

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: MIAMI LAKES K-8 CENTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: Rosy Calvo

SAC Chair: Maria Santelices

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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)
		BA- Elementary Education, University of Miami  Master of Educational			2011-2012: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math mastery: 66% Learning Gains-Reading: 77% Learning Gains-Math: 68% Writing Mastery 76% Science Mastery: 58% Gains-Reading Lowest 25%: 77% Gains Math Lowest 25%: 62%  2010-2011: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 78% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery 76% Science Mastery: 58%  AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged, Hispanics, English Language Learners  2009-2010: Grade: A

Principal	Rosy Calvo	Leadership, Florida International University  Principal Certification- State of Florida	12	22	<p>Reading Mastery: 80% Math mastery: 77% Writing Mastery 85% Science Mastery: 62%</p> <p>AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged and Hispanics</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 81% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery: 94% Science Mastery: 57% AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 84% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery: 85% Science Mastery: 56% AYP: all groups</p>
Assis Principal	Susan Fisch	BA- Elementary Education, Fairleigh Dickinson University  Master of Reading Education, CW Post Specialist in Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University	8	12	<p>2011-2012: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math mastery: 66% Learning Gains-Reading: 77% Learning Gains-Math: 68% Writing Mastery 76% Science Mastery: 58% Gains-Reading Lowest 25%: 77% Gains Math Lowest 25%: 62%</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 78% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery 76% Science Mastery: 58%</p> <p>AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged, Hispanics, English Language Learners</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 80% Math mastery: 77% Writing Mastery 85% Science Mastery: 62%</p> <p>AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged and Hispanics</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 81% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery: 94% Science Mastery: 57% AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 84% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery: 85% Science Mastery: 56% AYP: all groups</p>
		BA- Music Education			<p>2011-2012: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math mastery: 66% Learning Gains-Reading: 77% Learning Gains-Math: 68% Writing Mastery 76% Science Mastery: 58% Gains-Reading Lowest 25%: 77% Gains Math Lowest 25%: 62%</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 78% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery 76% Science Mastery: 58%</p> <p>AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged, Hispanics, English Language Learners</p>

Assis Principal	Carlos A. Salcedo	Master of Science in Educational Leadership, Florida International University	7	7	<p>2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 80% Math mastery: 77% Writing Mastery 85% Science Mastery: 62%</p> <p>AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged and Hispanics</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 81% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery: 94% Science Mastery: 57% AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 84% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery: 85% Science Mastery: 56% AYP: all groups</p>
Assis Principal	Lissett Robayna	BS-Elementary Education Nova Southeastern University MS-Computer Science Education Nova Southeastern University Certifications *Educational Leadership *Elementary Education *Primary Education	3	13	<p>2011-2012: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math mastery: 66% Learning Gains-Reading: 77% Learning Gains-Math: 68% Writing Mastery 76% Science Mastery: 58% Gains-Reading Lowest 25%: 77% Gains Math Lowest 25%: 62%</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 78% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery 76% Science Mastery: 58%</p> <p>AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged, Hispanics, English Language Learners</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 79% Math mastery: 79% Science Mastery: 50%</p> <p>AYP: Economically Disadvantaged, Hispanics and White subgroup did not make AYP.</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 76% Math mastery: 79% Science Mastery: 49% AYP: all groups, except Students with Disabilities</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 73% Math mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 58% AYP: all groups, except Students with Disabilities</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade: A Reading Mastery 74% Math Mastery 77% Science Mastery 47% AYP: groups, except Students with Disabilities</p>

## 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)
Reading	Susan Hall	ESOL Gifted Reading Elementary Ed.	26	3	<p>2011-2012: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math mastery: 66% Learning Gains-Reading: 77% Learning Gains-Math: 68% Writing Mastery 76% Science Mastery: 58% Gains-Reading Lowest 25%: 77% Gains Math Lowest 25%: 62%</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 78% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery 76% Science Mastery: 58%</p> <p>AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged, Hispanics, English Language Learners</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 80% Math mastery: 77% Writing Mastery 85% Science Mastery: 62%</p> <p>AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged and Hispanics</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 81% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery: 94% Science Mastery: 57% AYP: all groups, except economically disadvantaged</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 84% Math mastery: 79% Writing Mastery: 85% Science Mastery: 56% AYP: all groups</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade: A Reading Mastery 82% Math Mastery 79% Writing Mastery: 81 Science Mastery 53% AYP: All groups</p>

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Inform teachers of course offerings leading to certification	Assistant Principal	On-going	
2	2. Partner novice teachers with veteran teachers	Assistant Principal	On-going	
3	3. Reviewing resumes and credentials prior to the interview process	Assistant Principal	On-going	

## 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
14 Teachers	Provide professional development opportunities that will assist the teacher become highly qualified.

### 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
100	2.0%(2)	13.0%(13)	52.0%(52)	33.0%(33)	36.0%(36)	63.0%(63)	7.0%(7)	5.0%(5)	60.0%(60)

### Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

Title I, Part A

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

- School administrators
- SPED Chair
- School guidance counselors
- School psychologist

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

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention. It is anticipated that this will be a 3-year process of building the foundation and incorporating RtI into the culture of each school.

1. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team is vital, therefore, in building our team we have considered the following:

- Administrator will ensure commitment and allocate resources (Rosy Calvo, Principal; Susan Fisch, Assistant Principal, Lissett Robayna, Assistant principal; Carlos A. Salcedo, assistant Principal.)
- Coaches will share the common goal of improving instruction for all students (Susan Hall, Reading Coach).

2. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:

- Special education personnel, SPED Chair
- School guidance counselor and Trust Counselor
- School psychologist
- Member of advisory group and ESSAC Chair

3. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. RtI uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.

- The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.
- The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support.
- The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally.

There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data.

The following steps will be considered by the school's Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.

The Leadership Team will:

1. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing student needs.
2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
3. Hold regular team meetings
4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress
5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress

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?

1. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.
2. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
3. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

#### MTSS Implementation

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

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

1. Data Sources:

- Edusfot will be utilized to monitor reading, math, science and writing interim assessments.
- PMRN will be utilized to monitor FAIR and FLKRS.
- Student Performance Indicator will be utilized to access CELLA, FCAT 2.0 and SAT scores for reading, science, writing and mathematics.

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

- adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
- adjust the delivery of behavior management system
- adjust the allocation of school-based resources
- decisions regarding targeted professional development
- create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions

3. Managed data will include:

Academic

- FAIR assessment
- Interim assessments
- State/Local Math and Science assessments
- FCAT 2.0
- Student grades

- School site specific assessments

#### Behavior

- Student Case Management System
- Detentions
- Suspensions/expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
- Office referrals per day per month
- Team climate surveys
- Attendance
- Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:

1. Training for all administrators and teachers in the MTSS/RtI problem solving and data analysis process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

1. Providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures; and
2. Providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RtI organized through feeder patterns.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

- School administrators: Rosy Calvo, Principal; Susan Fisch, Assistant Principal, Lissett Robayna, Assistant Principal; Carlos Salcedo, Assistant Principal.
- Reading Coach: Susan Hall
- Language Arts Department Chair: Susan Hall
- Media Specialist; Ibis Mendoza

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

The principal selected for the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) based on a cross section of the faculty and administrative team that represents highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum. The Reading Coaches are members of the Reading Leadership Team. The team will meet monthly throughout the school year. The school-based literacy team may choose to meet more often. Additionally, the principal may expand the LLT by encouraging personnel from various sources such as Just Read, Florida! support staff to join.

The principal, as the instructional leader of the school, will supports literacy instruction and will promote membership on the Reading Leadership Team by:

- holding meeting at convenient times;
- providing adequate notice of meetings;
- providing time/coverage (if needed) to attend meetings;
- providing Master Plan Points (MPP) and team building activities for members commitment and participation; and
- offering professional growth opportunities such as educational retreats.

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

The principal will cultivate the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by being an active participant in all Literacy Leadership Team meetings and activities. The principal will provide necessary resources to the LLT. The reading coaches will serve as members of the Literacy Leadership Team. The coaches will share their expertise in reading instruction, and assessment and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. The reading coaches will work with the Literacy Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP. The reading coach will provide motivation and promote a spirit of collaboration within the Literacy Leadership Team to create a school-



wide focus on literacy and reading achievement by establishing model classrooms; conferencing with teachers and administrators; and providing professional development.

## 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.

N/A

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

The reading coach will conduct two trainings sessions on reading strategies to all teachers in grades 6-12. After the completion of these professional development sessions, teachers will be able to successfully implement reciprocal teaching, graphics organizers, think aloud techniques, re-reading, and use of visual definitions to increase vocabulary, Survey-Question, Read-Recite-Review (SQ3R), transactional reading and small group instruction based on ability level.

School administrators will monitor the implementation of reading strategies in all subject areas by monitoring lesson plans.

### \*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

## 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](#)

N/A

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.  Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 30 % of students achieved Level 3 proficiency.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30%(313)	31%(321)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2	<p>1a.1.The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test in Third Grade was Reporting Category 2- Reading Application, specifically in drawing conclusions and making inferences.</p> <p>In Fourth Grade, the deficiency was Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis Fiction and Non-fiction, including figurative and descriptive language.</p> <p>In Eighth Grade, the deficiency was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary, specifically in shades of meaning and in analyzing word structure.</p>	<p>1a.1. The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Reporting Category 2 Teachers will provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities including making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to the text to support answers, analyzing implied vs. stated main ideas, interacting with text, understanding text structures.</p> <p>To support Reporting Category 3 Teachers will provide specific instruction and activities that include reducing textual information to key points, using poetry to study figurative language, reading closely to identify key details through the use of graphic organizers and concept maps.</p> <p>To support Reporting Category 1 Teachers will provide a variety of instructional strategies that include utilizing vocabulary word maps, word walls and personal dictionaries. Instruction will be provided in shades of meaning, and context, and affix or root words.</p>	1a.1. The administration, and the Literacy Leadership Team will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies.	1a.1. Results of the bi-weekly assessment data reports will be reviewed to ensure progress is being made. Classroom walk-throughs by administration and reading coach will monitor adjustments to instruction as needed.	<p>1a.1.Formative: CAP Computer Assisted Program reports generated from FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, Reading Plus, Bi Weekly assessments.</p> <p>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment</p>

	Technology Programs such as Reading Plus and Success Maker will be utilized to support all Reporting Categories listed above.		
--	---	--	--

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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.  Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 38% of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 3 and 4 student proficiency by 1percentage points to 39%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (399)	39% (404)

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	In Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Grades, the deficiency was found in Reporting Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process, specifically interpreting, organizing, and synthesizing information.	2a.1. To support Reporting Category 4 Teachers will provide a variety of instructional activities that include building strong arguments to support answers, using reciprocal teaching and question-answer relationships, questioning the author, and summarizing.  Technology Programs such as Reading Plus and Success Maker will be	2a.1. The administration, and the Literacy Leadership Team will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies.	2a.1. Results of the bi-weekly assessment data reports will be reviewed to ensure progress is being made. Classroom walk-throughs by administration and reading coach will monitor adjustments to instruction as needed.	2a.1.Formativ: CAP Computer Assisted Program reports generated from FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, Reading Plus.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

	utilized to support all Reporting Categories listed above.		
--	--	--	--

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.  Reading Goal #2b:	5 (100%)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 100% of students score at or above level 7.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain 100% of students scoring at or above Level 7.	5 (100%)

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	In Grades 3-8, 100% of students scored at or above level 7 in the Florida Alternate Assessment	2b.1. students will continue to be guided to read fiction, nonfiction and informational text to identify the differences.	2b.1. The administration, and the Literacy Leadership Team will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies	2b.1. Results of the bi-weekly assessment data reports will be reviewed to ensure progress is being made. Classroom walk-throughs by administration and reading coach will monitor adjustments to instruction as needed.	2b.1. CAP Computer Assisted Program reports generated from FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, Compass Learning Odyssey, Reading Plus ,Bi Weekly assessments.

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3a:	75%(620)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 75% of students making learning gains.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase learning gains by 5 percentage points to 80%.	80%(662)

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. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test is Reporting Category 2- Reading Application, including making inferences and analyzing main idea.	3a.1. Teachers will provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities including making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to the text to support answers, analyzing implied vs. stated main ideas, interacting with text,	3a.1. The administration, and the Literacy Leadership Team will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies.	3a.1. Results of the bi-weekly assessment data reports will be reviewed to ensure progress is being made. Classroom walk-throughs by administration and reading coach will monitor adjustments to instruction as needed.	3a.1. Formative: CAP Computer Assisted Program reports generated from FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, Reading Plus .  Summative: Results from 2013

		understanding text structures.  Technology Programs such as Reading Plus and Success Maker will be utilized to support all Reporting Categories listed above.			FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2					
3					

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 100% of students made learning gains	To improve comprehension, teachers will introduce reading selections that are at a level that does not frustrate the student (high interest low readability).	The administration, and the Literacy Leadership Team will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies.	Classroom walk-through by administration and reading coach will monitor adjustments to instruction as needed	CAP Computer Assisted Program reports generated from FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, Compass Learning Odyssey, Reading Plus ,Bi Weekly assessments.

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 77% in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase learning gains by 5 percentage points to 82%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (162)	82%(172)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1					
2	4a.1. Overall, an area of concern is Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis Fiction and Non-fiction, including identifying key points and details.	4a.1. Teachers will provide specific instruction and activities that include reducing textual information to key points, using poetry to study figurative language, reading closely to identify key details through the use of graphic organizers and concept maps.  Technology Programs such as Reading Plus and Success Maker will be utilized to support all Reporting Categories listed above.	4a.1. The administration, and the Literacy Leadership Team will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies.	4a.1. Results of the bi-weekly assessment data reports will be reviewed to ensure progress is being made. Classroom walk-throughs by administration and reading coach will monitor adjustments to instruction as needed	4a.1. Formative: CAP Computer Assisted Program reports generated from FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, Reading Plus.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67	70	73	76	79	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 64% of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieve proficiency.  Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 67%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Hispanic: 64% (641)	Hispanic: 67% (667)

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	Hispanic: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 Vocabulary.	Provide a variety of Instructional strategies and activities that include vocabulary word maps, word walls, personal dictionaries and instruction in affix or root words, origin of words, as well as reading from a wide variety of texts.	Administrator	Review formative bi-weekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Review data reports from each FAIR assessment Computer generated reports from FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus & Ticket to Read	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District Interim Data reports FAIR data  Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 44% of students in the ELL subgroup achieve proficiency.  Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 49%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
ELL: 44%(60)	ELL 49%(64)

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: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 Vocabulary	Provide a variety of Instructional strategies and activities that include vocabulary word maps, word walls, personal dictionaries and instruction in affix or root words, origin of words, as well as reading from a wide variety of texts.	Administrators	Review formative bi-weekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. Review data reports from each FAIR assessment	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District Interim Data reports FAIR data Student authentic work Computer generated reports from FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus & Ticket to Read Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 64% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieve proficiency.  Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 68%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Economically Disadvantaged: 64%(327)	Economically Disadvantaged: 68%(347)

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	Economically Disadvantaged: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 Vocabulary.	Provide a variety of Instructional strategies and activities that include vocabulary word maps, word walls, personal dictionaries and instruction in affix or root words, origin of words, as well as reading from a wide variety of texts.	Administrator	Review formative bi-weekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. Review data reports from each FAIR assessment.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District Interim Data reports FAIR data Student authentic work Computer generated reports from FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus & Ticket to Read Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Informational Text & Research Process	Grades 3-8	Reading Coach.	Reading /LanguageArts Teachers in grades 3-8	ProfessionalDevelopmentdays: 11/6/12, 2/1/2013	Student work folders, classroom walk- through	Literacy Leadership Team and, Administration

Reading Budget:

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



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

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:		The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Listening and Speaking Test indicate that 56% are proficient in Listening and Speaking skills.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
56 % (93)					
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	After analyzing data from the state CELLA reports, 56% percent of ELL students are proficient in Listening/Speaking skills. Students require additional assistance with small groups for reinforcement and enrichment.	1.1. The teacher will implement small-group instruction in order to provide opportunities to students who need assistance with common needs, reinforcement and enrichment	1.1. Administrators	1.1. Administrators will monitor student work folders during bi-weekly classroom walk-throughs.	1.1. CELLA 2012-2013

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Reading Test indicate that 34% are proficient in Listening and Speaking skills.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

34% (55)

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	After analyzing data from the state CELLA reports, 34 percent of ELL students are proficient in Reading. Students require visual and graphic organizers to support comprehension	2.1. The teacher will implement visual displays (i.e., graphs, charts, photos) in the lessons and assignments to support the oral or written message. Visual/graphic organizers will be used before presenting a reading passage. The provision of additional contextual information in the form of a visual should make the comprehension task easier	2.1. Administrators	2.1. Administrators will monitor student work folders during bi-weekly classroom walk-throughs.	2.1. CELLA 2012-2013

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Test indicate that 36% are proficient in writing skills.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

36% (60)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. After analyzing data from the state CELLA reports, 36 percent of ELL students are proficient in Writing. Students require graphic organizers to fill-in with related ideas and information	2.1. Teachers will use graphic organizer to fill in with related ideas and information. This will give the student another way to see the information.	2.1. Administrators	2.1. Administrators will monitor student work folders during bi-weekly classroom walk-throughs.	2.1.CELLA 2012-2013

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$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.  Mathematics Goal # 1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 29% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 proficiency by 4 percentage points to 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (297)	33% (334)

### 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. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in Grades 3 and 4 was Reporting Category 3- Geometry and Measurement. Specifically involving linear measurement and problems using two- and three- dimensional figures.	1a.1. Provide students with models, both virtual and tangible, to enable them to visualize, draw, and explore measurement and geometric concepts.  Incorporate real-world problems and concrete experiences to increase understanding.  Develop guidelines for student to use writing and journaling to identify learned concepts and to eliminate misconceptions.	1a.1.Administrators ,  Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	1a.1.Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of virtual manipulatives	1a.1. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	1a.2. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in Grade 5 was Reporting Category 2- Expressions, Equations, and Statistics, including solving real world problems involving line graphs and interpreting data.	1a.2. Provide additional practice in data analysis and graphing, both with and without technology, that involve real world applications	1a.2.Administrators ,  Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	1a.2. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of technology.	1a.2. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 100% of students score at or above level 4.	1b.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to learn concepts using manipulatives visuals, number lines and assistive technology.	1b.1 Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	1b.1. Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of virtual manipulatives	1b.1. Student authentic work

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 35% of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 4 and 5 proficiency by 1 percentage points to 35%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (354)	36% (364)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in Grades 3, 4, and 5, was Reporting Category 3- Geometry and Measurement, including solving real world problems using customary and metric measurements.	2a.1. Provide students with opportunities to explore real-world problems and develop students' understanding of Measurement and Conversions through virtual manipulatives.  Incorporate the use of computer based exploration and investigation (such as FCAT Explorer, CompassLearning, and Successmaker) to ensure differentiated instruction and independent practice targeted to each students' needs.	2a.1. Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	2a.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of virtual manipulatives	2a.1. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment  CompassLearning, SuccessMaker, and/or FCAT Explorer reports

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 40% of students score at or above level 7.	2b.1 Teachers will review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement	2b.1 Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	2b.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	2b.1. Student authentic work

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 68% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percent to 73%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (558)	73% (599)

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. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in Grades 3, 4, and 5, was Reporting Category 3- Geometry and Measurement, including identifying geometric figures and solving real world problems involving two- and three-dimensional figures.	3a.1. Develop common math terminology embedded in lessons by the teachers and student. Common terminology to be used by all grade levels in increasing levels of complexity.  Infuse literature in mathematics to provide the necessary meaning for students to successfully grasp new concepts and allows students to make connections with real-world situations.  Include journal writing , reflecting about math , and interactive "World Walls".	3a.1. Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	3a.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy.	3a.1. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	
--	--

Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3b.1. The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 100% of students made learning gains	3b.1. Students will be introduced to guided discussion to engage students in real life math problems.	3b.1.Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	3b.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	3b.1. Student authentic work

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 62 % of students in the Lowest Quartile made learning gains.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions and remediation opportunities in order increase 5 percentage points to 67%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62%(133)	67%(143)

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. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in Grades 3, 4, and 5, was Reporting Category 3- Geometry and Measurement, including solving problems involving customary and metric measurements.	4a.1. Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction, and multiplication and division of whole numbers, as they apply to measurement and geometric concepts.	4a.1.Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI	4a.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Review CompassLearning and/or FCAT Explorer reports to monitor student progress .  Student authentic work.	4a.1.. Formative: District interim data reports.  Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66	69	72	75	78	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 61% of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 64% by providing appropriate interventions and remediation.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61%	64%

**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 Hispanic subgroup's area of lowest performance, as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, was in the Reporting Category 3, of Geometry and Measurement.	Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the composing and decomposing of; describing, analyzing, comparing, and building, drawing, and analyzing models that develop measurement concepts and skills through experiences in analyzing attributes and properties of two- and three-dimensional shapes/objects.	administrator	Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. Review CompassLearning and/or FCAT Explorer reports to monitor student progress .  Student authentic work.	Formative: District interim data reports.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicates that 46% of students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency.  Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 51%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46%	51%

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The English Language Learner subgroup's lowest area of	Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the	Administrators	Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is	Formative: District interim data reports.



1	performance, as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, was in the Reporting Category, Geometry and Measurement.	composing and decomposing of; describing, analyzing, comparing, and classifying; and building, drawing, and analyzing models that develop measurement concepts and skills through experiences in analyzing attributes and properties of two- and three-dimensional shapes/objects.	being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Review CompassLearning and/or FCAT Explorer reports to monitor student progress .  Student authentic work.	Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
---	---	--	--	--

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 31% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 6 percentage points to 37% by providing appropriate interventions and remediation.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31%	37%

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	Economically Disadvantaged: On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup's proficiency is 33%  Our focus will be to provide this subgroup increased opportunities for individual and cooperative learning while making real world connections.	Students will be provided with increased opportunities for interactive instructions and individual practice, tailored to their individual needs, using CompassLearning, and FCAT Explorer.  Classroom instruction will adhere strictly to the NGSS and newly developed pacing guides at each grade level, correlated very tightly with the newly adopted textbooks. Differentiated instruction will include small group hands on activities as well as individualized independent practice as needed.	Administrator	Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Review CompassLearning and/or FCAT Explorer reports to monitor student progress.	Formative: District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment  CompassLearning and/or FCAT Explorer reports

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 49% of students in the ED subgroup achieved proficiency.  Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 53%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

49%		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	The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup's lowest performing area, as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, was in the Reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement.	Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the composing and decomposing of; describing, analyzing, comparing, and classifying; and building, drawing, and analyzing models that develop measurement concepts and skills through experiences in analyzing attributes and properties of two- and three-dimensional shapes/objects. Through the implementation of the Holt-McDougal series.	Administrator	Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Review CompassLearning and/or FCAT Explorer reports to monitor student progress .  Student Authentic Work	Formative: District interim data reports.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment  CompassLearning and/or FCAT Explorer reports

*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.  Mathematics Goal # 1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 29% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 proficiency by 4 percentage points to 33%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (297)	33% (334)

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. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in Grade 6 was Reporting Category 1- Fractions, Ratios, Proportional Relationships, and Statistics, specifically in solving real world problems.	1a.1. Increase opportunities for students to solve problems involving Fractions, Ratios, and Proportions in a real world context.  Provide additional practice in data analysis and graphing, both with and without technology, that involve real world	1a.1. Administrators, Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	1a.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy.	1a.1. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

		applications			
2	1a.2. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in Grades 7 and 8 was Reporting Category 3- Geometry and Measurement, including solving real world problems involving similarity, volume, and surface area.	1a.2. Provide students with models, both virtual and tangible, to enable them to visualize, draw, and explore measurement and geometric concepts.  Incorporate real-world problems and concrete experiences to increase understanding.  Develop guidelines for student to use writing and journaling to identify learned concepts and to eliminate misconceptions.	1a.2. Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	1a.2. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of virtual manipulatives.	1a.2.. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1. The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 100% of students score at or above level 4.	1b.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to learn concepts using manipulatives visuals, number lines and assistive technology.	1b.1.Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads	1b.1. Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of virtual manipulatives	1b.1. Student authentic work

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 35% of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 4 and 5 proficiency by 1 percentage points to 36%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (354)	36% (364)

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	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in Grades 6, 7, and 8 was Reporting Category 3- Geometry and Measurement, including solving real world problems involving unit conversions.	2a.1. Provide students with opportunities to explore real-world problems and develop students' understanding of Measurement and Conversions through virtual manipulatives.  Incorporate the use of computer based exploration and investigation (such as FCAT Explorer, CompassLearning, and SuccessMaker) to ensure differentiated instruction and independent practice targeted to each students' needs.	2a.1.Administrators ,  Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	2a.1.Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of virtual manipulatives	2a.1.Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment  CompassLearning, SuccessMaker, and/or FCAT Explorer reports
---	--	--	---	---	--

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 40% of students score at or above level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1. The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 40% of students score at or above level 7	2b.1. Teachers will Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement	2b.1. Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads	2b.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	2b.1. Student authentic work.

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 68% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percent to 73%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%(558)	73% (599)

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	3a.1. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in Grades 6, 7, and 8 was Reporting Category 3- Geometry and Measurement, including solving real world problems involving geometric figures and customary and metric measurements.	3a.1. Develop common math terminology embedded in lessons by the teachers and student. Common terminology to be used by all grade levels in increasing levels of complexity.  Infuse literature in mathematics to provide the necessary meaning for students to successfully grasp new concepts and allows students to make connections with real-world situations.  Include journal writing , reflecting about math, and interactive "World Walls".	3a.1. Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	3a.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy.	3a.1. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 100% of students made learning gains  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain 100% of students making learning gains
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3b.1. The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 100% of students made learning gains	3b.1. Students will introduce guided discussion to engage students in real life math problems.	3b.1. Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads	3b.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	3b.1. Student authentic work

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 62% of students in the Lowest Quartile made learning gains.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions and remediation opportunities in order increase 5 percentage points to 67%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (133)	67% (143)

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. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in Grades 6, 7, and 8 was Reporting Category 3- Geometry and Measurement. Specifically in solving problems involving perimeter, area, volume, and surface area.	4a.1. Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction, and multiplication and division of whole numbers, as they apply to measurement and geometric concepts.	4a.1. Administrators, Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	4a.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Review Compass Learning and/or FCAT Explorer reports to monitor student progress.  Student authentic work.	4a.1 Formative: District interim data reports.  Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66	69	72	75	78	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 44 % of English Language Learners are proficient.
--	--

Mathematics Goal #5C:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions and remediation opportunities in order increase 11 percentage points to 55%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%(26)	55% (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	5c.1. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for ELL students in Grades 6, 7, and 8 was Reporting Category 3- Geometry and Measurement, including solving real world problems involving geometric figures and customary and metric measurements.	5c.1. Develop common math terminology embedded in lessons by the teachers and student. Common terminology to be used by all grade levels in increasing levels of complexity.  Infuse literature in mathematics to provide the necessary meaning for students to successfully grasp new concepts and allows students to make connections with real-world situations.  Include journal writing, reflecting about math, and interactive "World Walls".	5c.1. Administrators, Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	5c.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy.	5c.1. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 33 % of Students with Disabilities are proficient.
Mathematics Goal #5D:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions and remediation opportunities in order increase 10 percentage points to 43%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (28)	43% (37)

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	5D.1. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for SWD students in Grades 6, 7, and 8 was Reporting Category 3- Geometry	5D.1. Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division facts; fluency with multi-digit addition	5D.1 Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	5D.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Review CompassLearning and/or FCAT Explorer	5D.1 Formative: District interim data reports.  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics

and Measurement. Specifically in solving problems involving perimeter, area, volume, and surface area.	and subtraction; and multiplication and division of whole numbers, as they apply to measurement and geometric concepts.	reports to monitor student progress.  Student authentic work.	Assessment
--	---	---	------------

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #1:	Algebra Goal #1: The results of the 2011-2012 Algebra 1 EOC Test indicate that 40 % of students achieved proficiency (Level 3).  Our goal is to maintain 40% of students scoring Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (33)	40% (30)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The area of greatest difficulty on the Algebra 1 EOC 2012 was the Reporting Category involving Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete	1.1. Teachers will provide grade-level appropriate opportunities for identifying, duplicating, describing, extending and applying number patterns, and use number patterns to help students extend their knowledge	1.1. Administrators , Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	1.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback	1.1. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative:



Mathematics, including number properties, patterns, and operations.	of properties of numbers and operations; include nonnumeric growing and repeating patterns.	on effectiveness of strategy.	Results from 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Mathematics Assessment
---	---	-------------------------------	--

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #2:	Algebra Goal #2: The results of the 2011-2012 Algebra 1 EOC Test indicate that 59% of students achieved proficiency Levels 4 and 5  Our goal is to maintain 59% scoring Levels 4-5
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (49)	59% (49)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The results of the 11-12 Algebra 1 EOC Test indicate that an area of difficulty was the Reporting Category of Functions, Linear Equations, and Inequalities. Students would benefit from more learning experiences involving functional relationships.	2.1. Focus on building a foundation for later understanding of functional relationships by providing students with learning experiences that require them to create rules that describe relationships and to describe relationships in context.	2.1. Administrators, Grade Level and/or Department Heads, and MTSS/RtI.	2.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy.	2.1. Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District interim data reports. Student authentic work.  Summative: Results from 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Mathematics Assessment

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # Our Goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%					
3A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	99	99	99	99	99	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	
--	--

Algebra Goal #3E:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.		Geometry Goal #1: The results of the 2011-2012 Geometry EOC Test indicate that 31 % of students scored in the Middle Third			
Geometry Goal #1:		Our goal is to maintain 31% scoring in the Middle Third			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
31% (13)		31% (13)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. According to the results of the 2012 Geometry EOC test, the area of greatest difficulty was the Reporting Category of Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics	1.1. Provide students with practice in using coordinate geometry to find slopes, parallel lines, perpendicular lines, and equations of lines	1.1. Department chair and administrator, and MTSS/RtI.	1.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy.	1.1 Formative: District Interim Assessments  Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	The results of the 2011-2012 Geometry EOC Test indicate that 67 % of students scored in the Upper Third
Geometry Goal #2:	Our goal is to maintain 59% scoring in the Upper Third

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (28)	67% (28)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. According to the results of the 2012 Geometry EOC test, the area of greatest difficulty was the Reporting Category of Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics	2.1. Provide students with practice in using coordinate geometry to find slopes, parallel lines, perpendicular lines, and equations of lines	2.1. Department chair and administrator, and MTSS/RtI.	2.1. Review of formative and in-class assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.  Conduct Math Department meetings to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy.	2.1. Formative: District Interim Assessments  Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC Assessment

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66	69	72	75	

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

*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
Implementing Rigor	All Math Teachers	Department Chair	Math Teachers	October 26, 2012	Classroom observations and lesson plans	Administrators

Mathematics Budget:

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

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.

The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 34% of 5th and 8th grade students achieved proficiency (FCAT 2.0 Level 3).

Science Goal #1a:	Our goal is to increase 4 percentage points to 38 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34%(116)	38% (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	The area of difficulty on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 was Reporting Area Earth and Space Science, including scientific thinking and data analysis.	1a.1. Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental designs. Technology programs such Gizmos and Virtual Labs will be utilized to assist with this strategy	1a.1. School Administrators	1a.1. Administrators will monitor Gizmo reports bi-weekly	1a.1. Formative assessments, District Interim assessments, teacher assessments and lab reports. FCAT Explorer reports  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1. The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 66% of students score at or above level 4.	1b.1. Students will be given the opportunity to use hands on activities so they can manipulate and explore actions and outcomes.	1b.1. Administrators and department chair.	1b.1. Administrators will monitor activities during bi-weekly walk-throughs.	1b.1. Student Authentic Work

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.  Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 Science Test indicate that 16% of students scored at or above FCAT 2.0 Levels 4 and 5  Our goal is to increase 1 percentage point to 17 %
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
16% (53)		17% (58)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1. The area of difficulty on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 was Reporting Area on Physical Science, including energy, force, and motion.	2a.1. Provide teacher-demonstrated as well as student-centered laboratory activities that apply, analyze, and explain concepts related to matter, energy, force, and motion through the use of the newly adopted pacing guides	2a.1. Administration and Science Chair	2a.1. Review lesson plans and Interactive Science Notebooks  Student Authentic Work  Bi-weekly Classroom Walk-through by administrators	2a.1. Formative assessments, teacher assessments and attendance records.  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.  Science Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1. The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 33% of students score at or above level 7	2b.1. Provide students with continuous review/practice when learning science concepts.	2.1. Administration and Science Chair	2b.1. Review lesson plans and Interactive Science Notebooks  Student Authentic Work  Bi-weekly Classroom Walk-through by administrators	b.1. Student authentic work

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
Physical Science	6-8	District	Teachers grades 7-8	September 26, 2012	Lesson plans, PD Follow up	Science Chairperson
New Pacing Guides	5-8	District	Teachers grades 5-8	August 20, 2012	Benchmark Analysis, Lesson Plans, PD Follow up	Science Chairperson

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$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.  Writing Goal #1a:	#1a:  The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 writing Test indicate that 87% of students achieved Levels 3-6.  Our goal for the 2012 -2013 school year is to increase 1 percentage to 88%			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
87%(272)	88%(276)			
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	1a.1. Although the percentage of students earning a prompt score greater than 3 increased in grades 4, an area of deficiency was noted on area of expository essays involving procedures, instructions, graphs and tables.	1a.1. Students will have the opportunity to write in a variety of informational/ expository forms (e.g., rules, summaries, procedures, recipes, notes/messages, labels, instructions, graphs/tables, experiments, rubrics);	1a.1. Administrators and LLT	1a.1 Reading Coach will monitor samples of student writing process bi-weekly.	1a.1. Formative: Student scores on monthly writing assessments.  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment
2	1a.1. Although the percentage of students earning a prompt score greater than 3 increased in grades 8, an area of deficiency was noted on the area of persuasive essays involving procedures and instructions.	Students will have the opportunity to write in a variety of informational/ persuasive forms	Administrators and LLT	Reading Coach will monitor samples of student writing process bi-weekly.	.Formative: Student scores on monthly writing assessments.  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
Writing Across the Curriculum	Elementary & Middle School	Reading Coach	School-wide PD for all teachers and paraprofessionals	September 6, 2012	Language Arts Department Meetings for both elementary and middle	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$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.		Civics EOC will be administered in 2013 with expected performance of at least 10%. Scores on the 2012 District Baseline Assessment show overall performance is 0%.			
Civics Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0% (0)		10% (15)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Students will be provided additional reinforcement in the structure and function of government in the United States as established in the Constitution, including the three branches of government established in Articles I, II, and III with corresponding powers.	1.1. Utilize District-published lesson plans with assessments aligned to End of Course Exam Benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content. Specifically involving the three branches of government as established in Articles I, II, and III of the Constitution.	1.1. School Administrator	1.1. Administrators will monitor reports of the monthly school assessments administered and scored to track progress on tested benchmarks.	1.1. Formative: Monthly Assessments Chapter tests and Civics Interim Assessments.  Summative: 2013 Civics EOC
	1.1 Students will be	1.1. Utilize District-	1.1. School	1.1. Administrators will	1.1. Formative:

2	provided additional reinforcement in the structure and function of government in the United States as established in the Constitution, including the three branches of government established in Articles I, II, and III with corresponding powers.	published lesson plans with assessments aligned to End of Course Exam Benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content. Specifically involving the three branches of government as established in Articles I, II, and III of the Constitution.	Administrator	monitor reports of the monthly school assessments administered and scored to track progress on tested benchmarks.	Monthly Assessments Chapter tests and Civics Interim Assessments.  Summative: 2013 Civics EOC
---	---	--	---------------	---	---

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.  Civics Goal #2:	Civics EOC will be administered in 2013 with expected performance of at least 10%. Scores on the 2012 District Baseline Assessment show overall performance is 0%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(0)	10% (15)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Students will be provided additional opportunities to discuss and develop well-reasoned positions on social, political, and economic issues.	Provide students with opportunities to discuss the values, complexities, and dilemmas involved in social, political, and economic issues; assist students in developing well-reasoned positions on issues.	School Administrator	Administrators will monitor reports on progress made toward tested benchmarks during bi-weekly walk-throughs.	Formative: Monthly Assessments Chapter tests and Civics Interim Assessments.  Summative: 2013 Civics EOC .

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Pacing Guides	7th Grade	District	Civics Teachers	September 26, 2012	Monitor lesson plans	School administrator
Social Studies New Instructional Materials	7th grade	District	Civics Teachers	August 13, 2013	Monitor Lesson Plans	School Administrator

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	Our goal for this year is to maintain attendance at 97.05% – by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated.  Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) by 10 students, and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 12 students.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
97.05% (1485)	97.05% (1485)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
266	253
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
250	238

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The attendance rate did not change when comparing the 2011 and 2012 attendance data.	1.1. The school will identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non-attendance to the school counselor, and make every possible effort to schedule parent conferences.	Assistant Principal in charge of attendance	1.1. Weekly review of attendance records and parent conferences.	1.1. Parent conferences records and attendance records.
2	Excessive tardiness may be attributed to the staggered K-8 bell schedule and parents of identified students will be contacted to reinforce timeliness.	The school will identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern Tardiness to the school counselor, and make every possible effort to schedule parent conferences.	Assistant Principal in charge of attendance	Weekly review of attendance records and parent conferences	Parent conferences records and attendance 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
Truancy Prevention to better assist students and families that are developing patterns of non-attendance.	K-5 Attendance	Staff from Attendance Services	Counselor and attendance clerks	August, 2012 November, 2012 February, 2013	Assistant principal will monitor the implementation of strategies developed during professional development sessions.	Assistant Principal and Counselors
School representatives will attend professional development sessions offered by the Alliance for a Healthier	K-8	Staff from Alliance for a Healthier Generation	Trust Counselor and teachers	August 29, 2012 November 14, 2012 February 13, 2013	Assistant principal will monitor the implementation of strategies developed during professional development sessions	Assistant Principal and Counselors

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
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:		Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10%			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
35		32			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
30		27			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
30		35			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
30		27			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The total number of indoor and outdoor suspensions increased to 103 during the 2011-2012 school year, specifically involving	1.1. Utilize the Code of Student Conduct by providing incentives for compliance through the use of Elementary and Secondary-SPOT	1.1. Assistant Principals	1.1. Monitor Spot Success reports and COGNOS report on students suspensions	1.1. Participation Log for students who are recognized for complying with the Code of

repeat offenders	Success Recognition program to decrease recidivism rate.		Student Conduct.
------------------	--	--	------------------

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
The Code of Students Conduct	K-8	Administrator	School-Wide	August 22-23, 2012	Visit classrooms to monitor teachers' enforcement of the Code of Student Conduct	Administrators

Suspension Budget:

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

Parent Involvement Goal #1:

\*Please refer to the percentage of parents who

During the 2011-2012 school year, Miami lakes K-8 Center shows 90% of parents who participated on school activities.



<i>participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Our goal for the 2012-2013 is to maintain the percentage of parents participating in school activities at 90%
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
90% (1364)	90% (1364)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increase participation in school-wide activities by scheduling times more convenient for working parents	Offer various school sponsored activities on weekends, evenings and early mornings	Assistant Principal	Administrator will review the sign-in sheets on a monthly basis to determine the number of parents attending school-wide activities.	Sign-in sheets

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Volunteer Training	All Grades	Assistant Principal	Parents (School-Wide)	November 6, 2012	Sign-in Sheets	Assistant Principal

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
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
			<b>Grand Total: \$1,000.00</b>

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		Miami Lakes has the following STEM practices on campus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SECME Club.</li> <li>• Advanced science and math classes.</li> <li>• Honor classes for high school credits in math, science, and foreign languages.</li> <li>• All students in grades 5-8 participate in the District's Science Fair.</li> </ul> The plan for Miami Lakes K-8 is to increase the number of meetings related to STEM from 1 to 2 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	The number of articulation meetings with the feeder pattern is limited to one meeting a year.	The school will plan articulation meetings with the feeder pattern schools to align STEM programs	Administration and counselors.	Plan Articulation meetings during planning or early release days.	The number of courses offered and students enrolled in STEM courses

### 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
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:			All 8th Grade students will be introduced to Career Technical Education programs in neighboring high schools.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need additional information of Career Technical Education Programs at the high school level.	Students will receive information on CTE programs by providing them with fieldtrips, flyers, and school meetings.	Administrator	Counselors will ensure that students are provided with the necessary information about CTE Programs in neighboring high schools	Fieldtrip rosters, agendas, flyers, and Connect Ed messages

## 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
CTE Information	8th Grade	Counselor	All 8th grade homeroom teachers	November 6, 2012	Agendas and sign-in sheets	Administrator

## 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				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
Parent Involvement				\$1,000.00
STEM				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
STEM				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
STEM				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Civics				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
STEM				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$1,000.00

## School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/15/2012)

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
EESAC funds will be utilized to fund tutoring classes before and after school hours.	\$6,865.00

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

The EESAC and stakeholders will meet monthly in order to monitor the successful implementation of the school improvement plan. In Addition, the Council provides specific, but is not limited to, support as follows:

Budget:

EESAC members will attend District Professional Development to stay abreast of current EESAC requirements.

Training:

The EESAC will review instructional materials and offer suggested activities to enhance instruction.

Instructional Materials:

The EESAC will view technology programs and equipment and offer suggested activities to enhance instruction.

# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District MIAMI LAKES K-8 CENTER 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	79%	76%	58%	291	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	66%	73%			139	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	64% (YES)	68% (YES)			132	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					562	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District MIAMI LAKES K-8 CENTER 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	80%	77%	85%	62%	304	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	71%	69%			140	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	63% (YES)	62% (YES)			125	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					569	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested