | 1 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A B AYP Y Y Y Y Y High Standards – Rdg 76% 91% 91% 87% 84% High Standards – Math 78% 93% 91% 77% 81% High Standards - Writing 100% 88% 60% 92% 86% High Standards-Science 64% 80% 60% 34% 53% Learning Gains – Reading 83% 81% 60% 80% 65% Learning Gains – Math 93% 84% 60% 50% 68% Lowest 25% -Reading 83% 83% 60% 84% 40% Lowest 25% - Math 93% 93% 60% 55% 57% |

### 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.

| | 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No data submitted | | | | | |

## 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 | Common planning time | Principal | August 22, 2012 | |
| 2 | Professional Development | Principal | On going through 2012-2013 school year | |
| 3 | Provide new teachers with mentors | Principal | August 22, 2012 | |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| 11%(1) | Teacher is on a waiver for ESOL. She will take courses within the allotted time. |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 0.0%(0) | 88.9%(8) | 0.0%(0) | 11.1%(1) | 22.2%(2) | 88.9%(8) | 11.1%(1) | 11.1%(1) | 88.9%(8) |

## Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|---|---|---|---|

No data submitted

# ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

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.

> The Mater RtI Team is comprised of administration, faculty, and staff.
> Principal: The Mater MTSS/RtI Team is comprised of administration, faculty, and staff. Principal: The principal will provide a common vision for the use of the data based decision making. The principal will ensure that the school based team is implementing RtI, provide support and schedule professional development to support RtI. The principal will also communicate with parents regarding RtI plans and activities. General Education Teachers: Participate in student data collection and employ intervention strategies.

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

> The MTSS/RTI team will meet monthly to discuss, review, and analyze data. They will also discuss how data driven instruction is impacting the performance of the students at the school. The team will discuss interventions being implemented by the teachers as well as strategies being used to strengthen weak content clusters.

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 will meet with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team will discuss goals, areas of need and align procedure.

## 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.

> ? Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)
> ? Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
> ? Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
> ? Scores from district stated averages
> ? Interim Assessment Test
> ? Edusoft data
> ? Behavior: Teachers keep anecdotal records of student behavior

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> The MTSS/RtI leadership team will provide professional development through best practices during common teacher planning times,grade level meetings, and monthly faculty meetings. In addition, teachers will be provided with professional development to correspond with the subject area they are teaching.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

> The MTSS Team at Mater Grove will be supported through the effective and actively involved leadership that provides connections between the MTSS Framework with District/School Mission Statements to ensure alignment and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels. The MTSS will have ongoing facilitation to support planning, implementation, and evaluating effectiveness of services through the use of problem-solving process. The MTSS will collaboratively form partnerships with all stakeholders who would benefit with increases in student outcomes. The MTSS will use data from state and district assessments to support decision making. The school will provide coaching support to assist school and staff problem solving efforts and provide professional development to assist teachers in aligning student goals and staff needs. The MTSS will communicate outcomes and celebrate successes frequently.

# Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

## School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The LLT will be comprised of the principal (Sheila Caleo-Gonzalez), ESE Liason (Natalie Lara) and Lead Teacher (Vivian del Valle).

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

The LLT will meet monthly to review data and make program decisions. Reading teachers will model effective strategies, provide professional development and assist with monitoring progress and differentiated instruction. The principal will meet with the LLT regularly to discuss and plan professional development as well as district and state reading requirements.

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

The LLT will focus on utilizing the PMRN to determine accommodations in order to best impact student achievement. Data from interim assessments and FAIR will be utilized to address areas of need and guide instructional and intervention planning.

## 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.

## *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: | Based on the results of the 2012FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment,38% of our students achieved a Level 3 Proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 40%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 38%(24) | 40%(25) |

| 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<br>The area of deficiency in Grade 3, as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting category 2-Reading Application. | 1.1.<br>Use grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining or explaining. The author's perspective should be recognizable in text. Students should focus on what the author thinks and feels. Main idea may be stated or implied. Students should be able to identify causal relationships imbedded in text. Students must be familiar with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Provide practice in identifying topics and themes within texts. Teachers will use FCAT Test Maker Pro passages and Time for Kids magazine to boost achievement in this area. | 1.1.<br><br>MTSS/RTI Team | 1. Review students' formative biweekly assessment data reports from assessments which include FCAT, Interim Assessments, and teacher created tests using FCAT Test Maker Pro to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. | 1.1.<br>Formative: FAIR computer assisted Program,<br>CAP reports generated from FCAT Explorer, FCAT Test Maker Pro<br><br>Summative:<br>Results from 2013 FCAT 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: | |
|---|---|
| 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: | Based on the results of the 2012FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment, 35% of our students achieved levels 4 and 5 Proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 36%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 35% (22) | 36% (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 | 2.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting category 2- Reading Application.<br>. | 2.1.<br>Use grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining or explaining. The author's perspective should be recognizable in text. Students should focus on what the author thinks and feels. Main idea may be stated or implied. Students should be able to identify causal relationships imbedded in text. Students must be familiar with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Provide practice in identifying topics and themes within texts. Students will also use FCAT Explorer and FCAT Task cards. Sixth grade | 2.1.<br>MTSS/RtI | 2.1.<br>Review students' formative biweekly assessment data reports from assessments which include FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, and teacher created tests to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. | 2.1.<br>Formative: FAIR, FCAT Explorer, and Achieve 3000.<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment |

| | | teachers will differentiate reading instruction using Achieve 3000. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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: | |
|---|---|
| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

<div align="center">No Data Submitted</div>

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: | Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment, 83% of our students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains to 88%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 83% (19) | 88% (20) |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 3.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 admin of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting category 2- Reading Application. | 3.1. Use grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining or explaining. The author's perspective should be recognizable in text. Students should focus on what the author thinks and feels. Main idea may be stated or implied. Students should be able to identify causal | 3.1. MTSS/RTI Team | 3.1. Review formative biweekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. | 3.1. 3.1. Formative: FAIR , FCAT Explorer, and Success Maker, Reading Plus, FCAT Test Maker Pro. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment |

| | | relationships imbedded in text. Students must be familiar with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Provide practice in identifying topics and themes within texts. Supplemental instruction will be provided through Success Maker daily for 30 minutes based on tier. Students will also use FCAT Explorer and FCAT Task cards. Sixth grade teachers will differentiate reading instruction using Achieve 3000. Teachers will use FCAT Test Maker Pro passages and Time for Kids magazine to boost achievement in this area. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | |

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: | Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT Reading2.0 Assessment, 83% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains to 88%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 83% (n<30) | 88% (n<30) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting category 2- Reading Application. | 4.1. Utilize grade level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing including informing, telling a story, convey a particular mood, entertaining, and/or explaining using differentiated instruction. Supplemental intervention will be offered through Success Maker computer based program daily for 30 minutes. Voyager and Reading Eggs will be used in grades K-2. Reading Plus will be used in grades 3-6. Teachers will implement literacy activities from Florida Center for Reading Research (www.fcrr.org). After school FCAT tutoring will be provided using test prep materials aligned with common core standards. | 4.1.. MTSS/RTI Team | 4.1. Review formative biweekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. | 4.1 Formative: FAIR, Success Maker, Voyager, and Reading Eggs. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Reading 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 # <br><br> As a new school, our goal from 2011-2017, is based on District data, to reduce tehh percent of non-proficient students by 50%. Our goal is to increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above and to reduce the <br><br> 5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 58 | 61 | 65 | 69 | 73 | |

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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core State Standards | K-6 | FLDOE | Leadership Team | June 25-28, 2012 | Follow up assignment | Principal |
| Melissa Forney Workshop | K-6 | Angie Ramos | Reading/Language Arts Teachers | August 14-15, 2012 | Follow up assignment, implementation of strategies learned at workshop | Principal |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) ||||
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 1.1 | Time for Kids | FTE | $1,278.00 |
| 3.1, 4.1, 5.1 | Florida Ready | FTE | $1,600.00 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal: $2,878.00 |
| Technology ||||
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 3.1 | Achieve 3000 | FTE | $2,000.00 |
| 3.1 | Success Maker | FTE | $6,000.00 |
| 4.1 | Reading Eggs | FTE | $677.18 |
| 4.1 | Reading Plus | FTE | $4,000.00 |
| 1.1, 3.1 | Test Maker Pro | FTE | $832.00 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal: $13,509.18 |
| 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 |
| 4.1, 5.1 | After School Tutoring | Operating Account | $4,800.00 |
| 4.1, 5.1 | FCAT Tutoring | SAC funds | $250.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $5,050.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $21,437.18 |

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: | Based on the results of the 2012 CELLA 46% of our students are proficient in Listening/Speaking. |

**2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:**

46%(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 | Students have limited opportunities to practice listening/speaking English at home | Increase student opportunities for listening/speaking by including ESOL strategies such as Language Experience Approach, Repetition, and Role playing. | MTSS/RTI | Reviw CELLA score reports | Formative: Classroom Assessments Summative: CELLA |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: | Based on the results of the 2012 CELLA 34% of our students are proficient in reading. |

**2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:**

34% (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 |
| | Students have limited vocabulary due to limited English | Improve reading skills by incorporating a variety of ESOL | MTSS/RTI | Review CELLA score reports, Interim assessment score | Formative: Classroom Assessments |

| 1 | Proficiency. | strategies such as activating prior knowledge, picture walks, predictions, QAR's, using task cards. | | reports, weekly benchmark assessment results. Adjust instruction as needed. | Summative: CELLA |

| 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: | Based on the results of the 2012 CELLA 30% of our students are proficient in writing. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: |
|---|

| 30% (15) |
|---|

| 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 poor command of language due to limited English proficiency. Students show a weakness in sentence structure and organization of ideas. | Use personal journals, reader's response journals, and shared writing. | MTSS/RTI | Analyze monthly writing prompt results. Adjust instruction as needed. | Formative: Monthly writing prompts.<br><br>Summative: CELLA |

CELLA Budget:

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

*End of CELLA Goals*

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | As a new school, we will use the district averages to establish the current and expected performance. The district average of the 2011 FCAT Mathematics test indicate that 29% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 30%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 29% (18) | 30% (19) |

| 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.<br>Students in grades 3-5 scored lowest in the Reporting Category 2; Number Fractions. | 1.1.<br>Manipulatives will be used to provide opportunities for exploration and investigation of fraction concepts reinforce math concepts. Provide skill maintenance and reinforcement through IXL, a web based program. Conduct bi-weekly assessments on targeted benchmarks through test generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro. | 1.1.<br>MTSS/RTI Team | 1.1.<br>Review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs. | 1.1.<br>Formative: FCAT Test Maker Pro Bi-weekly assessment results, district interim reports, IXL reports. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |
| 2 | | | | | |

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: | Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment, 46% of our students achieved Levels 4 and 5 Proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency to 47%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 46% (29) | 47% (30) |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2.1<br>Students in grades 3-5 scored lowest in the Reporting Category 2; Number Fractions.</td><td>2.1<br>The student will participate in mathematical exploration using Gizmo's. Teachers in grades K-5 will differentiate instruction using Go Math Enrichment Book Activities. Grade 6 will use Holt McDougal Enrichment Resources. Conduct bi-weekly assessments on targeted benchmarks that include questions of higher complexity, through test generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro.</td><td>2.1<br>MTSS/RtI</td><td>2.1<br>Review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs.</td><td>2.1<br>Formative: FCAT Test Maker Pro Bi-weekly assessment results, district interim reports.<br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

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 mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test, 93% of our students made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by2 percentage points to 95%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 93% (21) | 95% (22) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 3.1.<br>Students in grades 3-5 scored lowest in the Reporting Category 2; Number Fractions. | 3.1.<br>The student will participate mathematical exploration using Gizmo's. Teachers in grades K-5 will differentiate instruction using Go Math Enrichment Book Activities. Grade 6 will use Holt McDougal Enrichment Resources. Conduct bi-weekly assessments on targeted benchmarks that include questions of higher complexity, through test generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro. Students will be identified for interventions based on data from baseline assessments and early intervention will be made available after school twice a week for 1 hour using Common Core Coach. Provide interventions through IXL 3 times a week for 20 minutes. Manipulatives will be used to provide opportunities for exploration and investigation of fraction concepts reinforce math concepts. | 3.1<br>MTSS/RTI | 3.1.<br>Review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs. | 3.1.<br>Formative: FCAT Test Maker Pro Bi-weekly assessment results, district interim reports, IXL reports.<br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics 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:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.<br><br>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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | As a new school we will use the district averages to establish the current and expected performance. The district average of the 2011 FCAT Mathematics test indicate that 93% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 2 percentage points to 95%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 93% (N,30) | 95% (N<30) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 4.1.<br><br>Students in grades 3-5 scored lowest in the Reporting Category 2; Number Fractions. | 4.1.<br><br>Students will be identified based on data from baseline assessments and early intervention will be made available after school twice a week for 1 hour using Common Core Coach. Provide interventions through IXL 3 times a week for 20 minutes. | 4.1.<br><br>MTSS/RTI | 4.1.<br>Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs. | 4.1.<br>Formative: Biweekly assessments, district interim reports, IXL reports.<br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Elementary School Mathematics Goal #<br><br>5A : As a new school, our goal from 2011-2017m us based on District data, to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. Our goal is to increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above and to reduce the |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 57 | 61 | 65 | 69 | 73 | |

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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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:

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics 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 | | | | |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | The district average of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 28, % of students achieved a Level 3 Proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage point to 32 %. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 28%(10) | 32% (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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Students demonstrate a weakness in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. | Manipulatives will be used to provide opportunities for exploration and investigation of geometry | MTSS/RTI Team | Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based | FCAT Test Maker Pro Bi-weekly assessment results, district interim |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | and measurement concepts reinforce math concepts. Provide skill maintenance and reinforcement through IXL, a web based program. Conduct bi-weekly assessments on targeted benchmarks through test generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro. | | on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs. | reports, IXL reports. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics 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:

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. 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. Mathematics Goal #2a: | The district average of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 28, % of students achieved a Level 3 Proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage point to 30%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 28% (9) | 30% (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 | Students demonstrate a weakness in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. | The student will participate in mathematical exploration using Gizmo's. Grade 6 will use Holt McDougal Enrichment Resources. Conduct bi-weekly assessments on targeted benchmarks that include questions of higher | MTSS/RTI Team | Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on | Formative: FCAT Test Maker Pro Bi-weekly assessment results, district interim reports. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics |

| | | complexity, through test generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro. | | additional needs. | 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 mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <div align="center" colspan="5">No Data Submitted</div> | | | | |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | The district average of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 68, % of students achieved a Level 3 Proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 73%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 68% (24) | 73% (25) |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students demonstrate a weakness in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. | Manipulatives will be used to provide opportunities for exploration and investigation of geometry and measurement concepts reinforce math concepts. Provide skill maintenance and reinforcement through IXL, a web based program. Conduct bi-weekly assessments on targeted benchmarks through test generated with FCAT Test Maker | MTSS/RTI Team | Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs. | Formative: Biweekly assessments, district interim reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pro. The student will participate in mathematical exploration using Gizmo's. Grade 6 will use Holt McDougal Enrichment Resources. Conduct bi-weekly assessments on targeted benchmarks that include questions of higher complexity, through test generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro. | | | | |

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.<br><br>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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test, 66% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 71%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 66% (23) | 71% (25) |

### 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 demonstrate a weakness in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. | Students will be identified for intervention based on data from baseline assessments and early intervention will be made available after school twice a week for 1 hour using Common Core | MTSS/RTI Team | Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level | Formative: Biweekly assessments, district interim reports, IXL reports. Summative: Results from 2013 |

| | | Coach. Provide interventions through IXL 3 times a week for 20 minutes. | | meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs. | FCAT Mathematics Assessment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Middle School Mathematics Goal #<br><br>As a new school, our goal from 2011-2017, is based on District data, to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. Our goal is to increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above and to reduce the<br><br>5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 57 | 61 | 65 | 69 | 73 | |

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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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:

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics 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 | | | | |

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

# Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #1: | |
| --- | --- |

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

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

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2: |  |
|---|---|

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3D: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

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

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

*End of Algebra EOC 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.<br><br>Geometry Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #2: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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

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

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Geometry Goal #<br><br>3A : | | | | |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
| --- | --- |
| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3B: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|  |  |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
| --- | --- |
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3C: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|  |  |

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

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

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

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

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

| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core State Standards | K-6 | FLDOE | Leadership Team | June 25-28, 2012 | Follow up assignment | Principal |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 2.1 | Holt McDougal Course 1 | FTE | $2,457.00 |
| 3.1, 4.1 | Florida Ready | Operating Account | $1,600.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $4,057.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 1.1, 3.1, 4.1 | IXL | FTE | $1,300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $1,300.00 |
| 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 |
| 3.1 | After School Tutoring | Operating Account | $4,800.00 |
| 3.1 | FCAT tutoring | SAC funds | $250.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $5,050.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $10,407.00 |

*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: | On the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment, 56% of students achieved a Level 3. For the 2012-2013 school year, the expected level of performance is 58% achieving proficiency |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 56% (10) | 58% (10) |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1. Based on district data analysis students demonstrated a lack of prior knowledge and exposure to Reporting Category: Earth and Space Sciences | 1.1. Students will conduct weekly science investigations pertaining to earth and space sciences during classroom instruction using Gizmo's. | 1.1. MTSS/RTI Team | 1.1. Analyze results of bi-weekly assessments and meet in grade levels to adjust instruction. | 1.1. FORMATIVE: Baseline and Interim assessments, science projects, teacher made tests. SUMMATIVE: 2013 FCAT |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b: | |
|---|---|
| 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. Science Goal #2a: | As a new school, we will use the District averages to establish the current and expected performance. The District averages of the 2011 FCAT Science Test indicate that 11% of students achieved level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for 2011-2012 school year is to increase the percentage of students attaining high achieving scores by 2 percentage points. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 11%(2) | 13%(2) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2.1. Based on district data | 2.1. Students will write | 2.1. MTSS/RTI Team | 2.1. Analyze results of | 2.1. Summative: |

| | analysis students demonstrated a lack of prior knowledge and exposure to Reporting Category: Earth and Space Sciences. | their observations and results in science journals, analyze data, and apply scientific thinking weekly. Students will use interactive science notebooks. | | assessments and meet in grade levels to adjust instruction. | Baseline and Interim assessments, science projects, teacher made tests. Formative: 2013 FCAT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core State Standards | K-6 | FLDOE | Leadership Team | June 25-28, 2012 | Follow up assignment | Principal |
| Gizmo's | 3-6 | Explore Learning Facilitator | Grades 3-6 Science Teachers | August 14, 2012 | Follow-up Assignment, Implementation | Principal, Grade Level Chair |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 1.1 | Pearson Interactive Science | FTE | $4,850.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $4,850.00 |
| 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: $4,850.00 |

*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: | The 2012 FCAT Writing Assessment indicates 96% of our students achieved a level 4 or higher. The school expects to maintain this level of performance during the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 96% (24) | 96% (24) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1.<br>Students demonstrated a weakness on focus and elaboration in their Writing Process. | 1.1.<br>Students should use a graphic organizer to write a draft organized with a logical sequence of beginning, middle, end and use supporting details to develop focus and elaboration using strategies from Zelda Glazer Writing Institute Implement school wide monthly writing prompts. | 1.1.<br>MTSS/RTI Team | 1.1.<br>Administer and score students' monthly writing prompts to monitor students progress and to adjust focus as needed. | 1.1.<br><br>Summative: Baseline data. Monthly writing assessments. Formative: 2013 FCAT |

| 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: |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core State Standards | K-6 | FLDOE | Leadership Team | June 25-28, 2012 | Follow up assignment | Principal |
| Melissa Forney | K-6 | | K-6 Language Arts | August 14-15, 2012 | Follow-up Assignment, Implementation of strategies learned at workshop | Principal, Grade Level Chairperson |

Writing Budget:

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

*End of Writing Goals*

## Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.<br><br>Civics Goal #1: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.<br><br>Civics Goal #2: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

*End of Civics Goals*

# Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Attendance<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | Mater Grove Academy's Level of Attendance was 96.64%. Our goal this year is to raise our Level of Attendance to a minimum of 97.14%.<br><br>In addition, our goal for this year is to reduce the number of students with excessive absences. In the 2011-2012 school year, there were 27students with excessive absences. In 2012-2013, we expect our excessive absences to decrease to at least 26 students.<br><br>Furthermore, our goal for this year is to reduce the number of students with excessive tardies. In the 2011-2012 school year, there were ¬¬¬¬¬36 students with excessive tardies. In 2012-2013, we expect our excessive tardies to decrease to at least 34 students or 5%. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 96.64% (126) | 97.14% (126) |

| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
|---|---|
| 27 | 26 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 36 | 34 |

| | 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.<br>Parents are unfamiliar with attendance policies. | 1.1.<br>Parent orientation to inform parents of attendance policy. | 1.1.<br>Principal and registrar. | 1.1.<br>Review attendance monthly. | 1.1.<br>Attendance reports |
| 2 | Parents plan extended out of town trips during the school year. | Make parents aware of academic impact.<br><br>Analyze attendance reports and conduct monthly perfect attendance contests. Reward classes with perfect attendance for the month with No Homework Coupons.<br><br>Conduct quarterly perfect attendance ceremonies. | Principal and registrar. | Review attendance reports weekly. | 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 |
| 1.1, 1.2 | Perfect attendance certificates and medals. | Internal Account | $200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $200.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $200.00 |

*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: | In the 2011-2012 school year, Mater Grove Academy had 0 indoor and 0 outdoor suspensions. The school's goal is to maintain its current level of suspension for the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 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 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 0 | 0 |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | | Person or | Process Used to | |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1.<br>Parents and students are unfamiliar with student code of conduct. | 1.1.<br>Workshops to make parents familiar with the student code of conduct. | 1.1.<br>Administrative team | 1.1.<br>Monitor suspension reports. | 1.1.<br>COGNOS reports.<br>ISIS reports.<br>Logs |

(Row label: 1)

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)

| 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.* | Our goal is to increase the percent of parents involved in school activities to 80%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 70% (105) | 80% (212) |

| 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.<br>Limited knowledge of the English language is a barrier in providing knowledge of activities. | 1.1.<br>Communication will be sent in English and in Spanish for all parent activities. Activities will be conducted in both languages. | 1.1.<br>Principal | 1.1.<br>Review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school or community events. | 1.1.<br>Sign in sheets. |

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

|  |  |  | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| --- | --- |
| 1. STEM<br><br>STEM Goal #1: | 5% of students will participate in the Miami-Dade County Science Fair. |

| 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 | There is a need for professionals prepared for careers in science, technology, engineering and math. | This initiative is being supported by fostering scientific thinking throughout the year and culminating in the students participating in the Miami-Dade science fair. Conduct weekly science labs. Students will also use Gizmo to participate in virtual inquiry based activities. Teachers will implement activities from AIMS curriculum. | Science Fair Committee | Number of participating students in Miami-Dade Science Fair | Science Fair Weekly Science Labs 2013 FCAT Science |

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 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gizmo's | 3-6 | Explore Learning Facilitator | Grade 3-6 Science Teachers | August 14, 2012 | Follow-up Assignment, Implementation | Principal, Grade Level Chair |

STEM Budget:

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

# Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. CTE <br><br>CTE 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 | | | | | | |

CTE Budget:

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | 1.1 | Time for Kids | FTE | $1,278.00 |
| Reading | 3.1, 4.1, 5.1 | Florida Ready | FTE | $1,600.00 |
| Mathematics | 2.1 | Holt McDougal Course 1 | FTE | $2,457.00 |
| Mathematics | 3.1, 4.1 | Florida Ready | Operating Account | $1,600.00 |
| Science | 1.1 | Pearson Interactive Science | FTE | $4,850.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $11,785.00 |
| **Technology** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | 3.1 | Achieve 3000 | FTE | $2,000.00 |
| Reading | 3.1 | Success Maker | FTE | $6,000.00 |
| Reading | 4.1 | Reading Eggs | FTE | $677.18 |
| Reading | 4.1 | Reading Plus | FTE | $4,000.00 |
| Reading | 1.1, 3.1 | Test Maker Pro | FTE | $832.00 |
| Mathematics | 1.1, 3.1, 4.1 | IXL | FTE | $1,300.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $14,809.18 |
| **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 |
| Reading | 4.1, 5.1 | After School Tutoring | Operating Account | $4,800.00 |
| Reading | 4.1, 5.1 | FCAT Tutoring | SAC funds | $250.00 |
| Mathematics | 3.1 | After School Tutoring | Operating Account | $4,800.00 |
| Mathematics | 3.1 | FCAT tutoring | SAC funds | $250.00 |
| Attendance | 1.1, 1.2 | Perfect attendance certificates and medals. | Internal Account | $200.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $10,300.00 |
| | | | | **Grand Total: $36,894.18** |

# Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| j͡n Priority | j͡n Focus | j͡n Prevent | j͡n NA |
|---|---|---|---|

Are you a reward school:  j͡n Yes  j͡n 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.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|---|
| After school tutoring. | $500.00 |

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

The SAC will assist in the development, implementation, and monitoring of the school improvement plan.

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found