FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: LEEWOOD K-8 CENTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: Bart D. Christie

SAC Chair: Karen B. Terilli

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/11/2012

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	Bart D. Christie	Bachelors Degree/ Elementary Education Masters Degree/ Educational Leadership	8	21	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades A A A A A High Standards – Rdg 78 91 91 90 92 High Standards – Math 79 87 88 89 90 Lng Gains-Rdg 73 70 79 73 82 Lng Gains-Math 78 69 68 71 75 Gains-R-25 71 71 76 67 83 Gains-M-25 65 68 74 55 67
Assis Principal	Carla D. Rivas	Bachelors Degree/ Psychology Masters Degree/ Elementary Education	7	13	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades A A A A A High Standards – Rdg 78 91 91 90 92 High Standards – Math 79 87 88 89 90 Lng Gains-Rdg 73 70 79 73 82 Lng Gains-Math 78 69 68 71 75 Gains-R-25 71 71 76 67 83 Gains-M-25 65 68 74 55 67
Assis Principal					
Principal					

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)
N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Regular meetings of new teachers with principal.	Principal	May 2013	
2	Partnering new teachers with veteran staff.	Assistant Principals	August 2012	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
4	Teachers are encouraged to attend the tutorial sessions provided by the District in preparation for subject area examinations.

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
53	1.9%(1)	7.5%(4)	45.3%(24)	45.3%(24)	37.7%(20)	79.2%(42)	5.7%(3)	5.7%(3)	60.4%(32)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
N/A	N/A	N/A	No first year teachers

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist/EESAC Chair, UTD Steward/Fifth Grade Language Arts Teacher, Middle School Mathematics Teacher, First Grade Gifted Teacher, Fourth Grade Gifted Language Arts Teacher, Second Grade Teacher, ESE Teacher, Middle School Teacher, Fifth Grade Mathematics 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?

The MTSS Leadership Team will monitor academic and behavioral progress. It will address curriculum issues to determine what students will learn; evaluate assessments to determine if students have learned; monitor progress of identified students to determine if interventions are effective; and identify enrichment opportunities to encourage expansion of learning. The MTSS Leadership Team will monitor the needs of all subgroups not meeting target goals and identify interventions needed to meet these goals. The MTSS Leadership Team will determine professional development needs for faculty based on student intervention and achievement needs. The MTSS Leadership Team will hold regular meetings, incorporating input and feedback from staff and will maintain channels of communication to share procedures and progress.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS Leadership Team will review the data and present the EESAC and faculty feedback on student needs and strategies to be implemented in the SIP. The leadership team will continue to analyze data on an ongoing basis and monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention to ensure improvement in student performance, also noting response to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress. Teachers will provide documentation in reference to strategies being implemented as mentioned on the SIP by way of a data collection file provided in a central location within the school.

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 such as Interim assessments, FAIR assessments, state/local math and Science assessments, FCAT 2.0 results, Edusoft scores and CELLA results will be utilized to analyze student progress in reading, math, and science and adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students. Monthly school-based writing prompts will be utilized to monitor student writing performance. The assistant principal and school counselor will monitor the Functional Assessment of Behavior and Behavior Intervention Plans. Additionally, the assistant principal and school counselor will monitor the referral process, as well as the increasing suspension rate and the school counselor will provide counseling and positive behavior interventions. We will utilize positive behavior systems as a school wide initiative.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Administration will train staff in the MTSS/RtI problem solving at Tiers 1, 2, and 3 (SST), using the Tier 1 Problem Solving Worksheet, Tier 2 Problem Solving Worksheet, and Tier 3 Problem Solving Worksheet and Intervention Plan provided by the District during training for school administrators.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Administration will be diligent in providing support for staff to understand and implement the basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures; and will utilize the ongoing support provided through our feeder pattern.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Mr. Christie (Principal), Mrs. Rivas (Assistant Principal), Mrs. Terilli (Media Specialist), Mrs. Fields (UTD Steward), Mrs. Margolesky (Middle School Teacher), Mrs. Zimmerman (Primary Gifted Teacher), Mrs. Vreones (Intermediate Gifted Teacher), Mrs. Barreda (Primary Teacher), Mrs. Boodramsingh (Middle School Teacher), Mrs. Saliers (Intermediate Teacher), Mrs. Morgado (Intermediate Teacher), Mr. Meador (Intermediate Teacher), Mrs. Rebecchini (Middle School Teacher).

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

The LLT will monitor and assist teachers with strategies to incorporate trade books into the reading program and throughout additional subject areas. The LLT will provide grade levels with innovative activities and appropriate resources to enhance the school's literacy culture.

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

Our Core Reading Program, Houghton Mifflin, Reading provides the basis for instruction and connects meaningfully to supplemental materials. The core reading program correlates to all Reading and Language Arts Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and Common Core Standards and addresses the six areas of reading: oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Our Supplemental Intervention Reading Program is used flexibly as part of our individualized differentiated instruction. Our Comprehensive Intervention Reading Program, Voyager, is used to provide practice in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. In addition to implementing the CRRP, our LLT will focus on increasing the use of novel studies to two per grading period in every grade level in an effort to increase students' fluency, vocabulary and comprehension skills. Teachers will monitor the time students spend reading for pleasure through the use of weekly reading logs and students will receive grades on a monthly basis that reflect a minimum of thirty minutes of reading nightly.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

During homeroom, students will participate daily in sustained silent reading. Weekly vocabulary words for cross-curricular areas will be introduced and displayed in the hallways to encourage student use in all classes. Thematic units will be utilized during all core classes to increase curriculum concepts and student participation across all subject areas. Teachers will be encouraged to organize student teams within their classrooms to heighten discussion and comprehension of classroom texts. Professional Development will be offered for all staff in the implementation of the Common Core Standards, as well as for the implementation of Reading Plus.

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 28% (137) of our students achieved a Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student achievement to 32% (157) students at Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (137)	32% (157)

Problem-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 Reading assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for grade three through five students was Category 4 Informational Text/Research Process. Students are weak in analyzing graphically depicted material and in drawing correct conclusions from the information.	Use how-to articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to identify text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc.) and to locate, interpret and organize information.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's knowledge of text features, students' ability to locate and identify details, compare and contrast relationships, and identify meanings of complex vocabulary.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
2	The area of greatest difficulty for grade six students was also Category 4 Informational Text/Research Process. Students are weak in synthesizing information from multiple sources to draw accurate and valid conclusions.	Provide practice locating and verifying details, critically analyzing text, and synthesizing details to draw correct conclusions.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's knowledge of text features, students' ability to locate and identify details, compare and contrast relationships, and identify meanings of complex vocabulary.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
3	The area of greatest difficulty for grade seven students was Category 3 Literary Analysis Fiction/ Nonfiction. Students are weak in their ability to compare and contrast within and across texts.	Teach students to graphically depict comparison and contrast relationships through the use of graphic organizers and concept maps.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's knowledge of text features, students' ability to locate and identify details, compare and contrast relationships, and identify meanings of complex vocabulary.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
4	The area of greatest difficulty for grade eight students was Category 1 Vocabulary. Students demonstrate weakness in identifying and understanding the	Provide opportunities for students to identify meanings of words and phrases derived from Greek and Latin, as well as the meaning of conceptually advanced	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's knowledge of text features, students' ability to locate and identify details, compare and contrast	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

	meaning of words derived from Greek and Latin, as well as those containing conceptually advanced prefixes and suffixes.	prefixes, suffixes and root words through the use of word study, word maps and Wordly Wise.		relationships, and identify meanings of complex vocabulary.	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 50% (246) of our students achieved at or above Level 4. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student achievement to 52% (257) students at or above Level 4.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (246)	52% (255)

Problem-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 Reading assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for grade three through five students was Category 4 Informational Text/Research Process. Students are weak in being able to identify and categorize information found in multiple nonfiction sources.	While instructing students in the implementation of the research process, provide opportunities to enhance note-taking skills through the use of District-approved online databases.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's ability to take notes from a variety of sources, to create real-world documents, research projects and presentations.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
	The area of greatest difficulty for grade six students was also	Provide practice locating and verifying details, critically analyzing text,	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's knowledge of	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom

2	Category 4 Informational Text/Research Process. Students are weak in synthesizing information from multiple sources to draw accurate and valid conclusions.	and synthesizing details to draw correct conclusions.		text features, students' ability to locate and identify details, compare and contrast relationships, and identify meanings of complex vocabulary.	Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
3	The area of greatest difficulty for grade seven students was Category 3 Literary Analysis Fiction/ Nonfiction. Students are weak in their ability to compare and contrast within and across texts.	Teach students to graphically depict comparison and contrast relationships through the use of graphic organizers and concept maps.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's knowledge of text features, students' ability to locate and identify details, compare and contrast relationships, and identify meanings of complex vocabulary.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
4	The area of greatest difficulty for grade eight students was Category 1 Vocabulary. Students demonstrate weakness in identifying and understanding the meaning of words derived from Greek and Latin, as well as those containing conceptually advanced prefixes and suffixes.	Provide opportunities for students to identify meanings of words and phrases derived from Greek and Latin, as well as the meaning of conceptually advanced prefixes, suffixes and root words through the use of word study, word maps and Wordly Wise.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's knowledge of text features, students' ability to locate and identify details, compare and contrast relationships, and identify meanings of complex vocabulary.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
5	The area of greatest difficulty for grade eight students was Category 1 Vocabulary. Students demonstrate weakness in identifying and understanding the meaning of words derived from Greek and Latin, as well as those containing conceptually advanced prefixes and suffixes.	Provide opportunities for students to identify meanings of words and phrases derived from Greek and Latin, as well as the meaning of conceptually advanced prefixes, suffixes and root words through the use of word study, word maps and Wordly Wise.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's knowledge of text features, students' ability to locate and identify details, compare and contrast relationships, and identify meanings of complex vocabulary.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate

gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	that 73% (273) of our students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for 78% (292) of our students to make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (273)	78% (292)

Problem-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	Data revealed that students had the most difficulty in Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students demonstrated difficulty with questions that asked them shades of meaning and identifying the Author's purpose for using figurative language.	Teach critical reading strategies to identify how and why authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification. Provide students with strategies to assist them in understanding overall meanings and develop tools to identify the overall concept written in the text.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' understanding of shades of meaning and figurative language.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FCAT Test Maker Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 71% (53) of students in the lowest 25 percentile made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for 76% (56) of lowest 25 percentile to make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

71% (53)	76% (56)

Problem-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	Data indicates that students had difficulty in Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students demonstrate difficulty understanding the text structure of particular passages and how it affects meaning.	Teach reading strategies that assist students in identifying causal relationships embedded in text and help them to become familiar with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Provide intervention with fidelity through the use of Successmaker.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' understanding of text structure, such as cause and effect, compare/contrast and chronological order. Ongoing monitoring of Successmaker reports.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FCAT Test Maker Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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 : Our goal from 2011 - 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	84	85	87	88	90	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 88% (103) of White students, 51% (31) of Black students, 80% (241) of Hispanic students and 80% (8) of Asian students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 92% (108) of White students, 68% (41) of Black students, 84% (253) of Hispanic students and 93% (9) of Asian students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 88% (103) Black: 51% (31) Hispanic: 80% (241) Asian: 80% (8) American Indian: NA	White: 92% (108) Black: 68% (41) Hispanic: 84% (253) Asian: 93% (9) American Indian: NA

Problem-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	Data indicates that White, Hispanic and Asian students are unable to compare/contrast across	Instruct students in the process of using graphic organizers to visualize the similarities and	5B.1. MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on the similarities and differences of paired	Formative: Interim Assessments, FCAT Test Maker Benchmark

	texts.	differences between paired texts.		texts.	Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
2	Data indicates that Black students had difficulty in Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students demonstrate difficulty understanding the text features of nonfiction and how it affects meaning.	Teach students to effectively use text features such as readings, charts, graphs and diagrams.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' understanding of text features. Ongoing monitoring of Successmaker reports.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 50% (6) of our ELL students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 58% (6).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (6)	58% (6)

Problem-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	Data indicates that ELL students had difficulty in Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students demonstrate difficulty understanding the text features of nonfiction and how it affects meaning.	Teach students to effectively use text features such as readings, charts, graphs and diagrams.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' understanding of text features. Ongoing monitoring of Successmaker reports.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FCAT Test Maker Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 29% (10) of our SWD students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 52% (18).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (10)	52% (18)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Data indicates that SWD students had difficulty in Reporting Category 2,	Teach students to effectively use text features such as	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' understanding	Formative: Interim Assessments, FCAT Test Maker

1	Reading Application. Students demonstrate difficulty understanding the text features of nonfiction and how it affects meaning.	readings, charts, graphs and diagrams.		of text features. Ongoing monitoring of Successmaker reports.	Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 56% (82) of our ED students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 73% (107).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (82)	73% (107)

Problem-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	Data indicates that ED students had difficulty in Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students demonstrate difficulty understanding the text features of nonfiction and how it affects meaning.	Teach students to effectively use text features such as readings, charts, graphs and diagrams.	MTSS/RtI Team, LLT	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' understanding of text features. Ongoing monitoring of Successmaker reports.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FCAT Test Maker Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards	K-8	District Personnel	Grade Level Chairs	November 6, 2012	Student work folders	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration
Successmaker	3-5	Successmaker liaison	Intervention teachers	October 4, 2012	Successmaker reports	Administration
Reading Plus	K-8	Reading Plus Representative	Language Arts Teachers	September 26, 2012	Reading Plus reports	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration

Reading Budget:

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

1.A .1	Time for Kids and/or National Geographic Explorer	PTSA	$2,500.00
1.A. 1	Wordly Wise	PTSA	$600.00
			Subtotal: $3,100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,100.00

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:	Data indicates that 75% (15) of students tested scored proficient in Listening/Speaking on the CELLA Test.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
75% (15)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	A diminished amount of time to model Listening/Speaking skills will affect students' ability to improve and obtain proficiency.	Provide meaningful English language practice and teacher modeling for everyday language throughout school day.	ESOL Coordinator	Ongoing teacher observation of students' ability to interact in English.	CELLA Test

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:	Data indicates that 50% (10) of students tested scored proficient in Reading on the CELLA Test.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

50% (10)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	A diminished amount of time to model Reading skills will affect students' ability to improve and obtain proficiency.	Utilize read aloud and jump-in reading to increase student fluency.	Classroom teacher	Ongoing teacher observation of students' ability to read in English.	CELLA Test

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Data indicates that 35% (7) of students tested scored proficient in Writing on the CELLA Test.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
35% (7)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	A diminished amount of time to model Writing skills will affect students' ability to improve and obtain proficiency.	Utilize the writing process steps such as planning, drafting, revising, editing and publishing as students complete the monthly writing prompts.	Administration	Review school-wide monthly prompts for evidence of proficiency.	CELLA Test; Monthly writing prompts.

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:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 28% (138) of our students achieved at Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for 30% (147) of our students to achieve a Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (138)	30% (147)

Problem-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	Data indicates a weakness in grades three through five in the reporting category of Numbers: Fractions; specifically students demonstrate difficulty with understanding of fractions and fraction equivalence, being able to generate and simplify equivalent fractions, and being able to add and subtract fractions.	Provide opportunities for students to develop skills in adding, subtracting, simplifying and finding equivalent fractions through the use of manipulative and the GoMath series.	MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to manipulate fractions.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 50% (245)of our students achieved at Level 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for 51% (250) of our students to achieve a Level 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (245)	51% (250)

Problem-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	Data indicates a weakness in grades three through five in the reporting category of Numbers: Fractions; specifically students demonstrate difficulty with the ability to compare and order fractions, as well as adding and subtracting fractions.	Provide opportunities for students to develop skills in comparing and ordering fractions, as well as adding and subtracting through the use of manipulatives, the GoMath series. Provide opportunities for students to utilize enrichment activities such as FCAT Explorer/FOCUS and Gizmos.	MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to add, subtract, compare and order fractions.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 78% (291) of our students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for 83% (310) of our students will make learning gains.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (291)	83% (310)

Problem-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	Data indicates a weakness in the reporting category of Number: Operations, Problems and Statistics in grades three through five; specifically with solving real-world problems that involve properties of operations.	Foster the use of meanings of numbers to create strategies for solving problems and responding to practical situations through the use of models, place value and properties of operations to represent mathematical operations, as well as create equivalent representation of numbers.	MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to solve real-world problems that involve properties of operations in elementary and students' ability to find area and perimeter of non-rectangular shapes for middle school students.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 65% (49) of the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 70% (53) of the lowest 25% make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (49)	70% (53)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data indicates a weakness in the reporting category of Number: Operations, Problems and Statistics in grades three through five; specifically with basic multiplication and related division facts.	Provide opportunities for students to explore and develop an understanding of multiplication and division through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities. Utilize Successmaker to progress-monitor the students' understanding of the relationship of numbers.	MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to multiply and divide fluently.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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 : Our goal from 2011 - 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	79	81	83	85	87	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 87% (102) of White students, 46% (28) of Black students, 81% (244) of Hispanic students and 90% (9) of Asian students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 88% (103) of White students, 52% (32) of Black students, 83% (250) of Hispanic students and 100% (10) of Asian students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 87% (102) Black: 46% (28) Hispanic: 81% (244) Asian: 90% (9) American Indian: NA	White: 88% (103) Black: 52% (32) Hispanic: 83% (250) Asian: 100% (10) American Indian: NA

Problem-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	Data indicates that Black students have difficulty understanding the relationship between multiplication and related division facts (inverse operations.)	Provide opportunities for students to explore and develop understanding of multiplication and division through the use of base ten blocks and alternate strategies such as repeated addition and repeated subtraction.	MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on developing quick recall of multiplication facts and related division facts.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
	Data indicates that Asian students have difficulty	Provide opportunities for students to develop skills	MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on	Formative: Interim Assessments,

2	developing an understanding of and fluency with fractions.	in manipulating fractions using fraction tiles and Gizmos.		students' ability to manipulate fractions.	Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 50% (6) of our ELL students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 58% (6).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (6)	58% (6)

Problem-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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 56% (20) of our SWD students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 59% (21).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (20)	59% (21)

Problem-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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 58% (85) of our ED students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 68% (99).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

58% (85)	68% (99)

Problem-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	Data indicates that ED students have difficulty understanding the relationship between multiplication and related division facts (inverse operations.)	Provide opportunities for students to explore and develop understanding of multiplication and division through the use of base ten blocks and alternate strategies such as repeated addition and repeated subtraction.	MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on developing quick recall of multiplication facts and related division facts.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 28% (138) of our students achieved at Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for 30% (147) of our students to achieve a Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (138)	30% (147)

Problem-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	Data indicates a weakness in grades six through eight in the reporting category of Geometry and Measurement; specifically students demonstrate difficulty with analyzing and solving problems involving perimeter and area, volume, and two and three-dimensional figures.	Provide opportunities for students to manipulate two and three-dimensional figures and to find area, perimeter and volume through the use of the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives and hands-on activities that explore area and volume.	MTSS/RtI Team	Data chats and results of Benchmark assessments to determine students' mastery.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Assessments, FOCUS Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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:	N/A

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 50% (245) of our students achieved at Level 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for 51% (250) of our students to achieve a Level 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (245)	51% (250)

Problem-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	Data indicates a weakness in grades six through eight in the reporting category of Geometry and Measurement; specifically students demonstrate difficulty with comparing and converting units of measure.	Provide opportunities for students to investigate strategies to compare, contrast and convert units of measure between different measurement systems through the use of enrichment programs such as FCAT Explorer/ FOCUS and Gizmos.	MTSS/RtI Team	Data chats and results of Benchmark assessments to determine students' mastery.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Assessments, FOCUS Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 78% (291) of our students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for 83% (310) of our students will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (291)	83% (310)

Problem-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	Data indicates a weakness in the reporting category of Geometry and Measurement in grades six through eight; specifically with finding area and perimeter of non-rectangular figures.	Provide opportunities for students to use various tool to aide in the development of students' spatial sense through the use of online and offline manipulative such as the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives.	MTSS/RtI Team	Data chats and results of Benchmark assessments to determine students' mastery.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Assessments, FOCUS Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 65% (49) of the lowest 25% made learning gains.

Mathematics Goal #4:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 70% (53) of the lowest 25% make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (49)	70% (53)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data indicates a weakness in the reporting category of Geometry and Measurement in grades six through eight, specifically in solving problems relating to area, surface area and volume.	Utilize Successmaker to progress-monitor the students' understanding of the measurement of area, surface area and volume.	MTSS/RtI Team	Data chats and results of Benchmark assessments to determine students' mastery.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Assessments, FOCUS Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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 : Our goal from 2011 - 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	79	81	83	85	87	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 87% (102) of White students, 46% (28) of Black students, 81% (244) of Hispanic students and 90% (9) of Asian students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 88% (103) of White students, 52% (32) of Black students, 83% (250) of Hispanic students and 100% (10) of Asian students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 87% (102) Black: 46% (28) Hispanic: 81% (244) Asian: 90% (9) American Indian: NA	White: 88% (103) Black: 52% (32) Hispanic: 83% (250) Asian: 100% (10) American Indian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Data indicates that Black students demonstrate weakness in the reporting	Provide opportunities for students to measure area and perimeter of	MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on demonstrating the ability	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom

1	category of Geometry and Measurement in grades six through eight, specifically in finding the perimeters and areas of composite, two-dimensional figures.	composite, two-dimensional figures through the use of Gizmos and the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives.		to find perimeter and area of two-dimensional figures.	Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
2	Data indicates that Asian students demonstrate weakness in grades six through eight in the reporting category of Geometry and Measurement, specifically in comparing and converting units of measure.	Provide opportunities for students to investigate strategies that convert units of measurement between different measurement systems through the use of programs such as FCAT Explorer, FOCUS and Gizmos.	MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on demonstrating the ability to convert units of measure between different measurement systems.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 50% (6) of our ELL students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 58% (6).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (6)	58% (6)

Problem-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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 56% (20) of our SWD students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 59% (21).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (20)	59% (21)

Problem-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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 58% (85) of our ED students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student progress to 68% (99).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (85)	68% (99)

Problem-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	Data indicates that ED students demonstrate weakness in the reporting category of Geometry and Measurement in grades six through eight, specifically in finding the perimeters and areas of composite, two-dimensional figures.	Provide opportunities for students to measure area and perimeter of composite, two-dimensional figures through the use of Gizmos and the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives.	MTSS/RtI Team	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on demonstrating the ability to find perimeter and area of two-dimensional figures.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC indicate that 41% (16) of students scored at Achievement Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain 41% (16) of students scoring at Achievement Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (16)	41% (16)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data indicates a weakness in the reporting category Functions, Linear Equations and Inequalities. Students demonstrate difficulties in the areas of slope-intercept, point-slope, and standard forms; graphing a function; and solving systems by	Provide opportunities for students to graph one- and two-step inequalities in one variable and to use graphing calculators or computers with compatible software to explore slopes, graphs, and tables of linear functions.	MTSS/RtI Team	Data chats and results of Benchmark assessments to determine students' mastery.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Assessments, FOCUS Summative: 2013 Algebra EOC

	graphing, substitution & elimination.	Provide access to Riverdeep, FCAT Explorer, FCAT Testmaker and FOCUS to enhance instruction in classroom.			

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:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC indicate that 56% (22) of students scored at Level 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain 56% (22) of students scoring at Level 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (22)	56% (22)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data indicates a weakness in the reporting category of Polynomials. Students demonstrate difficulties when adding and subtracting polynomials; multiplying and factoring polynomials; and multiplying and factoring special cases.	Use virtual manipulatives to provide practice in applying basic mathematical and algebraic concepts. Provide access to Riverdeep, FCAT Explorer, FCAT Testmaker and FOCUS to enhance instruction in classroom.	MTSS/RtI Team	Data chats and results of Benchmark assessments to determine students' mastery.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Testmaker Assessments, FOCUS Summative: 2013 Algebra EOC

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				

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Utilization of Interactive White Boards	Math Teachers	Promethean Representative	School wide, as needed	February 1, 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrator
Common Core Curriculum	K-8	District Personnel	School wide	November 6, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrator
GO Math Technology Component	Math Teachers	Math Chair	School wide, as needed	February 1, 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrator

---

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1A.1	GO Math Assessment workbooks	School	$1,300.00
1A.1	Crossroads FCAT Testmaker	PTSA	$1,900.00
			Subtotal: $3,200.00

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,200.00

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:	On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT 2.0 47% (76)of students achieved proficiency. The expected level of performance for 2013 is 49% (79) achieving proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47% (76)	49% (79)

Problem-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	Data indicates that students in grade five demonstrated a weakness in the reporting category of Physical Science. Students demonstrated difficulty with understanding the difference between physical and chemical changes due to limited exposure to these scientific principles.	Provide activities for students to participate in laboratory activities that apply, analyze and explain concepts related to matter.	MTSS/RtI Team	Review student work folders to provide evidence of mastery. Monitor student lab reports.	Formative: Quarterly Exams, Science Assessment Tool, Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Test Maker Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
	Data indicates that students in grade eight demonstrated a weakness in the reporting category of Nature of Science. Students demonstrated difficulty	Provide classroom and after-school opportunities to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and	MTSS/RtI Team	Review student work folders to provide evidence of mastery. Monitor student lab reports.	Formative: Quarterly Exams, Science Assessment Tool, Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments,

2	with the development of logical arguments to describe scientific phenomena; the design of experiments; the applications of concepts to laboratory procedures; connection of scientific laws to observations during experiments; data interpretation ; generation of data from lab observations; formulation of hypotheses and recognition of variables during experiments.	discussion of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, models, and various investigative methods scientists use through a Science Fair and participation in the Fairchild Challenge.			FCAT Test Maker Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

Problem-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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT 2.0 23% (38)of students achieved a Level 4 or 5. The expected level of performance for 2013 is 24% (39) achieving a Level 4 or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (38)	24% (39)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Data indicates that students in grade five demonstrated a weakness in the reporting category of Physical Science.	Provide opportunities for students to participate in enrichment activities that apply, analyze and explain concepts	MTSS/RtI Team	Review student work folders to provide evidence of mastery. Monitor student lab reports.	Formative: Quarterly Exams, Science Assessment Tool, Interim Assessments,

1	Students demonstrate difficulty understanding the difference between physical and chemical changes due to limited exposure to these scientific principles.	related to matter.			Classroom Assessments, FCAT Test Maker Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0
2	Data indicates that students in grade eight demonstrated a weakness in the reporting category of Nature of Science. Students demonstrate difficulty with the development of logical arguments to describe scientific phenomena; the design of experiments; the applications of concepts to laboratory procedures; connection of scientific laws to observations during experiments; data interpretation ; generation of data from lab observations; formulation of hypotheses and recognition of variables during experiments.	Provide classroom and after-school enrichment opportunities to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and discussion of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, models, and various investigative methods scientists use through a Science Fair and participation in the Fairchild Challenge.	MTSS/RtI Team	Review student work folders to provide evidence of mastery. Monitor student lab reports.	Formative: Quarterly Exams, Science Assessment Tool, Interim Assessments, Classroom Assessments, FCAT Test Maker Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

Problem-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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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 Leaders Workshops	K-8	Science Chair	K-8 Science Teachers	September 24, 2012	Review team meeting minutes.	Administration
Hands-on Lab Training	K-8	District Personnel	K-8 Science Teachers	February 1, 2013	Review students' essential lab log for evidence of hands-on lab activities.	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
2.1	Pearson Kit replenishment	PTSA	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $500.00

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:	For the 2011-2012 school year in the administration of the FCAT Writing Test 92% (136) of students scored at a level 3 and above achieving at or above proficiency. For the 2013 administration of the FCAT Writing Test students will increase the percentage scoring at or above a Level 3 to 93% (137).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92% (136)	93% (137)

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	FCAT Writing 2012 data shows that students in both fourth and eighth grades lack the ability to elaborate and support their ideas and use appropriate writing conventions.	Continue to provide instruction in the Four Square Writing process in grades K through second. Continue to utilize Melissa Forney Writing strategies in grades three through eight.	MTSS/RtI Team; LLT	Review student writing folders to locate evidence of students' ability to elaborate on a concept and support ideas.	Formative: Students' scores on monthly writing assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment

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

Problem-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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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
Melissa Forney Writing workshops	3-8	Melissa Forney	3-8 Writing Teachers	October 13, 2012	Monthly writing prompts.	Administration

---

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.1	Writing workshops	EESAC	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00

			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

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:	2012-2013 M-DCPS Baseline data were used for goals 1-2. Data indicates that 3% of our students are proficient. Our goal is to increase proficiency by 50% to 53%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Pending	Pending

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students demonstrate difficulty using print and non-print resources to successfully research issues related to government and civics.	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.	Administration	Ongoing formal and informal debates of civic and government-related issues.	Formative: Classroom assessments Summative: Winter Interim Civics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	2012-2013 M-DCPS Baseline data were used for goals 1-2. Data indicates that 3% of our students are proficient. Our goal is to increase proficiency by 50% to 53%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Pending	Pending

Problem-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 demonstrate difficulty when reading and interpreting graphs, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons and other graphic representations.	Provide enrichment opportunities for students that strengthen their ability to read and interpret graphs, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons, and other graphic representations.	Administration	Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's ability to use and interpret graphs, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons and other graphic representations	Formative: Classroom assessments Summative: Winter Interim Civics Assessment

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$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:	Our attendance rate during the 2011-2012 school year was 97.31% . Our goal for 2012 - 2013 is to maintain 97.31% by continuing a healthy climate in our school. The number of students with excessive tardies during the 2011-2012 school year was 91. Our goal during the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease that number by five to 86.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
97.31% (795)	97.31% (795)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
123	117
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
91	86

Problem-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	Illnesses have continued to cause a barrier toward reaching 100% attendance.	Continue to maintain a clean environment throughout the school. Teach and demonstrate healthy choices and illness prevention strategies. Provide incentives for students with 100% attendance during honor roll assemblies and monthly attendance reviews.	Administrator; Truant Officer	Administrators will monitor school's environment and ensure that health education and illness prevention strategies are implemented throughout the school.	Attendance rosters
2	Students are excessively tardy due to transportation issues and extensive commutes.	Send truant officer to homes of students who are excessively tardy.	Administrator; Truant Officer	Administration will monitor those students who are excessively tardy and will work with truant officer to ensure prompt arrival at school.	Attendance rosters

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
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our suspension rate for the 2011-2012 school year increased from 7 to 10. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of outdoor suspensions from 10 to 9.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1	1
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1	1
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
10	9

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
7	6

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students use technology inappropriately resulting in indoor as well as outdoor suspensions. Indoor suspensions are less severe cases.	Implement positive behavior strategies for specific students identified as having difficulties. Provide incentives for students to promote positive behavior.	Assistant Principal; Counselor; Grade Level Chairs	Monitor monthly the decrease in amount of referrals resulting in suspensions.	Monthly COGNOS suspension report.

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
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Suspension Budget:

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

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.*	During the 2011-2012 school year 110 parents attended FCAT 2.0 and SAT Information Sessions. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase attendance at these sessions by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
14% (110)	21% (169)

Problem-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	Parents have limited knowledge and understanding of the new FCAT 2.0 benchmarks and the NGSSS. These limits are the result of language barriers and the inability to attend meetings due to transportation issues.	Disseminate information through FCAT Parent Information sessions, school website, online newsletters, and flyers in both English and Spanish.	Administration	Review sign-in sheets and attendance logs for FCAT 2.0 and SAT Information sessions	Sign-in sheets and 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
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$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 opportunities for students to participate in STEM related learning experiences through our participation in the Green School Challenge, the Fairchild Challenge, our Green Team Club, Robotics and Wind Energy classes.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have had limited exposure to science, math and engineering projects that utilize technology and increase scientific thinking to develop and implement inquiry-based activities.	Increase activities for students to design and develop science, math and engineering projects utilizing technology to increase scientific thinking and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities.	Administration	Monthly monitoring of Green Team Challenges, Fairchild Challenge projects, Green Team Club participation, Robotics and Wind Energy class projects.	Green Team Challenges, Fairchild Challenge projects, Green Team Club participation, Robotics and Wind Energy class projects.

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
Green School Challenge	Schoolwide	Dream in Green Organization	Fourth Grade Teacher, Media Specialist	September 17, 2012	Participation in monthly Green School Challenges	Administration

Fairchild Challenge workshop	6-8	Fairchild Gardens Representative	Middle School Science Teacher	August 25, 2012	Maintenance of Slow-Food Garden	Administration

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.1	Plants/seeds for Slow-Food garden program	PTSA/donations from community	$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $200.00

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:	Increase vertical teaming through the articulation process with local highs schools to which our students matriculate to ensure smooth transition from middle school to high school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Curriculum not aligned to promote a seamless transition for students attending nearby high schools.	Provide opportunities for student exposure to local high school curriculum through our yearly Magnet Fair and the promotion of the Curriculum Fairs of local high schools.	Administration	Monitor the articulation process with local high schools.	Attendance logs at Magnet and Curriculum Fairs.

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
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

N/A Goal:

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						

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 N/A Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	1.A .1	Time for Kids and/or National Geographic Explorer	PTSA	$2,500.00
Reading	1.A. 1	Wordly Wise	PTSA	$600.00
Mathematics	1A.1	GO Math Assessment workbooks	School	$1,300.00
Mathematics	1A.1	Crossroads FCAT Testmaker	PTSA	$1,900.00
Science	2.1	Pearson Kit replenishment	PTSA	$500.00
Writing	1.1	Writing workshops	EESAC	$1,000.00
Civics	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Attendance	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Suspension	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Parent Involvement	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
STEM	1.1	Plants/seeds for Slow-Food garden program	PTSA/donations from community	$200.00
CTE	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $8,000.00

Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Mathematics	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Science	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Writing	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Civics	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Attendance	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Suspension	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Parent Involvement	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
STEM	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
CTE	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Mathematics	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Science	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Writing	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Civics	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Attendance	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Suspension	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Parent Involvement	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
STEM	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
CTE	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Mathematics	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Science	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Writing	NA	NA	NA	$0.00

Civics	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Attendance	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Suspension	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Parent Involvement	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
STEM	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
CTE	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $8,000.00

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 10/10/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
EESAC funds will be used to send select writing teachers to Writing Professional Development opportunities.	$1,000.00

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

The EESAC is responsible for implementing and monitoring the School Improvement Plan through ongoing data analysis, disbursing the SAC and A+ Recognition funds, and discussing and evaluating the school's policies and procedures.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District
LEEWOOD K-8 CENTER
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	91%	87%	78%	74%	330	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	70%	69%			139	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	71% (YES)	68% (YES)			139	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					608	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
LEEWOOD K-8 CENTER
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	91%	88%	86%	79%	344	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	79%	68%			147	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	76% (YES)	74% (YES)			150	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					641	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested