FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: BRIDGEPOINT ACADEMY INTERAMERICAN

District Name: Dade

Principal: Maria Cedeno/Yeinier Rodriguez-Padron

SAC Chair: Vanessa Latorre

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/21/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Maria D. Cedeno	Bachelor of Arts in Family and Consumer Science Master's in Social Science Education Educational Leadership Certified Program (36 hrs. beyond Master's)	1	24	Year: '12 '11 '10 '9 School Grades: A A A AMO: N N N High Standards-Reading 71 71 67 High Standards-Math 70 73 74 Learning Gains-Reading 69 69 61 Learning Gains-Math 73 72 73 Gains-Reading- low 25% 80 73 70 Gains-Math-low 25% 69 67 68

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	Vanessa Latorre	Endorsement	1	1	

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. Incentives to retain highly qualified teachers would be to provide grants that will allow for teachers to further their education.	Administrator	On-going	
2	2. Part of the hiring strategy is to hire highly qualified teachers.	Administrator	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
4	ESOL Waivers-planning with someone else.

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
11	27.3%(3)	63.6%(7)	9.1%(1)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	63.6%(7)	9.1%(1)	0.0%(0)	63.6%(7)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Vanessa Latorre	Dania Rivas	Mentors will support the creation of effective classroom strategies to enhance the delivery of classroom instruction.	Shared planning after school 3-5 days.
		Mentors will support the creation of effective	

Vanessa Latorre	Nicolle Meirin	classroom strategies to enhance the delivery of classroom instruction.	Shared planning after school 3-5 days.
Vanessa Latorre	Arlhin Cartone	Mentors will support the creation of effective classroom strategies to enhance the delivery of classroom instruction.	Shared planning after school 3-5 days.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS Leadership Team will be made up of Principal, administrator, and two classroom teachers, (ESE teacher and General ed teacher).

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?

MTSS team will meet weekly to discuss student progress and monitor Problem-Solving Worksheets. Team will distribute samples of Problem-Solving Worksheets to all teachers during the first month of school. Team will also monitor district trainings for MTSS.

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?

Team will proofread and help revise SIP before submission to State. RtI process will be considered when writing academic goals in the various content areas.

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.

Data sources will include EduSoft for monitoring Baseline and Interim Assessments, Teacher gradebooks, as well as data from FAIR, FLKRS and the Voyager Intervention Program. Teachers will use Progress Monitoring forms on district website for behavior.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff will be trained on MTSS during regular faculty meetings the first month of school. The MTSS team will conduct the trainings which will include use of PMRN, Problem-Solving Worksheets and our data sources described above.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS is an important part of the school culture and will be monitored by the Principal throughout the year to ensure that teachers are following up on the appropriate intervention and instructional strategies.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will be made up of Maria Cedeno, Principal; Vanessa Latorre, administrator, and two classroom teachers, Lourdes Nunez and Karol Cardenas.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will be made up of participating members of the school's community. It includes the principal, the curriculum specialist, the special education specialist, grade level team leaders, special areas teachers, media specialist, student and community representatives. These members meet monthly to address the best way to encourage a community of literacy to develop. Items included on meeting agendas include, but are not limited to ensuring the 90 minute daily reading instruction using the CRRP, whole group initial instruction using the CRRP/Houghton Mifflin, explicit instruction in phonics/spelling/vocabulary, differentiated instruction/immediate intensive intervention usng appropriate materials, guided reading using leveled text and/or skills based lessons. Also, under review will be whether literacy centers are in use , that groups are fluid and using assessment results, classroom libraries being used effectively, theme related CRRP assessment (unit test) are being used to monitor student learning, instructions for all levels of learners including LEP, and that lesson plans reflect instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

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

"Reading Across the Curriculum"
We will have to organize our team and acquire the necessary training for a successful team. Our reading coach will attend the monthly coaches' meetings; return to the school and train the staff. The principal will visit, the classrooms to ensure all teachers are using differentiated instruction and that level I and II students are being pulled out for intensive small group reading.
Another major initiative of the LLT will be "Read To Me!," a program for family literacy, encouraging families to read together through monthly literacy activities. The literacy activities will require that parents and students attend a family activity night. At the family nights, we will take the opportunity to encourage reading in the family circle. We will be using Reading Strategies to support our initiative.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessments indicate that 25% of students achieved proficiency. As a new school, our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is based on district averages to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 5 percentage points to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (22)	30% (26)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As a new school we are using district averages. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test is Reading Category 2: Reading Application	Emphasize Reading Strategies of determining cause/effect, author's purpose, main idea, and text features using graphic organizers, one-sentence summaries, cause/effect charts on a daily basis Teachers will use available test-prep materials, tutoring, CRISS strategies, and classroom textbooks to teach and assess this reporting category. Interventions will take place daily during reading blocks.	Reading Coach and LLT	Following the FCIM model, Reading Coach, LLT and classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category and to adjust instruction when needed.	Formative: District Baseline, Fall, winter Interim assessments, teacher-generated classroom assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	As a new school we are using district averages. The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessments indicate that 28% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 2 percentage points to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (24)	30% (26)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test is Reading Category 2: Reading Application	Emphasize Reading Strategies of determining cause/effect, author's purpose, main idea, and text features using graphic organizers, one-sentence summaries, cause/effect charts on a daily basis Special attention will be given to provide differentiated instruction and leveled texts appropriate for students level.	Reading Coach and LLT	Following the FCIM model, Reading Coach, LLT an classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category and to adjust instruction when needed.	Formative: District Baseline, Fall, winter Interim assessments, teacher-generated classroom assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	As a new school we are using district averages. The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessments indicate that 68% of students made learning gains Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving gains by 2 percentage points to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (59)	73% (63)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test is Reading Category 2: Reading Application	Emphasize Reading Strategies of determining cause/effect, author's purpose, main idea, and text features using graphic organizers, one-sentence summaries, cause/effect charts on a daily basis Teachers will use available test-prep materials, tutoring, Voyager, CRISS strategies, and classroom textbooks to teach and assess this reporting category. Interventions are conducted during reading block each day.	Reading Coach and LLT	Following the FCIM model, Reading Coach, LLT an classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category	Formative: District Baseline, Fall, winter Interim assessments, teacher-generated classroom assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	As a new school we are using district averages.The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessments indicate that 70% of students made learning gains Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving gains by 5 percentage points to 75%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (61)	75% (65)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test is Reading Category 2: Reading Application	Emphasize Reading Strategies of determining cause/effect, author's purpose, main idea, and text features using graphic organizers, one-sentence summaries, cause/effect charts on a daily basis Teachers will use available test-prep materials, tutoring, CRISS strategies, and classroom textbooks to teach and assess this reporting category. Students will receive interventions through Voyager as determined by FAIR results. Voyager Interventions are conducted during reading block each day.	Reading Coach and LLT	Following the FCIM model, Reading Coach, LLT an classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category	Formative: District Baseline, Fall, winter Interim assessments, teacher-generated classroom assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 5A : As a new school this year our goal from 2011-2017 is based on District data, 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

	58%	62%	66%	69%	73%	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

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 Common Core Standards	2-5	Reading Coach	2nd-5th grade teachers	Pre-school	Monitoring by LLT will occur year-long during PLCs	Principal/LLT
Lessons from Common Core FY12	K-1	Reading Coach	K-1 Teachers	Pre-school	Year-long monitoring by LLT during PLCs	Principal/LLT

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT Practice Book			$250.00
			Subtotal: $250.00
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: $250.00

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase percentage of students proficient in listening/speaking by 1percentage point.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
45%	

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	An anticipated barrier for the Listening/ Speaking portion of the CELLA is that students may not fully answer the asked question and that parents do not speak English, and therefore cannot assist the students.	Modeling, teacher led groups, total physical response, use of illustrations, use of simple direct language.	Administration/LLT	1. Walk-through 2.Monitor Data 3. Data Chats with students 4.Mini-assessments	On-going formative assessments, FAIR, graded assessments SUMMATIVE:2013 CELLA

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase percentage of students proficient in reading by 1percentage point.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:
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	An anticipated barrier in the reading portion of the test is that students with low reading skills and familiarity with content of the passage.	Activating prior knowledge, K-W-L, Read Alouds, Reader's theater, cooperative learning, interactive word walls, word banks.	Administration/LLT	1. Walk-through 2.Monitor Data 3. Data Chats with students 4.Mini-assessments	On-going formative assessments, FAIR, graded assessments. SUMMATIVE:2013 CELLA

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase percentage of students proficient in writing by 1 percentage point.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
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	We anticipate student hesitation due to their inexperience in writing and the fact that they lack vocabulary.	Graphic organizers, illustrating and labeling, personal journals, writing prompts, summarizing.	Administration, LLT	1. Walk-through 2.Monitor Data 3. Data Chats with students 4.Mini-assessments	On-going formative assessments, FAIR, graded assessments. SUMMATIVE:2013 CELLA

CELLA Budget:

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	As a new school we are using district averages.The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments indicate that 28% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at level 3 by 4 percentage points to 32%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28%	32%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was the Reporting Category 1: Number: Operations and Problems Limited access to hands-on activities in order to break down multi-step problems.	Teachers will provide contexts for mathematical exploration and development of student understanding of mathematical concepts, through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice.	Administration	On a monthly basis, review formative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. . Review teacher lessons plans to ensure hands-on activities are being implemented in the classroom.	Formative: Pre/Post Evaluative Class Assessments and Baseline Data Assessments. Benchmark assessment tests. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	As a new school we are using district averages.The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments indicate that 28% of students achieved level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at level 2 percentage points to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (24)	30% (26)

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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was the Reporting Category 1: Number: Operations and Problems Limited access to hands-on activities in order to break down multi-step problems.	Teachers will provide opportunities for students to explore mathematical concepts through project based learning using real world concepts.	Administration	Review formative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. . Review teacher lessons plans to ensure hands-on activities are being implemented in the classroom.	Formative: Pre/Post Evaluative Class Assessments and Baseline Data Assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	As a new school we are using district averages.The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments indicate that 68% of students made a learning gain.

Mathematics Goal #3a:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (59)	73% (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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was the Reporting Category 1: Number: Operations and Problems Limited access to hands-on activities in order to break down multi-step problems.	Teachers will provide contexts for mathematical exploration and development of student understanding of mathematical concepts, through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. Interventions will be done daily during math block using sumdog.com and tutoring will be provided.	Administration	1. Walk-through 2. Monitor Data 3. Mini-assessments 4. Data chats with students	Formative: Pre/Post Evaluative Class Assessments and Baseline Data Assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments indicate that 66% of LOWEST 25% students made a learning gain. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 71%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (57)	71% (62)

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. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was the Reporting Category 1: Number: Operations and Problems Limited access to hands-on activities in order to break down multi-step problems.	Teachers will provide contexts for mathematical exploration and development of student understanding of mathematical concepts, through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. In-Class differentiated instruction will be utilized to provide for the needs of the lowest 25% of students on a daily basis. Interventions will be done daily during math block using sumdog.com and tutoring will be provided twice a week.	Administration	Differentiated instruction will be monitored through walk-throughs. Weekly mini-assessments will be monitored by the Rti/MTSS team.	Formative: Pre/Post Evaluative Class Assessments and Baseline Data Assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : As a new school this year, our goal from 2011-2017 is based on District data 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
	57	61	65	69	73	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
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 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:	As a new school, we will use the District averages to establish the current and expected performance. The district average of the 2012 FCAT indicates 28% achieved
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (24)	32% (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	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 3 Geometry and Measurement.	Provide students with models both digital and tangible to enable them to visualize, draw and measure cross-sections of a range of geometric solids.	Administration	Following the FCIM model, the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments,reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The district average of the 2012 FCAT indicates 28 % of students achieved a Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (24)	30% (26)

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 grade 6 was Reporting Category 3 Geometry and Measurement.	Teachers will provide opportunities for students to explore mathematical concepts through project based learning using real world concepts.	Administration	Following the FCIM model, the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The district average of the 2012 FCAT indicates 68% of students achieved learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase this percentage by 5 percentage points to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (33)	73% (35)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	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 3 Geometry and Measurement.	Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. Provide these resources during small group differentiated instruction daily.	Administration	Following the FCIM model, the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics
2	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 7 was Reporting Category 4 Statistics and Probability	Use manipulatives (coins, spinners, die) to explore outcome of an experiment and predict which events are likely or unlikely	Administration	Following the FCIM model, the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics
3	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 8 was Reporting Category 1 Number, operations, Problems and statistics.	Provide opportunities for students to make reasonable approximations of square roots and mathematical expressions that include square roots, and use them to estimate solutions to problems and to compare mathematical expressions involving real numbers and radical expressions.	Administration	Following the FCIM model, the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments indicate that 66% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 71%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (32)	71% (34)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	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 3 Geometry and Measurement.	Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice daily during math block and offer tutoring twice a week.	Administration	Following the FCIM model, the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics
2	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 7 was Reporting Category 4 Statistics and Probability	Use manipulatives (coins, spinners, die) to explore outcome of an experiment and predict which events are likely or unlikely	Administration	Following the FCIM model, the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics
3	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 8 was Reporting Category 1 Number, operations, Problems and statistics.	Provide opportunities for students to make reasonable approximations of square roots and mathematical expressions that include square roots, and use them to estimate solutions to problems and to compare mathematical	Administration	Following the FCIM model, the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics

		expressions involving real numbers and radical expressions			

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 # 5A : As a new school this year, our goal from 2011-2017 is based on District data 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
	57	61	65	69	73	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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
Mathematics FCAT 2.0	K-5	NAEP Consultant	Teachers of Gr. K-5	August 16, 2012 and monthly WebEx	Teacher conferencing and Professional Learning Community	Administration and NAEP

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of hands on materials to re-enforce concepts taught in the classroom	Mathematics Manipulatives Kits	EESAC	$300.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
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: $300.00

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. Science Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicate that 32% of students achieved proficiency. As a new school this year, based on district averages our goal is to increase the percentage of the proficient students by 4 percentage points to 36%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (7)	36% (8)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Test results show area of deficiency to be life science in elementary and physical science/life sciences in middle school.	Monitor implementation of hands-on activities and scientific writing strategies to ensure students understand benchmark areas. Lab activities will reinforce benchmark areas as well.	Principal/AP	1. Walk-through 2. Data chats with students 3. Lab Portfolios	Formative: Baseline, Interim Assessments, Teacher generated classroom assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Science Test

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicate that 13% of students achieved proficiency. As a new school this year, based on district averages our goal is to increase the percentage of the proficient students by 2 percentage points to 15%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (3)	15% (4)

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	Test results show area of deficiency to be life science in elementary and physical science/life sciences in middle school.	Monitor implementation of hands-on activities and scientific writing strategies to ensure students understand benchmark areas. Lab activities will reinforce	Principal/AP	1. Walk-through 2. Data Chats with students	Formative: Baseline, Interim Assessments, Teacher generated classroom assessments

		benchmark areas as well.			Summative: 2013 FCAT Science Test

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Essential Labs	K-5	NAEP Consultant	Teachers of Gr. K-5	Aug. and monthly WebEx	Teacher conferencing and Professional Learning Community	Administration and NAEP
Science FCAT 2.0	K-5	NAEP Consultant	Teachers of Gr. K-5	Aug. and monthly WebEx	Teacher conferencing and Professional Learning Community	Administration and NAEP

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Hands on Science Labs to re-enforce concepts taught during classroom instruction	Science Lab Materials	EESAC	$295.00
			Subtotal: $295.00
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: $295.00

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase proficiency by 2% in each grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4th grade: 80% (21) 8th grade: 78% (8)	4th grade: 82%(22) 8th grade: 78%(9)

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	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase proficiency by 2% in each grade level.	Changes in FCAT Writes at State Level without proper communication may impact student scores. 4th grade students need practice in the writing process. Grammar and Conventions	Leadership Team	1. Walk-through 2. Monitor Data	Formative: Classroom assessments and monthly writing prompts Summative: 2013 FCAT Writes
2	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase proficiency by 2% in each grade level.	8th grade students need practice in planning and conventions. Grammar and Conventions	Leadership Team	1. Walk-through 2. Monitor Data	Formative: Classroom assessments and monthly writing prompts Summative: 2013 FCAT Writes

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Across the Curriculum	K-8	NAEP	All Teachers	Pre-School	Reading Coach and teachers will meet monthly to discuss student work and effectiveness of instruction	Reading Coach/AP
Reading/Writing FCAT 2.0	3-5	NAEP Consultant	Language Arts Teachers 3-5	August 16, 2012 and monthly WebEX	Reading Coach and teachers will meet monthly to discuss student work and effectiveness of instruction	Reading Coach/AP

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	As a new school this year, based on district averages our goal is to increase the percentage of the proficient students by 10 percentage points to 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An anticipated barrier is student's unfamiliarity with civics, seeing this is a first year course for them	Institute regular, on-going common planning sessions for Civics teachers to ensure that the Civics curriculum is taught with fidelity and is paced so as to address all State and District Benchmarks and curricular requirements. Utilize District-published lesson plans with assessments aligned to tested End of Course Exam Benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content. Provide classroom activities which help students develop an understanding of the content-specific vocabulary taught in government/civics. Provide opportunities for students to strengthen their abilities to read and interpret graph, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons, and other graphic representations.	Administrator	Montlhy school wide assessments will be generated to assess student progress in Civics. Administration will review and adapt as needed.	Monthly Assessemnts, Chapter/Unit Assessments, District Spring Assessment

		Provide activities that allow students to interpret primary and secondary sources of information. Provide opportunities for students to examine opposing points of view on a variety of 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. Provide opportunities for students to write to inform and to persuade. Provide opportunities for students to utilize print and non-print resources to research specific issues related to government/civics; help students provide alternate solutions to the problems researched.			

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:	As a new school this year, based on district averages our goal is to increase the percentage of the proficient students by 10 percentage points to 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(0)	10% (1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	An anticipated barrier is student's unfamiliarity with civics, seeing this is a first year course for them.	Institute regular, on-going common planning sessions for Civics teachers to ensure that the Civics curriculum is taught with fidelity and is paced so as to address all State and District Benchmarks and curricular requirements. Utilize District-published lesson plans with assessments aligned to tested End of Course Exam Benchmarks to	Administrator	Montlhy school wide assessments will be generated to assess student progress in Civics.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Civics

1		maximize opportunities for students to master tested content. Provide classroom activities which help students develop an understanding of the content-specific vocabulary taught in government/civics. Provide opportunities for students to strengthen their abilities to read and interpret graph, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons, and other graphic representations. Provide activities that allow students to interpret primary and secondary sources of information. Provide opportunities for students to examine opposing points of view on a variety of 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. Provide opportunities for students to write to inform and to persuade. Provide opportunities for students to utilize print and non-print resources to research specific issues related to government/civics; help students provide alternate solutions to the problems researched.			

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	As a new school, we are using district averages.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93.69% (345800)	94.69%(349491)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
112190	106581
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

85606	81326

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 order to maintain high attendance rates, parents need to fully understand the correlations between student attendance and academic achievement.	Teachers will review the MDCPS Attendance Policy with parents at Open House in order to stress the importance of student attendance.	Leadership Team	School will provide parents with attendance policy and so parents are aware of attendance procedures. Attendance policy states consequences for absenteeism and requires parent signature.	Attendance Reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Bridgepoint Classroom management, Parent Academy.	K-5	NAEP, Parent Academy	Classroom teachers, Parents	Monthly	Award ceremony each grading period	Teachers, administration

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Award students for perfect attendance	certificates	Principal's Roundtable	$50.00
			Subtotal: $50.00
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: $50.00

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:	As a new school we will use district averages.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
41430	37287
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
23562	21206
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
36701	33031
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
21850	19665

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	An anticipated barrier is that students and parents may be unaware of the behavior policy and the consequences of the student's behavior	Students and parents will receive an explanation of consequences, and expected behaviors	Administration	1.Review log 2. Behavior chart 3. Code of Conduct	School suspension reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Bridgepoint Classroom Management	K-5	NAEP	School-wide (classroom and special area teachers)	Wednesdays, Teacher Planning days	Monitor classroom behavior charts and interventions, monthly check up of parent communication log.	Administration

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	We will use a 20 hour parent participation program per family per year. Our schools goal is for 85% of the families to be actively involved in school activities.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
97%(174)	98%(175)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increase awareness of parental involvement activities.	All activities, such as The Parent Academy, Parent/Teacher Breakfast, Meet and Greet, Open House, and Tea for Two, at the school will be posted on the internet, emails and phone calls will also be made.	Administration	Monitoring participation	Sign-in Sheets, Volunteer logs, PAVE Logs.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Creating a parent/family friendly environment.	K-5	Administration	Classroom Teachers	Wednesdays (early release)	Monthly updates of parent volunteer hours through the schools PAVE (Parents as volunteers in education) program	Creating a parent/family friendly environment.

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Increase the number of science and math based activities by participating in science and math based field trips .

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student's unfamiliarity with science projects.	Establish a lego club, science projects and recycling initiatives throughout the year.	Administration	Sign in logs for the various clubs will be used as data to determine percentages of student involvement. Students will have lego based assignments, utilizing math and science.	1. Sign in sheets 2. Logs

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Across the Curriculum, Common Core Standards & Differentiated Instruction, Accountability Updates for Florida Schools	K-5	NAEP	Classroom teachers, special area teachers	August 2012	One science field trip a grading period with follow up written response, registration into various science programs/ competitions	Science Teachers

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	FCAT Practice Book			$250.00
Mathematics	Use of hands on materials to re-enforce concepts taught in the classroom	Mathematics Manipulatives Kits	EESAC	$300.00
Science	Hands on Science Labs to re-enforce concepts taught during classroom instruction	Science Lab Materials	EESAC	$295.00
Attendance	Award students for perfect attendance	certificates	Principal's Roundtable	$50.00
				Subtotal: $895.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $895.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	● Prevent	○ NA

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ● No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/16/2012)

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
This year the SAC plans to plan educational activities, and schedule beneficial workshops for both students and parents.	

In addition, the SAC will make sure that the funds are properly allocated to programs that serve as enrichment for the student body.	$895.00

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

This year the SAC plans to plan educational activities, and schedule beneficial workshops for both students and parents. The SAC will monitor implementation of the school improvement plan. In addition, the SAC will make sure that the funds are properly allocated to programs that serve as enrichment for the student body.

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
No Data Found
No Data Found