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

School Name: KENWOOD K-8 CENTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: Moraima Almeida-Perez

SAC Chair: Evie Mayor

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/29/2012

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

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

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Moraima Almeida-Perez | M.S., Special Education; Certification in Mental Handicaps, ESOL Endorsement, and Educational Leadership | 12 | 12 | 2012 2011 2010 2009 2008<br>Grades A A A A A<br>HS - Rdg 71 74 82 81 81<br>HS – Math 69 75 82 77 82<br>LG – Rdg 76 65 72 69 65<br>LG – Math 78 69 73 66 72<br>25LG-Rdg 80 67 69 64 59<br>25LG-Math 71 66 76 58 76 |
| Assis Principal | Janet Hauser | M.S., Educational Leadership; Certification in Elementary Education, Middle Grades Social Science, Educational Leadership | 7 | 7 | 2012 2011 2010 2009 2008<br>Grades A A A A A<br>HS - Rdg 71 74 82 81 81<br>HS – Math 69 75 82 77 82<br>LG – Rdg 76 65 72 69 65<br>LG – Math 78 69 73 66 72<br>25LG-Rdg 80 67 69 64 59<br>25LG-Math 71 66 76 58 76 |
| | | M.S., Educational | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assis Principal | Gabriel Quintero | Leadership; Ed.D., Educational Administration and Supervision; Certification in Middle Grades Social Science, Educational Leadership | 7 | 16 | 2012 2011 2010 2009 2008<br>Grades A A A A A<br>HS - Rdg 71 74 82 81 81<br>HS – Math 69 75 82 77 82<br>LG – Rdg 76 65 72 69 65<br>LG – Math 78 69 73 66 72<br>25LG-Rdg 80 67 69 64 59<br>25LG-Math 71 66 76 58 76 |

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

## 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 | Classroom Walk-throughs and Discussions | Administrators | August 22, 2012 and ongoing throughout school year | |
| 2 | Shared Leadership and Decision-making models that encourage leadership development of key instructional staff | Administrators | August 22, 2012 and ongoing throughout school year | |
| 3 | Monthly grade-level planning meetings which include members of the Leadership Team | Asst. Principals | August 22, 2012 and monthly thereafter | |

## 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 |
|---|---|
| Out of Field – 6 (9.52%)<br>Not Highly Effective - 0 | - Provision of site-based mentoring and support through PLCs<br>- Involvement in professional development and coursework toward attaining in-field status |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 72 | 0.0%(0) | 5.6%(4) | 40.3%(29) | 54.2%(39) | 41.7%(30) | 100.0%(72) | 11.1%(8) | 20.8%(15) | 63.9%(46) |

### 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evie Mayor | TBD | Elementary/Primary grades expertise | PLC participation; individualized mentoring |
| Educardo Lacayo | TBD | Secondary Special Areas expertise | PLC participation; individualized mentoring |
| Harieta Guthrie | TBD | Intermediate grades Content Area expertise | PLC participation; individualized mentoring |

## 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.

Principal: provides common vision and instructional leadership for data-based decision-making; ensures the implementation of the MTSS/RtI model; assesses the MTSS/RtI
Selected General Education teachers: Grade-level and department chairpersons (provide information about core instruction; serve as liaisons to instructional teams
Special Education teacher: Provides information about core instruction to SWD; serves as liaison to instructional teams
School Psychologist: Participates in the Student Support Team process; provides information as to services and interventions for students
Student Services Personnel: Guidance Counselors and School Social Worker who participate in the Student Support Team process; provide information as to services and interventions for students (academic and behavioral)
Student Services Personnel: Guidance counselors and School Social Worker who participate in the Student Support Team process; provide information as to services and interventions for students
Reading Coach: Provides information and guidance on reading intervention and the development of intervention plans; assists with the reporting of data for RtI purposes

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?

This team will meet quarterly (as a whole or as smaller working teams) to discuss assessment results and student progress. During these meetings data, lesson plans, student work samples and other materials will be gathered and analyzed as to differentiate instruction and meet the special needs of students. Special attention will be given to students at moderate or high risk for failure. The team will identify appropriate professional development, resources and/or interventions to meet identified needs. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will work closely with the Literacy Leadership Team to ensure that instructional decisions, strategies and recommendations are faithfully implemented and consistent with CRRP requirements.

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 representatives from the EESAC to review all pertinent student performance data. Additionally, input will be gathered from faculty and staff as to best practices and necessary adjustments. Periodic reviews of the School Improvement Plan will be conducted, thereby allowing for the ongoing review of the plan to meet developing needs. The Florida Continuous Improvement Model will be utilized during this review process.

### 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.

Primarily, FCAT and SAT 10 data will be used to make initial program and instructional decisions for students in first through

eighth grades. FAIR and other assessment data (e.g., FLKRS) will be used for students in Kindergarten. Benchmark and Interim assessments, data from which will be collected through the EduSoft system, will be used to generate additional formative reports. These data will be disaggregated at the classroom and individual student levels, providing teachers with clear indications as to areas in need of re-teaching (as well as areas of mastery where enrichment and acceleration can be implemented). Benchmark assessments will be administered in September 2012; Interim Assessments will be administered in December 2012/January 2013.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

A "train the trainer" approach was employed to ensure that all staff had been trained on the implementation of the MTSS/RtI model. Grade-level and Department chairpersons will continue to serve as liaisons to their respective professional learning communities throughout the model's implementation. Additionally, supporting professional development will be coordinated by the school's Professional Development Liaison, and delivered during regularly scheduled team/faculty meetings and Professional Learning Communities. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team observations will determine the fidelity of implementation of the MTSS/RtI model, and lead to additional professional development offerings, as appropriate.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet on a quarterly basis to assess the effectiveness of the site-based implementation of the model. During these reviews the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will examine the implementation of interventions, the effectiveness of progress monitoring activities, and the status of students identified to receive multi-tiered interventions. These quarterly reviews will provide opportunities to identify additional areas in which support or training are needed.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal: Moraima Almeida-Perez (provides common vision and instructional leadership for data-based decision-making; ensures the implementation of the CRRP at the school site)
Assistant Principals: Janet Hauser and Gabriel Quintero (participate in decision-making processes regarding the implementation of the CRRP at the school site; monitor and assess the effectiveness of CRRP implementation; facilitate the use of data-collection instruments and assessments, as well as the analysis of resulting data for the purpose of improving the effectiveness of literacy-related activities)
Selected General Education Teachers: Grade-level and department chairpersons (provide information about core instruction and interdisciplinary activities supporting literacy development; serve as liaisons to instructional teams)
Special Education Teacher: Griselda Stanfield (provides information about core instruction and interdisciplinary activities supporting literacy development for SWD; serves as a liaison to instructional teams)

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

The LLT will meet four times during the school year, to coincide with meetings of the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team. The primary purposes of these meetings will be to review students' assessment data (e.g., FAIR results), make collaborative instructional decisions based on the data, and assess the fidelity of implementation of CRRP components and activities. By including grade-level and department chairpersons among the members of the LLT, it will be possible to disseminate data and additional information more effectively to all teachers. Additionally, the LLT will assess the status and impact of additional literacy-related initiatives and interventions, and make recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the overall program (e.g., Reading intervention laboratories, interdisciplinary strategies supporting literacy instruction).

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

Among the LLT's major initiatives during the 2012-2013 school year will be:
- Participating in the collection, disaggregation and analysis of Reading assessment data for the purpose of instructional decision-making;
- Assessing the utilization and effectiveness of Reading intervention programs, including technologically-based applications;
- Work closely with the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team to ensure fidelity of implementation and program consistency;
- Monitoring the implementation of literacy development strategies in all classes, including special areas, electives and content courses; and
- Facilitating the sharing of best practices in Reading instruction through professional learning community conversations.

## 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.

A school-wide, interdisciplinary approach to the teaching of reading will be implemented at all grade levels, including sixth through eighth grades. Content and Special area teachers will incorporate reading activities in their classes. Additionally, all teachers will be provided with the District Pacing Guide for Reading as an additional resource for instructional planning purposes. Teachers will have access to site-based support regarding the Comprehensive Research-based Reading Plan, as well as strategies for the incorporation of reading in their specific areas of responsibility. The Literacy Leadership Team will monitor the implementation of reading activities and strategies in all classrooms through monthly observations.

## *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: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 33% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 students proficiency by 3 percentage points to 36%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 33% (245) | 36% (264) |

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 | 1A.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reading Application. | 1a.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 must seek evidence in text. 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.<br><br>Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific reading benchmarks through tutorial programs. | 1a.1.<br>Literacy Leadership Team<br>Principal<br>Asst. Principals | 1a.1.<br>Review, in PLCs, data attained from assessments administered and adjust instruction accordingly; Monitor the implementation and/or incorporation of the CCS Rigorous Plan and related activities across grade levels (K through 8). | 1a.1.<br>Formative: FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus, FOCUS, District Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Reading. |
| | 1a.2.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 | 1a.2.<br>Teach students to identify and interpret | 1a.2.<br>Literacy Leadership Team | 1a.2.<br>Review, in PLCs, data attained from | Formative: FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus, |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Informational Text and Research Process | elements of story structure within a text. Help students understand character development, character point of view by asking “What does he think, what is his attitude toward…and what did he say to let me know?” Use poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. Note how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification. Use text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc.) to locate, interpret, and organize information. | Principal Asst. Principals | assessments administered and adjust instruction accordingly; Monitor the implementation and/or incorporation of the CCS Rigorous Plan and related activities across grade levels (K through 8). | FOCUS, District Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Reading. |

| 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: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 38% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 students’ proficiency by 1 percentage points to 39%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 38% (281) | 39% (285) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2a.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reading Application. | 2a.1.<br>Provide enrichment 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, as well as the author's intent in structuring text in specific ways. Students should focus on what the author thinks and feels, as well as how text structure communicates these ideas. Main idea may be stated or implied; students must seek evidence in text. 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, and the reasons why they have been used in the selected texts. Provide practice in identifying topics and themes within texts. | 2a.1.<br>Assistant Principal | 2a.1.<br>Review, in PLCs, data attained from assessments administered and adjust instruction accordingly; Monitor the implementation and/or incorporation of the CCS Rigorous Plan and related activities across grade levels (K through 8). | 2a.1.<br>Formative: FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus, FOCUS, District Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Reading. |
| 2 | 2a.2.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Literary Analysis/Fiction and Non-Fiction. | 2a.2.<br>Through enrichment activities teach students to identify and interpret elements of story structure within a text. Help students understand character development, character point of view by asking "What does he think, what is his attitude toward…and what did he say to let me know?" Use poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. Note how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification. Use text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc.) to locate, interpret, and organize information, as well as to deepen understandings of text meanings and author's intent. | 2a.2.<br>Assistant Principal | 2a.2.<br>Review, in PLCs, data attained from assessments administered and adjust instruction accordingly; Monitor the implementation and/or incorporation of the CCS Rigorous Plan and related activities across grade levels (K through 8). | 2A.2.<br>Formative: FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus, FOCUS, District Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Reading. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in | |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3a: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of students making Learning Gains in Reading by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 76% (450) | 81% (479) |

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 | 3a.1.<br>As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, 76% (450) of students in grades 3 through 8 made Learning Gains. This reveals that 24% (142) of students did not make Learning Gains. The provision of additional interventions and ongoing progress monitoring of these students is critical to ensuring they make Learning Gains. | 3a.1.<br>Provision of reading interventions, monthly assessment and data analysis of student performances in Reading. | 3a.1. Principal<br>Asst. Principals<br>Micro-Systems Technician | 3a.1<br>Review assessment data with Literacy Leadership Team and PLCs; participation in data chats to drive instructional planning; Monitor the implementation and/or incorporation of the CCS Rigorous Plan and related activities across grade levels (K through 8). | 3a.1.<br>Formative: FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus, FOCUS, District Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Reading. |
| 2 | 3a.2.<br>Opportunities are needed to provide additional interventions and reading practice to students in need of additional instruction (e.g., students in Tier II of the MTSS/RtI Process). | 3a.2.<br>Develop and implement master schedules that support the provision of targeted reading instruction to selected students, including the use of Reading Plus, Successmaker, Accelerated Reader, and other technological tools. | 3a.2.<br>Principal<br>Asst. Principals<br>Micro-Systems Technician | 3a.2.<br>Monitoring of utilization data to ensure fidelity of implementation and reviews of program-specific progress reports on individual students. | 3a.2.<br>Program reports reflecting student progress |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific reading benchmarks through tutorial programs | | | |

| 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 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: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 80% (121) | 85% (128) |

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 | 4a.1.<br>As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test, 80% (121) of students in the Lowest 25% made Learning Gains. This reveals that 20% (30) of these students did not make Learning Gains. The identification, provision of interventions, and | 4a.1.<br>Monthly assessment and data analysis of student performances in Reading. | 4a.1.<br>Principal<br>Asst. Principals<br>Micro-Systems Technician | 4a.1.<br>Review assessment data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule and utilizing data to target instruction; Monitor the implementation and/or incorporation of the CCS Rigorous Plan and related activities across grade | Evaluation Tool<br>4a.1.<br>Formative: FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus, FOCUS, District Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Reading. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ongoing progress monitoring of these students is critical to ensuring they make Learning Gains. | | | levels (K through 8). | |
| 2 | 4a.2. Opportunities are needed to provide additional interventions and reading practice to students in need of additional instruction. | 4a.2. Develop and implement master schedules that support the provision of targeted reading instruction to selected students, including the use of Reading Plus, Successmaker, Accelerated Reader, and other technological tools. | 4a.2. Principal Asst. Principals Micro-Systems Technician | 4a.2. Monitoring of utilization data to ensure fidelity of implementation and reviews of program-specific progress reports on individual students. | 4a.2. Program reports reflecting student progress |

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Reading Goal # 5A : We will increase the percentage of students scoring at Levels 3-5 in Reading and reduce the percentage of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 71 | 73 | 76 | 79 | 81 | |

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: | Not applicable |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 80% (90)<br>Black: 69% (21)<br>Hispanic: 71% (404)<br>Asian: 89% (16) | White: 81% (92)<br>Black: 72% (22)<br>Hispanic: 73% (415)<br>Asian: 90% (16) |

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: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of English Language Learners making Satisfactory Progress by 11%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 52% (29) | 63% (35) |

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 | 5C.1. Opportunities are needed to provide additional interventions and reading practice to students in need of additional instruction. | 5C.1. Develop and implement master schedules that support the provision of targeted reading instruction to ELL students, individually or in small groups, including the use of Teen Biz, Reading Plus, Successmaker, Accelerated Reader, and other technological tools. | 5C.1. Principal Asst. Principals Micro-Systems Technician | 5C.1. Monitoring of utilization data to ensure fidelity of implementation and reviews of program-specific progress reports on individual students. | 5C.1. Formative: FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus, FOCUS, District Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Reading. |

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: | Not applicable |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 34% (28) | 39% (32) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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: | Not applicable |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 65% (233) | 66% (236) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Voyager Interventions | K through 5 | Asst. Principal Grade-level Chairpersons | Elementary Teachers | August 17, 2012 | PLC meetings will include opportunities for providing additional support; Administration will monitor intervention usage monthly to assess fidelity. | Principal; Asst. Principals |
| Successmaker | K through 5 | Asst. Principal Grade-level Chairpersons | Elementary Teachers | August 17, 2012 | PLC meetings will include opportunities for providing additional support; Administration will monitor intervention usage monthly to assess fidelity. | Principal; Asst. Principals |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific reading benchmarks through tutorial programs | Tutorial program materials; supplementary materials | EESAC | $2,600.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $2,600.00 |
| **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 |

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | 2012 CELLA Administration data indicate that 86 ELL students (50%) achieved a score of "Proficient" in Listening/Speaking. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | |
| 50% (80) | |

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>ELL students should be provided additional opportunities to engage in spoken presentations and conversational use of English as a means to enhance their acquisition of the language. | 1.1.<br>Plan and implement lessons that engage students in the oral use of English vocabulary through presentations, role-playing, and other formats. | Asst. Principals | 1.1.<br>Classroom observations and teacher reflections on student performances. | 1.1.<br>Formative: Ongoing observations and teacher assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 CELLA administration scores |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.<br><br>CELLA Goal #2: | 2012 CELLA Administration data indicate that 52 ELL students (31%) achieved a score of "Proficient" in Reading. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| 31% (52) | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | ELL students should be afforded additional opportunities to interact with English-language text as a means of enhancing vocabulary, fluency and comprehension skills. | 2.1.<br>Enhance the utilization of technology-based resources (e.g., KidBiz, Reading Plus) designed to assist ELL students with acquiring English-language reading skills. | Asst. Principals | 2.1.<br>Student progress will be monitored based on program-generated reports and teacher observations. | 2.1.<br>Formative: Ongoing observations and teacher assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 CELLA |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | administration scores |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br><br>CELLA Goal #3: | 2012 CELLA Administration data indicate that 53 ELL students (30%) achieved a score of “Proficient” in Writing. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | |
| 30% (53) | |

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 | ELL students should be afforded additional opportunities daily to engage in writing activities. | 2.3.<br>Daily journal writing will be incorporated into ELL students instructional program, with an emphasis on the reading and oral presentation of journal entries (in support of Listening/Speaking and Reading). | 2.3.<br>Principal<br>Asst. Principals | 2.3.<br>Ongoing reviews of student journal entries, including the development and utilization of rubrics to assess improvements in writing performances over time. | Formative: Ongoing observations and teacher assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 CELLA administration scores |

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: | The results of the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 36% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase Level 3 students' proficiency by 1 percentage point to 37%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 36% (287) | 37% (301) |

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 | Additional opportunities are needed for students to develop understandings of mathematical concepts and skills beyond operational and application levels. | 1a.1.<br>Implement teacher-directed instruction and small-group activities, including grade-level competitions, designed to provide the students an opportunity to solve problems and communicate their thinking through writing and journaling activities.<br><br>Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific mathematics benchmarks through tutorial programs. | 1a.1.<br>Assistant Principal | 1a.1.<br>Review, in PLCs, data attained from assessments administered and adjust instruction accordingly. | 1A.1.<br>Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation; Assessments provided with Go Math Series<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |
| 2 | Additional opportunities are needed for students to develop concrete understandings of abstract mathematical concepts and operations. | Utilize manipulatives for hands-on activities to introduce concepts through discovery as well as demonstrate understanding. | 1a.2.<br>Assistant Principal | 1a.2.<br>Provide opportunities for grade levels to meet biweekly to plan hands-on activities through PLCs. | 1A.2.<br>Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation; Assessments provided with Go Math Series<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

| 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: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 40% of elementary students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of elementary students achieving Level 4 and 5 proficiency. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 40% (292) | 40% (293) |

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 | While these students perform at a high level, involving them in rigorous conversations and dialogue about real-world problems and abstract concepts will deepen their understandings. Opportunities exist to provide additional instructional experiences in these areas. | 2a.1. Provide an opportunity for students to be engaged in mathematical dialogue and problem solving activities through the use of collaborative learning centers, hands-on interactions with mathematical concepts and content, and more complex problem-solving processes. | 2a.1. Assistant Principal | Review, in PLCs, data attained from assessments administered and adjust instruction accordingly. | 2A.1. Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation; Assessments provided with Go Math Series<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

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: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of elementary students making Learning Gains in Mathematics by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 78% (463) | 83% (492) |

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 | While 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test revealed an increase of 8% in the percentage of students making learning gains in Mathematics, student performances in Geometry and Measurement continue to be a concern at all grade levels. A lack of repeated opportunities for exposure and skill-development on specific mathematics benchmarks has hindered student progress in this area. | 3a.1.<br>Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to engage in meaningful instructional activities (including hands-on activities, reinforcement, practice and enrichment) focused on mathematics benchmarks and developing mastery of mathematics skills, with particular emphasis on geometry and measurement.<br><br>Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific mathematics benchmarks through tutorial programs. | Principal<br>Asst. Principals | 3a.1.<br>Classroom walk-throughs; monitoring of classroom instruction to ensure that instruction is consistent with curricular expectations, Pacing Guides, and meeting student learning needs. | 3A.1.<br>Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation; Assessments provided with Go Math Series<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

| 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: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of elementary students in the Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Mathematics by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 71% (108) | 76% (116) |

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 | Although there was a 5% increase in the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics (from 66% to 71%), a lack of repeated and consistent opportunities for exposure to specific mathematics strands and benchmarks may again hinder student progress. | 4a.1. Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific mathematics benchmarks, identified through progress monitoring activities, through tutorial programs. | Principal<br>Asst. Principals | 4a.1. Classroom walk-throughs; monitoring of classroom instruction to ensure that instruction is consistent with curricular expectations, Pacing Guides, and meeting student learning needs. | 4A.1. Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation; Assessments provided with Go Math Series<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

| 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>5A : We will increase the percentage of students scoring at Levels 3-5 in Mathematics and reduce the percentage of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years. |

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 69 | 72 | 75 | 77 | 80 | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the |

| | |
|---|---|
| satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | percentage of elementary students in the Asian Sub-group making satisfactory progress in Mathematics by 7%, and in the Black Sub-group by 14%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Asian: 89% (16)<br>Black: 45% (14) | Asian: 96% (17)<br>Black: 59% (18) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Opportunities are needed to provide additional interventions and mathematics practice to students in need of additional instruction. | Develop and implement plans and schedules that support the provision of targeted mathematics instruction and remediation to selected students, including the use of Successmaker, FCAT Explorer, Destination Math, manipulatives, and additional technological tools | Principal<br>Asst. Principals<br>Micro-Systems Technician | 5B.1.<br>Monitoring of utilization data to ensure fidelity of implementation and reviews of program-specific progress reports on individual students; monitoring of interim and other assessment data. | 5B.1.<br>Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation; Assessments provided with Go Math Series<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of elementary students in the Students with Disabilities Sub-group making satisfactory progress in Mathematics by 9%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 32% (27) | 41% (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 | A lack of repeated opportunities for exposure to specific mathematics strands and benchmarks has hindered student progress. | 5D.1. Provide Students with Disabilities with additional opportunities to access technology-based mathematics skill-building programs (e.g., Successmaker, Destination Math). | Asst. Principals | 5D.1. Program utilization reports and ongoing progress monitoring will be used to determine the impact of strategy. | 5D.1. Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation; Assessments provided with Go Math Series<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal E: | NA |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 65% (233) | 66% (236) |

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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 70% of middle school students achieved Level 3 proficiency or above.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students earning Level 3 or higher by 5 percentage points to 75%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 70% (267) | 75% (286) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | The area of concern in 6th grade Mathematics was Fractions, Ratios/Proportional Relationships and Statistics (61%).<br><br>The area of concern in 7th grade Mathematics was Ratios/Proportional Relationships (58%).<br><br>The area of concern in 8th grade Mathematics was Geometry and Measurement (53%). | 1a.1.<br>Implement teacher-directed instruction and small group activities designed to provide the students an opportunity to develop the necessary skills in their respective areas of concern, solve problems and communicate their thinking. | 1a.1.<br>Assistant Principal | 1a.1.<br>Review, in PLCs, data attained from assessments administered and adjust instruction accordingly. | 1A.1.<br>Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |
| 2 | Additional opportunities are needed for students to develop concrete understandings of abstract mathematical concepts and operations. | Utilize visuals and manipulatives for hands-on activities to introduce concepts through discovery as well as to demonstrate understanding. | 1a.2.<br>Assistant Principal | 1a.2.<br>Provide opportunities for grade levels to meet biweekly to plan hands-on activities through PLCs. | 1A.2.<br>Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

| 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: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 40% of middle school students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of middle school students achieving Level 4 and 5 proficiency at 40%. |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 40% (292) | 40% (293) |

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 | While these students perform at a high level, involving them in rigorous conversations and dialogue about real-world problems and abstract concepts will deepen their understandings. Opportunities exist to provide additional instructional experiences in these areas. | 2a.1. Provide an opportunity for students for students to be engaged in rigorous mathematical dialogue and problem solving activities through the use of collaborative learning approaches. | 2a.1. Assistant Principal | Review, in PLCs, data attained from assessments administered and adjust instruction accordingly. | 2A.1. Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |
| 2 | Opportunities exist to provide students with additional rigorous, real-world experiences involving the application of mathematical concepts and skills. | 2a.2. Select rigorous, real-world problems, aligned to the content the students are learning. | 2a.2. Assistant Principal | 2a.2. Review, in PLCs, data attained from assessments administered and adjust instruction accordingly. | 2A.2. Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

| 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: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of middle school students making satisfactory progress in Mathematics by 5%. |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 78% (463) | 83% (492) |

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 | A lack of repeated opportunities for exposure to specific mathematics strands and benchmarks has hindered student progress. | 3a.1. Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to engage in meaningful instructional activities (including hands-on activities, reinforcement, practice and enrichment) focused on mathematics benchmarks. | Principal Asst. Principals | 3a.1. Classroom walk-throughs; monitoring of classroom instruction to ensure that instruction is consistent with curricular expectations, Pacing Guides, and meeting student learning needs. | 3A.1. Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

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: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of middle school students in the Lowest 25% making satisfactory progress in Mathematics by 5%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 71% (108) | 76% (116) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, and in spite increased focus in classroom instruction, the percentage of students in the Lowest 25% making Learning Gains increased only 1% from 70% in 2011 to 71% in 2012. A lack of repeated opportunities for exposure to specific mathematics strands and benchmarks has hindered student progress. | 4a.1.<br>Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific mathematics benchmarks through tutorial programs. | Principal<br>Asst. Principals | 4a.1.<br>Classroom walk-throughs; monitoring of classroom instruction to ensure that instruction is consistent with curricular expectations, Pacing Guides, and meeting student learning needs. | 4A.1.<br>Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

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>5A : We will increase the percentage of students scoring at Levels 3-5 in Mathematics and reduce the percentage of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 66 | 69 | 72 | 75 | 77 | |

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: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of middle school students in the Asian Sub-group making satisfactory progress in Mathematics by 7%, and the percentage of middle school students in the Black Sub-group making satisfactory progress by 14%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Asian: 89% (16)<br>Black: 45% (14) | Asian: 96% (17)<br>Black: 59% (18) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of middle school students in the Hispanic Sub-group making Learning Gains in Mathematics by 5%. | 5B.1.<br>Develop and implement plans and schedules that support the provision of targeted mathematics instruction and remediation to selected students, including the use of FCAT Explorer, Destination Math, manipulatives, and additional technological tools. | Principal<br>Asst. Principals<br>Micro-Systems Technician | 5B.1.<br>Monitoring of utilization data to ensure fidelity of implementation and reviews of program-specific progress reports on individual students; monitoring of interim and other assessment data. | 5B.1.<br>Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

| 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: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of middle school students in the Students with Disabilities Sub-group making satisfactory progress in Mathematics by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 32% (27) | 41% (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 | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the percentage of middle school students in the Students with Disabilities Sub-group making Learning Gains in Mathematics by 5%. | 5D.1.<br>Provide Students with Disabilities with additional opportunities to access technology-based mathematics skill-building programs (e.g., Destination Math). | Asst. Principals | 5D.1.<br>Program utilization reports and ongoing progress monitoring will be used to determine the impact of strategy. | 5D.1.<br>Formative: District Assessment data and ongoing teacher observation<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results in Mathematics. |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

*End of 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: | Based on the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC Examination, 27% (12) of students demonstrated proficiency by scoring at Level 3. 100% (45) of students scored at Level 3 or higher. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 27% (12) | 27% (12) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Demonstration of proficiency in Algebra is greatly contingent on students' having developed proficiency on previous mathematical skills. Students demonstrated the greatest difficulty in the Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics cluster (65% correct rate). | 1.1. Vertical Teaming and articulation efforts between middle school and elementary mathematics teachers will be enhanced, to include the expansion of efforts to prepare students to be proficient in Algebra. | Principal<br>Asst. Principals | 1.1. Review of PLC minutes; Ongoing monitoring of student performances on benchmarked assessments aligned with District Pacing Guides. | 1.1. Formative: EduSoft reports on District Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results of the 2013 Algebra EOC Examination |

| 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.<br><br>Algebra Goal #2: | Based on the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC Examination, 73% (33) of students demonstrated proficiency by scoring at Levels 4 and 3. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 73% (33) | 73% (33) |

| 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 | Demonstration of proficiency in Algebra, and successful progress toward more rigorous mathematics courses at the high school level, is greatly contingent on students' having developed proficiency on higher-level and complex mathematical skills. | Vertical Teaming and articulation efforts between middle school and elementary mathematics teachers will be enhanced, and will include efforts to enrich instruction in preparation for more rigorous coursework at the high school level. | 2.1. Asst. Principals | 2.1. Review of PLC minutes; Ongoing monitoring of student performances on benchmarked assessments aligned with District Pacing Guides. | 2.1. Formative: EduSoft reports on District Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results of the 2013 Algebra EOC Examination |

*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 | | | | |

*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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific mathematics benchmarks | K-8 | Math Liaison | Elementary teachers; Mathematics teachers | August 17, 2012; additional training to be provided through PLCs and on Professional Development days. | Classroom walk-throughs and observations of instruction to ensure fidelity of implementation; PLC logs. | Asst. Principals |
| Common Core Curriculum – Mathematics | K-8 | Asst. Principals | All teachers | August 17, 2012; Through PLCs weekly and monthly thereafter | PLC meetings and data chats will provide opportunities for follow-up and data-based instructional planning. | Asst. Principals; Grade-level and Department Chairpersons |
| Destination Math | K-5 | Asst. Principal | Elementary teachers | August 17, 2012; support throughout the school year, including access to vignettes and online support. | Monitoring of program utilization. | Principal; Asst. Principals |
| Data Analysis | K-8 | Asst. Principals | All teachers | Beginning in August 2012; additional sessions and data chats to be scheduled in conjunction with data collection activities. | PLC meetings and data chats will provide opportunities for follow-up and data-based instructional planning. | Asst. Principals; Grade-level and Department Chairpersons |
| Go Math! Series | K-5 | Asst. Principals | Elementary teachers | August 17, 2012; support throughout the school year, including access to vignettes and online support. | Implementation of the series will be monitored through PLC interactions and observations of classroom teaching performances. | Principal; Asst. Principals |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific mathematics benchmarks through tutorial programs. | Tutorial program materials; supplementary materials | EESAC | $2,600.00 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Subtotal: $2,600.00 |
| **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: $2,600.00** |

*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: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 45% of Fifth and Eighth Grade students achieved Level 3 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of Fifth and Eighth Grade students scoring at Level 3 by 2 percentage points to 47%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 45% (123) | 47% (130) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT Science Test was in the Physical Science cluster (73% proficiency), as well as in Big Idea 2 (the Characteristics of Scientific Knowledge) | Encourage teachers to use the District Pacing Guides and to become proficient in their grade levels NGSSS.<br><br>Involve students in an increased number of laboratory and simulation activities to reinforce understanding of concepts in physical science and the nature of scientific processes. Enco | 1a.1. Assistant Principal and/or designee | Monitoring the use of the Pacing Guides through observations. Teacher lesson plans will demonstrate evidence of compliance with the District's Pacing Guides.<br><br>Bi-weekly grade-level and departmental meetings will provide opportunities to review implementation of strategies and modify approach as necessary. | 1A.1. Formative: District Baseline data and school-based assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test |
| | Greater articulation and common planning | 1a.2 Continue | 1a.2. Assistant | 1a.2. PLC minutes and notes | 1a.2. Formative: |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | among elementary and middle school science teachers is needed to enhance instructional effectiveness, as well as to build capacity to support improved student performances in Science. | implementation of vertical articulation and Professional Learning Communities for elementary and middle school science teachers, focusing on ongoing progress monitoring of student performance on benchmarks, the identification of best practices in the teaching of science standards, and the development of additional strategies and activities addressing all big ideas and targeted benchmarks. | Principal | | District Baseline data and school-based assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 21% of Fifth and Eighth Grade students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of Fifth and Eighth grade students earning levels 4 and 5 by 1%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 21% (58) | 22% (61) |

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 | Greater articulation and common planning among elementary and middle school science teachers is needed to enhance instructional effectiveness, as well as to build capacity to support improved student performances in Science and enhanced participation in rigorous Science courses in high school. | 2a.2 Continue implementation of vertical articulation and Professional Learning Communities for elementary and middle school science teachers, focusing on ongoing progress monitoring of student performance on benchmarks, the identification of best practices in the teaching of science standards, and the development of additional strategies and activities designed to involve students in rigorous science-based activities. | 2a.2. Assistant Principal | 2a.2. PLC minutes and notes | 2a.2. Formative: District Baseline data and school-based assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Continue implementation of vertical articulation and PLC's for elementary | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| and middle school science teachers, focusing on ongoing progress monitoring of student performance on benchmarks, the identification of best practices in the teaching of science standards, and the development of additional strategies and activities addressing all big ideas and targeted benchmarks. | 4-8 Science | Science Liaison | Science Teachers | August 2012, and weekly thereafter (PLC meetings); meetings to take place at least four times during the school year. | PLC conversations will provide opportunities for sharing of best practices to support implementation; observations of teaching performances and instructional activities. | Principal Asst. Principals |
| Implement hands-on, "real-world" activities addressing benchmarks in Physical Science and Scientific Thinking areas (e.g., laboratory activities, GIZMOS, technology) through science classes. | 4-8 Science | Science Liaison | Science Teachers | August 17, 2012; refresher training and additional support available throughout the school year. | PLC conversations will provide opportunities for sharing of best practices to support implementation; observations of teaching performances and instructional activities. | Principal Asst. Principals |

Science Budget:

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

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.<br><br>Writing Goal #1a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 83% of students scored Level 3 or higher.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Writing Test by two percentage points. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 83% (205) | 85% (209) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test, 80% (82) of fourth grade and 85% (122) of eighth grade students achieved scores of 3.0 or higher. These performances can be attributed in part to the success of the interventions and programs being used in the teaching of writing, but point to the need for enriched writing instruction at all grade levels. | Continue to implement specific writing strategies and techniques (e.g., Melissa Forney strategies, Write Traits, Power Ed, rubric analysis, revision/editing process, high-impact writing strategies, journaling) in all classes beginning in Kindergarten. | Principal<br>Asst. Principals | 1a.1.<br>Classroom walk-throughs, observations of instruction and ongoing monitoring of science activities; Monitor the implementation and/or incorporation of the CCS Rigorous Plan and related activities across grade levels (K through 8). | 1a.1.<br>Formative: District Baseline and monthly writing prompt data<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test |
| 2 | 1a.2.<br>In order to maintain the percentage of students at or above proficiency in writing, students should be provided additional opportunities to apply the writing process in narrative, expository and persuasive forms. | 1a.2.<br>Expose students to a variety of genres, formats and models of writing (published and student-written), and clarify expectations for writing performances through the critical use of anchor papers. | Principal<br>Asst. Principals | 1a.2.<br>Classroom walk-throughs, observations of instruction and ongoing monitoring of science activities; Monitor the implementation and/or incorporation of the CCS Rigorous Plan and related activities across grade levels (K through 8). | 1a.2.<br>Formative: District Baseline and monthly writing prompt data<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test |
| 3 | 1a.3.<br>Ensuring that students develop rich writing skills, including the use of dialogue, figurative language, and rich vocabulary within the context of proper use of conventions, during the course of the school year is critical. In order to accurately assess progress and adjust instructional methods, monthly | 1a.3.<br>Evaluate and return monthly writing prompt responses to teachers for use as teaching tools to drive classroom instruction, particularly regarding content, stylistic elements, vocabulary, and proper writing conventions. | Principal<br>Asst. Principals | 1a.3.<br>Reviews of writing prompt performances will reflect improved student performances throughout the school year; Monitor the implementation and/or incorporation of the CCS Rigorous Plan and related activities across grade levels (K through 8). | 1a.3.<br>Formative: Writing prompts, score logs<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test scores |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | assessments should continue to be used at all grade levels. | | | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Continue to implement specific writing strategies and techniques (e.g., Melissa Forney strategies, Write Traits, Power Ed, rubric analysis, revision/editing process, high-impact writing strategies, journaling) in all classes beginning in Kindergarten. | K-8 | Grade-level and Department Chairpersons | Elementary teachers; Language Arts teachers; Content Area teachers | August 22, 2012 for elementary teachers (through PLCs); Professional Development Day refresher training session for all teachers. | PLC conversations will provide opportunities for sharing of best practices to support implementation; observations of teaching performances and instructional activities. | Principal; Asst. Principals |
| | | | | | PLC conversations will | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PLC Focus – Conventions | K-8 | Grade-level and Department Chairpersons | Elementary teachers; Language Arts teachers; Content Area teachers | November 6, 2012, follow-up through weekly PLC meetings. | provide opportunities for sharing of best practices to support implementation; observations of teaching performances and instructional activities. | Principal; Asst. Principals |

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: | Students will be required to complete EOC examinations in Civics beginning in the 2013-2014 school year. During the 2012-2013 school year, 70% of seventh grade students will demonstrate mastery of Civics content. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0) | 70% (87) |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Results from the 2012-2013 District Civics Baseline Assessment indicated that no current seventh graders demonstrated | 1.1. Students will be provided instruction that aligns with the Common Core State Standards for Civics | Principal<br>Asst. Principal | Reviews of student progress on classroom assignments and assessments aligned with standards. | 1.1. Student course grades and data generated by baseline/interim assessments, and |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | proficiency (average score 38% correct). All seventh grade students must complete Civics as part of their instructional program. However, the advent of the Common Core Standards, and the absence of standardized instructional materials and assessments aligned with these new Civics standards, creates an obstacle to preparing students for the EOC in 2013-2014. | and that incorporates supplementary materials to address the new expectations, as appropriate. | | Student performances on baseline and interim Civics assessments will provide data for instructional planning purposed. Social studies teachers will review trends in monitoring data and determine areas where additional instruction is necessary. | publisher or teacher-developed examinations. |

| 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: | Students will be required to complete EOC examinations in Civics beginning in the 2013-2014 school year. During the 2012-2013 school year, 30% of seventh grade students will demonstrate high mastery of Civics content by scoring Level 4 and 5 on the EOC examination. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0) | 30% (43) |

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 | All seventh grade students must complete Civics as part of their instructional program. However, the advent of the Common Core Standards, and the absence of standardized instructional materials and assessments aligned with these new Civics standards, creates an obstacle to preparing students for the EOC in 2013-2014. | 2.1<br>Students will be provided instruction that aligns with the Common Core State Standards for Civics and that incorporates supplementary materials to address the new expectations, as appropriate. | Principal<br>Asst. Principal | Reviews of student progress on classroom assignments and assessments aligned with standards.<br><br>Student performances on baseline and interim Civics assessments will provide data for instructional planning purposed. Social studies teachers will review trends in monitoring data and determine areas where additional instruction is necessary. | 2.1<br>Student course grades and data generated by baseline/interim assessments, and publisher or teacher-developed examinations |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strategies for implementing Civic in the Middle Grades | 6-8 | Social Studies Department Chairperson | Social Studies Teachers; Special Area Teachers; Language Arts Teachers | August 17, 2012; Ongoing through Departmental Meetings | PLC conversations will include discussions of new materials and strategies supporting rigorous instruction in Civics; Reviews of progress monitoring data in Civics will indicate the need for additional professional development in this area; Administration will monitor the implementation of pacing guides and instruction aligned with curricular expectations in Civics. | Principal; Asst. Principals |

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: | Attendance rates over the past two years have demonstrated minor fluctuations, but have generally been positive. The 2010-2011 attendance rate was 96.48%; the 2011-2012 attendance rate was 96.51%. A review of quarterly attendance data reveals the greatest differences occurring during the latter half of the school year. While already in use, the site-based attendance intervention plan, as well as the use of the attendance review committee, should be expanded particularly during the second semester. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 96.67% (1073) | 97.17% (1079) |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 230 | 219 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 159 | 151 |

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. Student attendance has fluctuated slightly over the past two years, from 96.48% in 2010-2011 to 96.51% in the 2011-2012 school year. While there has been a slight improvement, attendance rates, particularly during the latter half of the school year, continue to decline. | 1.1. Identify and implement incentive and/or reward programs to encourage improved student attendance, particularly during the latter half of the school year. | Principal Asst. Principal | 1.1. Monthly and quarterly reviews of attendance data | 1.1. Attendance reports |
| 2 | A review of attendance data reveals that approximately 15% (160) students had 10 or more absences during the 2011-2012 school year; 7% (85) of the student population has 15 or more absences. The identification of these students and proactive implementation of attendance interventions is a priority. | 1.2. Increase the frequency of interventions targeting students with 3 or more absences (e.g., Attendance Review Committee actions, counseling, and communication with parents, Connect-Ed messages, parent letters, calls and conferences). | Principal Asst. Principals | 1.2. Attendance Review Committee proceedings and outcomes; successful delivery of Connect-Ed and other communications. | 1.2. ARC reports; Connect-Ed reports |
| 3 | 1.3. A review of attendance data reveals that approximately 21% (227) of students had 10 or more tardies during the 2011-2012 school year, an increase over the 2010-2011 figures of 17% (199). The identification of these students and proactive implementation of attendance interventions is a priority. | 1.3. Increase the active implementation of procedures to encourage timely and consistent attendance, including enforcement of consequences outlined in the school's Progressive Discipline Plan and the Code of Student Conduct, as well as reinforcement of staggered arrival times. | Principal Asst. Principals | 1.3 Reduction in the number of students with excessive tardiness | 1.3 Attendance reports (daily and quarterly) |

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

*End of Attendance Goal(s)*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Suspension<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | A review of student suspension data over the past two years reveals: 2010-2011: In-school 19, Out of school 24; 2011-2012: In-school 5, Out of school 21. The enhanced availability of individual and group counseling as a component of our Progressive Discipline Plan (e.g. listeners, conflict resolution/ peer mediators) will likely assist with reducing the suspension rates, as will the expanded use of alternatives to suspensions (e.g., In School Detention, Work Assignments, Service Detail). |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6 | 5 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 5 | 5 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 32 | 29 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 21 | 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 | Outdoor suspensions increased from 22 during the 2010-2011 school year to 32 during the 2011-2012 school year. The primary cause for out-of-school suspensions during the 2011-2012 school year was conflicts between students, including bullying. | 1.1. Increase the availability of student services personnel to provide conflict resolution, peer mediation and crisis management training for targeted students and staff. | Principal Asst. Principals Counselors | 1.1. Reduction in out-of-school suspensions resulting from a decrease in occurrences of fighting. | 1.1. Suspension reports; counseling records |
| 2 | 1.2. Indoor suspensions decreased from 17 during the 2010-2011 school year to 6 during the 2011-2012 school year. The primary cause for indoor suspensions during the 2011-2012 school year was disruptive behavior (3 occurrences). | 1.2 Provide students with orientation and ongoing support regarding the implementation of the school's Progressive Discipline Plan and the district's Code of Student Conduct. | Principal Asst. Principals Counselors | 1.2 Reduction in the number of violations of the Progressive Discipline Plan and Code of Student Conduct resulting in suspensions. | 1.2 Suspension reports; counseling records |
| 3 | 1.3. Although there are opportunities to recognize positive behavior throughout the school year, increasing the number of opportunities to recognize and reward positive behavior will reinforce expectations. | 1.3 Utilize the district's SPOT Success and Do The Right Thing programs to recognize students for positive behavior. | Principal Asst. Principals Counselors | 1.3 Increase in the number of students receiving recognition and incentives for positive behavior through the SPOT Success system and the Do The Right Thing Program. | 1.3 SPOT Success reports; suspension reports |

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Parent Involvement<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>**Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | Parental involvement has been maintained in school wide activities with an overall increase throughout the school year. The wide variety of available activities (e.g., PTSA meetings, Open House, Resource Fair, Science Fair, Parent Orientation, Volunteer Orientation, awards assemblies, Fall Harvest and Winter Festivals, Winter and Spring Shows, and Elementary and Upper Academy musical performances) has led to increasing numbers of parents attending and participating in these events. Workshops and presentations focusing on instructional topics are provided to parents throughout the school year, and parents receive frequent communication regarding school events and activities. Parents are also afforded opportunities to access web-based resources for informational and instructional purposes through the school’s website. |

| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
|---|---|
| 247/2,803 hours | 259/2,943 |

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 | A total of 247 individuals were registered as active volunteers during the 2011-2012 school year. These individuals provided 2,803 hours of volunteer services to the school. These services ranged from assisting with arrival, dismissal and cafeteria supervision, to assisting in individual classrooms. Our goal is to increase both the number of volunteers and the number of service hours provided in support of the school's overall program by 5%. | Increase the number of parents registering and serving as volunteers by involving faculty and staff in active recruitment efforts | Principal<br>Asst. Principals | An increase in the number of parent volunteers will lead to an increase in the number of service hours provided to the school. Data regarding the number of volunteers and service hours will be reviewed mid-year and at the end of the year to determine progress. | Volunteer log |
| 2 | Although there is a high level of parental involvement at our school, we would like to maintain or increase the number of opportunities parents have to attend workshops and in-services on instructional topics (e.g., reading, FCAT, effective parenting). A total of eight parent workshops were offered during the 2011-2012 school year. | 1.2<br>Parents at Kenwood K-8 Center will be offered a minimum of four parent workshops on instructional topics during the 2012-2013 school year. | Principal<br>Asst. Principal | 1.2<br>Sign-in/Attendance rosters and agendas from workshops. | 1.2<br>Rosters and agendas |
| 3 | Communication with parents increased significantly during the 2011-2012 school year, particularly through the use of the Connect-Ed system and the school website. The school's website was re-designed in order to provide greater ease of use and access to resources. Continuing to increase the utilization of the website will empower them to be more effective partners in their children's learning. | 1.3<br>Increase the frequency of communications with parents, including communications requiring them to access the school's website. | Principal<br>Asst. Principals<br>Microsystems Technician | 1.3<br>Increased utilization of the school's website will enhance parental involvement by ensuring they have access to valuable resources and school information. | 1.3<br>Website utilization; communication records |

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: | During the 2012-2013 school year, eighth grade students will engage in rigorous applications of science, technology, engineering and mathematics in designing solutions for real-world problems as a means of preparing them to apply these skills in advanced coursework at the high school level. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Middle school students are in need of additional, rigorous | Students will identify community issues (e.g., methods for increasing | Asst. Principal | Monitoring of student participation and performances; Teacher | Culminating projects presented in |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | applications of science process, technological, and matehamtical skills in defining problems and designing solutions to real-world situations as a means to enhance their performances on mathematics and science assessments, as well as to better prepare them for advanced coursework in these areas at the high school level. | recycling participation and impact), and work in small groups over the course of the school year, researching the issue/problem, designing solutions, and predicting the impacts of their solution strategies through the application of scientific, technological, and mathematical knowledge and skills. | | observation and assessment of student and small group products. | Spring 2013; Student and teacher reflections on the effectiveness of the strategy. |

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. CTE<br><br>CTE Goal #1: | Enrollment in Computer Applications and Business Keyboarding courses has decreased from 134 students during the 2010-2011 school year to 122 during the 2011-2012 school year.<br><br>We will increase enrollment in Computer Applications and Business Keyboarding by at least 10% (135) during the 2012-2013 school year. |

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 | Given the limited number of elective offerings at a K-8 Center as opposed to a traditional middle school program, selection of an elective course is highly competitive. | 1.1. Develop and implement strategies to market and increase the visibility of CTE offerings. | Principal<br>Asst. Principal | 1.1. Review of enrollment data for CTE courses. | 1.1. Enrollment data |

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 | Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific reading benchmarks through tutorial programs | Tutorial program materials; supplementary materials | EESAC | $2,600.00 |
| Mathematics | Increase the number of opportunities for individual students to receive additional supports and differentiated instruction on specific mathematics benchmarks through tutorial programs. | Tutorial program materials; supplementary materials | EESAC | $2,600.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $5,200.00 |
| **Technology** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: $5,200.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/11/2012)

## School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|---|
| Provision of After-school Tutorial Programs in Reading and Mathematics (Grades 3 through 8) | $5,200.00 |

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

The EESAC will review, approve and oversee the implementation of the SIP.

Budget: The EESAC will reach consensus on the distribution of the Florida Recognition Enhancement Funds. Input will be sought by all members to reach consensus on the expenditure of EESAC monies.

Training: The EESAC will recommend staff development in the areas of technology integration with classroom instruction, as well as in high-impact strategies for meeting the needs of student sub-groups.

Staffing: The EESAC will recommend the staffing of teachers to serve as instructors in the school's before and after-school tutorial program.

Student Support Services: The EESAC will recommend the continued implementation of character education for all students, with specific emphasis on bullying prevention, harassment, developing positive self-esteem, and strengthening coping skills (e.g., dealing with divorce).

Other Matters of Resource Allocation: The EESAC will recommend increasing the involvement of our Dade Partners and School Volunteers by increasing their active roles in school-wide activities.

Benchmarking: The EESAC will recommend the continued implementation and use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model in order to effectively meet the needs of all students.

School Safety and Discipline: The EESAC will recommend the implementation of Saturday School as a means to reduce the amount of outdoor suspensions, as well as to reduce the number of instructional hours lost for disciplinary reasons. The EESAC supports the development of additional alternatives to suspension.

# AYP DATA

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

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

| Dade School District<br>KENWOOD K-8 CENTER<br>2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 83% | 83% | 95% | 68% | 329 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 67% | 70% | | | 137 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 70% (YES) | 66% (YES) | | | 136 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 602 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Dade School District<br>KENWOOD K-8 CENTER<br>2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 82% | 82% | 95% | 51% | 310 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 72% | 73% | | | 145 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 69% (YES) | 76% (YES) | | | 145 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 600 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |