

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: RONALD W. REAGAN/DORAL SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Jacques Bentolilla

SAC Chair: Allison Ibarra

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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 math 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	Jacques Bentolilla	Bachelor's Degree in Specific Learning Disabilities, Master's Degree in Mentally Educational Leadership, Doctorate in Exceptional Student Education Certified in Varying Exceptionalities K-12, Mentally Handicapped K-12, Educational Leadership K-12, and Principal Certification K-12 Handicapped 12, Specialist Degree	4.5	12	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A AMO High Standards Rdg. 60 63 55 59 High Standards Math 86 87 85 61 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 60 68 59 64 Lrng Gains-Math 75 83 79 70 Gains-Rdg-25% 61 64 50 68 Gains-Math-25% 65 76 75 72 Schools: Ronald Reagan/Doral Sr. High – 2009 –Present (Principal) West Miami Middle School – 2007 -2009 (Principal)

Assis Principal	Elena Cabrera	in Bachelor's Degree in English; Master's Degree in Reading; Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership Certified in English 5-9; English 6-12; Reading K-12; Educational Leadership K-12; ESOL Endorsement	2	7	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade D C B B AMO High Standards Rdg. 32 28 51 53 High Standards Math 61 62 54 55 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 44 47 61 64 Lrng Gains-Math 66 71 67 71 Gains-Rdg-25% 44 48 80 74 Gains-Math-25% 60 68 71 77 Schools: Ronald Reagan/Doral Sr. High – 2012 (Assistant Principal) Hialeah-Miami Lakes Sr. High – 2010 –2011 (Asst. Principal) Jose Marti Middle – 2009- 2008 (Asst. Principal)
Assis Principal	Christopher Quarles	Bachelor's Degree in Psychology; Master's Degree in Psychology/Guidance and Counseling; ; Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership Certified in Guidance & Counseling K-12; Educational Leadership K-12	2	3	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C A C D AMO High Standards Rdg. 44 85 38 31 High Standards Math 44 89 37 35 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 61 78 67 56 Lrng Gains-Math 61 81 68 66 Gains-Rdg-25% 75 78 84 73 Gains-Math-25% 68 83 74 73 Schools: Ronald Reagan/Doral Sr. High – 2012 (Assistant Principal) North Miami Middle – 2011 (Assistant Principal) Young Women's Prep. – 2010 (Lead Teacher) Jose De Diego Middle – 2009-2008 (Counselor)
Assis Principal	Tony Ullivarri	Bachelor's Degree in Education, Masters Degree in Education, Specialist in Educational Leadership Certified in Mathematics 5-9, Educational Leadership K-12	4	6	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A AMO High Standards Rdg. 6063 55 59 High Standards Math 86 87 85 61 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 6068 59 64 Lrng Gains-Math 7583 79 70 Gains-Rdg-25% 6164 50 68 Gains-Math-25% 65 76 75 72 Schools: Ronald Reagan/Doral Sr. High – 2009- Present (Assistant Principal) West Miami Middle – 2008-2009 (Assistant Principal)
Assis Principal	Calvin Buchanan	Bachelor's Degree in English, Master's Degree in English, Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership Certified in English 6-12 and Educational Leadership K-12	2	3	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade D A A A AMO High Standards Rdg. 16 63 74 70 High Standards Math 47 87 71 71 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 34 68 69 67 Lrng Gains-Math 59 83 66 75 Gains-Rdg-25% 48 64 76 66 Gains-Math-25% 58 76 68 75 Schools: Ronald Reagan/Doral Sr. High – 2012 (Assistant Principal) Miami Central Senior High – 2011 (Assistant Principal) Ronald Reagan/Doral Sr. High – 2010 (Administrative Asst.) Howard McMillan Middle – 2009-2008 (Teacher)

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					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	J. Bentolila, Principal	06/2013	
2	2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff.	E. Cabrera, Assistant Principal	06/2013	
3	3. Soliciting referrals from current employees	J. Bentolila, Principal	06/2013	
4	4. Professional Learning Communities	Curriculum Leaders	06/2013	

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
7 Out-of-Field 1 Non-Highly Effective	The teachers will be informed of the subject area certification examination for that is needed for them to be considered highly qualified. Also, they will be informed of upcoming test tutorial sessions that are offered twice a year by the Assistant Principal for Curriculum.

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
96	1.0%(1)	21.9%(21)	52.1%(50)	25.0%(24)	46.9%(45)	99.0%(95)	5.2%(5)	7.3%(7)	12.5%(12)

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			

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

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.

MTSS/RtI is an extension of Ronald Reagan/Doral's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic

examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.

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

- Administrator(s) who will ensure commitment and allocate resources;
- Teacher(s) and Coaches will extend and report on meeting the goals of the leadership team at grade level, subject area, and intervention group, problem solving

• Team members who will meet to review consensus, infrastructure, and implementation of building level.

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

- School reading, math, science, and behavior specialists
- Special education personnel
- School guidance counselor
- School psychologist
- School social worker
- Member of advisory group

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

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

There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data. The MTSS/RtI four step problem-solving models will be used to plan, monitor, and revise instruction and intervention. The four steps are problem identification, problem analysis, intervention implementation, and response evaluation.

The MTSS/RtI members at Ronald Reagan/Doral Senior High are: Dr. Jacques Bentollla, Principal; Elena Cabrera, Assistant Principal; Tony Ullivarri, Assistant Principal; Calvin Buchanan, Assistant Principal; Christopher Quarles, Assistant Principal; Lillian Sosa Fernandez, ELL Dept. Chair; Myra McKee, SWD Dept. Chair; Maite Lopez, Student Services Dept. Chair; and Vanessa Dager, TRUST Counselor. MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. MTSS/RtI uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.

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

The Leadership Team will:

1. Use the Tier 1 Problem Solving process to set Tier 1 goals, monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress at least three times per year by addressing the following important questions:

- What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
- What progress is expected in each core area?
- How will we determine if students have made expected levels of progress towards proficiency? (common assessments)
- How will we respond when grades, subject areas, or class of, or individual students have not learned? (Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
- How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (Enrichment opportunities).

2. Gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by group or individual student diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment.

3. Hold regular team meetings. Use the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success.

4. Gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM.

5. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.

6. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.

7. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.

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

1. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.

2. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.

3. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

The leadership team will consider data the end of year Tier 1 problem solving.

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.

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

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

2. Managed data will include:

Academic

- FAIR assessment through PMRN (Reading)
- Interim assessments through Edusoft (Reading, Mathematics & Science)
- State/Local Math and Science assessments
- FCAT 2.0
- EOC (Algebra, Geometry, Biology & US History)
- Student grades
- School site specific mini benchmark assessments

Behavior

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

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

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during secondary early release days and during professional learning communities (PLC) meetings. The goal of professional development is to provide support for school staff to understand the basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures. Moreover, full implementation of MTSS/RtI problem solving model.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS will be supported in the following ways:

- Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following important questions:
- Gather and analyze data to determine effective professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention

and achievement needs.

- Hold monthly leadership team meetings.
 - Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, and updating them on procedures and progress.
 - Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
 - Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
- Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal selects team members for the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) based on a cross section of the faculty and administrative team that represents highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum. The team will meet monthly throughout the school year. School Literacy Leadership Team may choose to meet more often. Additionally, the principal may expand the LLT by encouraging personnel from various sources such as District and Regional support staff to join.

The Literacy Leadership Team is comprised of the following members:

Jacques Bentolilla, Principal
Elena Cabrera, Assistant Principal
Tony Ullivarri, Assistant Principal
Calvin Buchanan, Assistant Principal
Christopher Quarles, Assistant Principal
Lourdes Montiel, Curriculum Leader Information Communication and Technology
FernandoCollar, Curriculum Leader Fine Arts
Alicia Romero, Curriculum Leader Fine Arts
Lillian Sosa Fernandez, Curriculum Leader ELL
Maria Cabra, Curriculum Leader Foreign Languages
Allison Ibarra, Curriculum Leader Language Arts
LissetteGonzalez, Curriculum Leader Mathematics
Marilyn Gonzalez, Curriculum Leader Reading
Michael Russ, Curriculum Leader Science
Yesenia Santos, Curriculum Leader Science
Stephen Parris, Curriculum Leader Social Studies
Ana Pol, Curriculum Leader Gifted
Mayra McKee, Curriculum Leader Special Education
Ana Medina, Media Specialist

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

The principal will cultivate the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by being an active participant in all Literacy Leadership Team meetings and activities. During school site visits, the District team will review the minutes from LLT meetings and have a dialogue with principals regarding the meetings. The principal will provide necessary resources to the LLT. The reading coaches will share their expertise in reading instruction, and assessment and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. The reading coaches will work with the Literacy Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP. The reading coaches will provide motivation and promote a spirit of collaboration within the Literacy Leadership Team to create a school-wide focus on literacy and reading achievement by establishing model classrooms; conferencing with teachers and administrators; and providing professional development.

At Ronald Reagan/Doral Sr. High, we will meet once a month to discuss ways to enhance literacy across the curriculum, make curriculum decisions, and address all school wide needs or issues that pertain to literacy. We implemented a required summer reading per grade level and a suggestive summer reading for students to help establish a reading club. We discussed having a Curriculum Fair and different Literacy Events. Our goal is to develop a school wide literacy plan as part of the school improvement plan. We want to create a capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on the areas of literacy concern across the school.

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

The principal will promote the LLT as an integral part of the school literacy reform to promote a culture of reading by:

- including representation from all curricular areas on the LLT
- selecting team members who are skilled and committed to improving literacy
- offering professional growth opportunities for team members
- creating a collaborative environment that fosters sharing and learning
- developing a schoolwide organizational model that supports literacy instruction in all classes
- encouraging the use of data to improve teaching and student achievement

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.

Every department is responsible for "Reading Across the Curriculum", and every teacher will focus on infusing the reading benchmarks in their content areas. Over 50% percent of our teachers have been CRISS trained. Remedial instruction is offered for students retaking the FALL and Spring FCAT through the after-school tutoring and the Administrative Team will monitor the implementation

*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?

The school incorporates applied and integrated courses by supporting student success through organized work-based learning experiences (on-the-job training, internships, and job shadows) in collaboration with our parents/guardians, community, and business partners at Ronald Reagan/Doral Senior High school. Work-based learning activities are designed to provide the student with practical training and skills needed to function in the workplace. Students gain practical, first-hand knowledge through a structured internship experience in which they are able to integrate occupational and academic skills. The school offers students elective courses in art, technology, and Industry Certification. Many of these courses focus on job skills.

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?

Articulation agreements allow students to earn college credits in high school and provide more opportunities for students to complete 2 and 4 year postsecondary degrees. Readiness for post secondary education or work will strengthen with the integration of academic and career technical components and a coherent sequence of courses.

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](#)

Given an analysis of the High School Feedback Report, it indicated that Ronald W. Reagan/Doral Sr. High had a higher rate than both the district and the state in the following pre-graduation indicators: percent of 2010 graduates who scored at level

3 or higher on the 10th grade FCAT in both Reading and Math, percent of 2010 graduates completing a college prep-curriculum, percent of 2010 graduates who were eligible for the maximum Bright Futures award, percent of 2010 graduates who completed at least one AP, IB, AICE, or Dual Enrollment course, percent of 2010 graduates completing at least one level 3 high school math course, percent of 2010 graduates completing at least one level 3 high school science course, percent of 2010 graduates who took the PSAT, percent of 2010 graduates who took the SAT, percent 2010 graduates who took and scored at above college level in all three subjects on the SAT, percent 2010 graduates enrolled in a Florida public postsecondary institution, percent 2010 graduates at a community college in Florida, percent 2010 graduates enrolled in college credit courses at a Florida public postsecondary institution earning a GPA above 2.0, percent 2010 graduates enrolled college credit courses at independent colleges and University of Florida earning a GPA above 2.0, of the graduates enrolled in a Math course in Florida in Fall—the percent who successfully completed Remedial Math, Entry-Level Math, and other College-level English.

The following are strategies that have proven to be effective for Ronald W. Reagan/Doral Sr. High's student population and we will continue to implement in the 2012—2013 school year:

- Arranging for all tenth grade students to take the PSAT in October, and provide the opportunity for any ninth and eleventh grade student who might be interested in taking the PSAT.
- Students in eleventh and twelfth grade will be provided with SAT preparation for the verbal section of the examination through their Language Arts classes.
- Students will participate in career planning through the state's www.flvc.org website - completing the EPEP, portfolio, interest inventory, and monitoring their Bright Futures award eligibility.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 25% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 6 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (277)	31% (343)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application	Students will read from a wide variety of grade level fiction and non-fiction texts utilizing grade appropriate novels and the textbook. Students will practice identifying main idea, relevant details, author's purpose, author's point of view and bias, comparisons, cause and effect, text structures and organizational patterns within and across texts utilizing graphic organizers and marginal note-taking. Students will participate in grade level and benchmark specific Bell ringers that will address the specific benchmarks included in this reporting category. All students enrolled in Language Arts and Reading will be required to complete Reading Plus activities on a weekly basis	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, teachers, administrators, and the Literacy Leadership Team will monitor ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' developing knowledge of Main Idea/Details, Comparisons, Cause/Effect, Author's Purpose and Point of View.	Formative: District Interim Assessments Quarterly Benchmark Exams Reading Plus Reports FAIR Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis/Fiction/Non-fiction	Students will read from a wide variety of grade level fiction and non-fiction texts utilizing grade appropriate novels and the textbook. Strong emphasis will be placed on utilizing poetry and graphic organizers in order for students to	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, teachers, administrators, and the Literacy Leadership Team will monitor ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' developing knowledge character development, point of view, descriptive	Formative: District Interim Assessments Quarterly Benchmark Exams Reading Plus Reports FAIR Reports

2		<p>identify and analyze examples of descriptive and figurative language. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to identify and interpret elements of story structure within a fictional text. Help students understand character development and character point of view using questioning strategies from the grade level appropriate textbook and grade level appropriate texts such as "What does he think, what is his attitude toward, ... and what did he say that lets me know? Teachers will utilize non-fiction text in order for students to identify text features and how those features impact the text.</p> <p>Students will participate in grade level and benchmark specific Bell ringers that will address the specific benchmarks included in this reporting category.</p> <p>All students enrolled in Language Arts and Reading will be required to complete Reading Plus activities on a weekly basis</p>		language, literary devices, etc.	Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment.
3	An area deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 Informational Text/Research Process	<p>Students will read from a wide variety of grade level informational texts in order to identify and analyze reliability and validity of sources, identify text features and analyze their impact on the text, and synthesize, analyze, and evaluate information within and across texts in order to make inferences and draw conclusions</p> <p>Students will participate in grade level and benchmark specific Bell ringers that will address the specific benchmarks included in this reporting category.</p> <p>All students enrolled in Language Arts and Reading will be required to complete Reading Plus activities on a weekly basis.</p>	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, classroom teachers and administrators will monitor ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' research and application of research in assigned papers and projects.	<p>Formative: District Interim Assessments Quarterly Benchmark Exams Reading Plus Reports FAIR Reports</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment.</p>

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:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 35% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 38%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (387)	38%(420)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area that showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis/Fiction/Non-fiction	Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities utilizing appropriate grade level material that include exploring shades of meaning through the use of specific diction by the author, analyzing an author's use of literary devices through imagery to relay meaning, and recognizing and identifying the speaker, occasion, audience, purpose, subject, and tone of utilized texts	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, classroom teachers and administrators will monitor ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' developing knowledge and skills in recognizing and analyzing an author's use of figurative language as well as his/her point of view and purpose	Formative: District Interim Assessments Quarterly Benchmark Exams Reading Plus Reports FAIR Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment purpose
	The area that showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application	Utilize grade level texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining and or explaining. In addition, use text features	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, classroom teachers and administrators will monitor ongoing classroom Assessments and review of data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention	Formative: District Interim Assessments Quarterly Benchmark Exams Reading Plus Reports FAIR Reports

2		(subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc.) to interpret, locate, and gather information in order to interpret Main Idea, Supporting Details, Causes and Effects, Comparisons, and Author's Purpose and Point of View		as needed.	Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment
3	The area that showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting Category 4 Informational Text/Research Process	Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include building strong arguments to support answers to a variety of relevant and grade level appropriate topics through the use of a variety of sources located and gathered during library research sessions.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, classroom teachers and administrators will monitor ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' research and application of research in assigned papers and projects.	Formative: District Interim Assessments Quarterly Benchmark Exams Reading Plus Reports FAIR Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 FAA Reading Test indicate that 100% of students scored at level 7 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school years is to increase students achieving level 7 or higher by 25% .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% scored at level 7.	25% to improve to a level higher than 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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA was in vocabulary.	Vocabulary will be introduced to students with pictures and print. Pictures will be faded for long term comprehension and retention.	SPED Dept. Chair Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM and formative assessments through Reading Plus Program the LLT team will review data reports to ensure progress is being made.	Formative: Access points assessments every nine weeks. Reading Plus data Reports Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative 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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 74% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 79%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

74% (715)			79% (763)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis/Fiction/Non-fiction	Devise a more systematic computer lab schedule to assist in optimizing computer based learning. Reading Plus will be utilized to enhance skills through lab time as well as home learning assignments on a weekly basis.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, classroom teachers and administrators will monitor ongoing classroom Assessments and review Reading Plus data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: District Interim Assessments Quarterly Benchmark Exams Reading Plus Reports FAIR Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 FAA Reading Test indicate that 100% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school years is to increase students achieving learning gains by 25% scoring higher than a level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% at independent reading level.	25% increase to a level 8 in independent reading level.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the administration of the FAA was higher level comprehension.	Devise a more systematic computer lab schedule to assist in optimizing computer based learning. Reading Plus will be utilized to enhance skills through lab time as well as home learning assignments on a weekly basis.	SPED Dept. Chair Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM and formative assessments through Reading Plus Program the LLT team will review data reports to ensure progress is being made.	Formative: Access Points assessment every nine weeks. Reading Plus Program data reports to ensure progress is being made. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative 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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 76% in the Lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 81%.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (192)	81% (205)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need additional attention to Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis. Additional instructional support in the Intensive Reading classrooms is needed.	Identify the Lowest 25% subgroup and inform teachers, so that they can differentiate instruction with Literary Analysis: Fiction and Non Fiction. Also, the Lowest 25% will be targeted for tutorial services with a focus on Literary Analysis. Reading Plus will be utilized to enhance skills through lab time as well as home learning assignments on a weekly basis.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, classroom teachers and administrators will monitor ongoing classroom Assessments and review of Reading Plus and FAIR data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: District Interim Assessments Quarterly Benchmark Exams Reading Plus Reports FAIR Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # Our goal is to decrease by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	70	73	75	78	81	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 61% of the students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students proficiency by 11 percentage points to 72%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Hispanic: 61% (5)	Hispanic: 72% (700)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Hispanic: As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test,	Identify students and place in appropriate intervention within two	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative	Using the FCIM, classroom teachers and administrators will	Formative: District Interim Assessments

1	the Hispanic subgroup did not make AYP specifically because of lack of knowledge with Literacy Analysis: Fiction and NonFiction.	weeks of the administration of the District Baseline Interim Assessment and monitor student progress via data. Emphasize character point of view, theme and figurative language.	Team	monitor ongoing classroom Assessments and review of data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Quarterly Benchmark Exams Reading Plus Reports FAIR Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment.
---	--	--	------	--	---

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 25% of the students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students' proficiency by 25 percentage points to 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (50)	50% (101)

Problem-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 in the ELL subgroup lack the vocabulary necessary to be successful readers. Category 1: Vocabulary. Students need additional support identifying and understanding the meaning of conceptually advanced prefixes, suffixes, and root words.	Students will utilize concept maps, word walls, and personal dictionaries to help build their knowledge of word meanings and relationships. Students will also receive explicit instruction in multiple-meaning words and in prefixes, suffixes, and root words.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM and ongoing classroom Assessments Data chats Adjust intervention as needed Student Work Folders	Formative: District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment.

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 32% of the students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students' proficiency by 14 percentage points to 46%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32%(15)	46%(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
	Students in the SWD	Students will utilize	Literacy Leadership	Using the FCIM and	Formative:

1	subgroup lack the vocabulary necessary to be successful readers.	concept maps, word walls, and personal dictionaries to help build their knowledge of word meanings and relationships. Students will also receive explicit instruction in multiple-meaning words and in prefixes, suffixes, and root words.	Team (LLT) Administrative Team	ongoing classroom Assessments to review data reports and ensure progress is being made. Adjust intervention as needed.	District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment.
---	--	--	--------------------------------	--	--

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 59% of the students in the ED subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students' proficiency by 7 percentage points to 66%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (278)	66% (311)

Problem-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 in the ED subgroup are deficient in Reporting Category 4: Informational Text/Research Process in the ability to fully employ critical thinking strategies needed to consistently locate, ascertain, interpret and categorize data in order to effectively determine the validity and reliability of text.	Create bell work activities, that address a variety of real world documents and texts that will permit them to explore, locate, interpret and organize information as part of the Informational Text/Research Process reporting category.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM and ongoing classroom Assessments to review data reports and ensure progress is being made. Adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: District Interim Assessments Quarterly Benchmark Exams Reading Plus Reports FAIR Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 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
Reading Plus	9/10	Marilyn Gonzalez	English teachers in grade 9/10	November 6, 2012	Data Report debriefing	Administration and Curriculum Leader
Common Core Standards	9-12	Allison Ibarra	English teachers	February 1, 2013	Sample Lesson Plan	Administration and Curriculum Leader

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Cambridge AICE Program	Assessments	SBBS (02 Account)	\$9,000.00
Cambridge AICE Program	Textbooks	SBBS (02 Account)	\$3,500.00
			Subtotal: \$12,500.00
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: \$12,500.00

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:	<p>The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 55% of the ELL students achieved proficient level in the Listening/Speaking section .</p> <p>Our goal for the 2012- 2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students that show improvement as measured by the CELLA by 2 percentage points to 57%.</p>
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
55%(194)	
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	Limited class time allotted to oral activities which allow students to participate frequently in speaking academic language.	The teacher will encourage students to speak in class as much as possible by structuring conversations around books and subjects that build vocabulary and will ask open-ended questions.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM and ongoing classroom Assessments to review data reports and ensure progress is being made. Department Meetings Student Grades	Formative: District Interim Assessments Achieve 3000 Data Reports Summative: 2013 CELLA

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 38% of the ELL students achieved proficient level in the Reading section .

Our goal for the 2012- 2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students that show improvement as measured by the CELLA by 5 percentage points to 43%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

38%(132)

Problem-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	Change instructional activities. Insufficient time in computer lab. Absences.	The teacher will use the Reading Question Task Cards and Reciprocal Teaching strategies to develop and reinforce the student's abilities to understand and respond to texts. The teacher will use Differentiated Instruction regularly. Students will complete a minimum of 2 articles in Achieve 3000 on a weekly basis. Intervention to improve attendance.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM and ongoing classroom Assessments to review data reports and ensure progress is being made. Student Work Folders Department Meetings Debriefing of Interim Test Results Lesson Plans	Formative: District Interim Assessments Achieve 3000 Data Reports Summative: 2013 CELLA

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 33% of the ELL students achieved proficient level in the Writing section .

Our goal for the 2012- 2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students that show improvement as measured by the CELLA by 5 percentage points to 38%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

33%
(115)

Problem-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	Fidelity of instruction	The teacher will use Bell Ringers to promote student creativity in writing. Encourage students to interact with texts and communicate in written form through use of student workbooks	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM and ongoing classroom Assessments to review data reports and ensure progress is being made. Student Work Folders Debriefing of Interim Test Results Student Grades	Formative: Monthly Writing Assessments w/Rubrics District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA

CELLA Budget:

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

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:	Algebra 1 Using the 2011 Algebra 1 EOC data, our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the number of who score Level 3 by 5 percentage points to 58%. Geometry Using the 2011-2012 Baseline data, our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase students meeting Level 3 proficiency by 10 percentage points to 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Algebra 1 53% (222) Geometry 0%	Algebra 1 58% (242) Geometry 10% (68)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2010- 2011 administration of the Algebra 1 EOC Test was Content Area 1. Students need improvement in functions, linear equations, and inequalities. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 Geometry baseline data is two dimensional geometry. Students need improvement on properties of polygons, parallel and perpendicular lines, and circles	Common departmental bellringers will be used in Algebra 1 and Geometry classes, based on problems from the respective Item Specifications. In addition, teachers will be trained in using meaning in real-world context to develop students' problem-solving skills.	Administration Curriculum Leader	Following the FCIM model, monitor the results of bi-weekly and interim assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments and District Interim Assessments Summative: Algebra 1 & Geometry EOC
2	There is little time for teachers to individualize course work to remediate student deficiencies.	E2020 will be utilized by Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers in order to remediate individual student's weaknesses.	Administration Curriculum Leader	Monitor computer labs to ensure that they are being utilized for e2020 and students activity reports.	Formative: Bi-weekly reports of student activity on e2020. Summative: Algebra 1 & Geometry EOC

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Algebra 1 Using the 2010-2011 Algebra 1 EOC data, our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the number of students Level 4 and 5 by 5 percentage points to 58%. Geometry Using the 2011-2012 Baseline data, our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase students meeting Level 4 and 5 proficiency by 0 percentage points to 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Algebra 1 53% (222) Geometry 0%	Algebra 1 58% (242) Geometry 10% (68)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2010-2011 administration of the Algebra 1 EOC Test was Content Area 3. Most teachers did not have time to cover Rationals, Radicals, and Quadratics. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 Geometry baseline data is three-dimensional geometry. Students need improvement surface area, volume, and cross-sections of solids.	Teachers will meet at least once per month to ensure that everyone teaching Algebra 1 honors is keeping up with the Pacing Guide in order to reach Content Area 3 before the Alg 1 EOC in May and concentrating on the areas of Rationals, Radicals and Quadratics. Teachers will assign more real life projects in which students must construct 3-dimensional solids in order to develop students' spacial-visual perception.	Curriculum Leader	Following the FCIM model, monitor the results of bi-weekly and interim assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments and District Interim Assessments Summative: Algebra 1 EOC

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.	
---	--

Mathematics Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:		N/A		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

No Data Submitted

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	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				

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 : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:	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				

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:	Using the 2010-2011 Algebra 1 EOC and 10th Grade FCAT results, our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the number of ELL students to meet proficiency by 4% to 69%. Geometry Using the 2011-2012 Baseline data, our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase students meeting Level 4 and 5 proficiency by 3 percentage points to 69%.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Algebra 65% (60) Geometry 65% (60)	Algebra 69% (64) Geometry 69% (64)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	There is a language barrier for students in ESOL levels 1 and 2. Therefore, their barrier is Math Vocabulary for Algebra and Geometry .	Teachers will be trained in online textbook resources available to Spanish-speaking students and focus on Math vocabulary. Additionally, National Honor Society will be offering peer tutoring after school, in Spanish, for the Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC ELL students.	National Honor Society Sponsor Administration	Monitor the results from the posttest assessment. An attendance log will be maintained. Tutors will follow the Success Academy lesson plans.	Formative: Weekly Success Academy assessments. Summative: Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	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				

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		N/A			
Mathematics Goal #5E:					
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				

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.		The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 29% of the students achieved a level 4-6 in math.			
Mathematics Goal #1:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year, is to increase the percentage of student proficiency by 15 percentage points to 85% scoring higher than a 4-6			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
29%in level 4-6		Decrease to 15% in level 4-6			

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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FAA administration was repetition for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurements.	Students must have continuous review/practice when learning math concepts.	SPED Dept. Chair Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Access Points Assessments every nine weeks. Using the FCIM and ongoing classroom Assessments to review data reports and ensure progress is being made.	Formative: Access Points Assessments every nine weeks. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative 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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.		The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 71% of the students achieved a level 7-9 in math.			
---	--	--	--	--	--

Mathematics Goal #2:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year, is to increase the percentage of student proficiency by 15 percentage points to 85% scoring in the independent range			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
71%		85%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FAA administration was using guided discussion to engage students in real life math problems	Students must have continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts.	SPED Dept. Chair Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Formative assessments through "i-ready" computer program. Access Points Assessments every nine weeks. Using the FCIM and ongoing classroom Assessments to review data reports and ensure progress is being made.	Formative: Assessments and data collection through the "i-ready" computer program for math. Access Points Assessments every nine weeks. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative 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:

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics.		The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 71% of the students achieved a level 7-9 in math.			
Mathematics Goal #3:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year, is to increase the percentage of student proficiency by 15 percentage points to 85% scoring in the independent range			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
71%		85%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FAA administration was using guided discussion to engage students in real life math problems	Students must have continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts.	SPED Dept. Chair Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Formative assessments through "i-ready" computer program. Access Points Assessments every nine weeks. Using the FCIM and ongoing classroom Assessments to review data reports and ensure progress is being made.	Formative assessments and data collection through the "i-ready" computer program for math. Access Points Assessments every nine weeks. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment

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 2012 Algebra 1 EOC indicate that 37% of the students achieved a level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year, is to increase the percentage of student achieving level 3 proficiency by 3percentage points to40%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (130)	40% (142)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 -2012 administration of the Algebra 1 EOC Test was Content Area 2: Polynomials.	CommonAlgebra 1 bellringers will be used in Algebra 1 classes, based on Polynomial problems from the Item Specifications.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Following the FCIM model, the LLT will monitor the results of bi-weekly and interim assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Algebra 1 EOC
2	There is little time for teachers to individualize course work to remediate student deficiencies.	E2020 will be utilized by Algebra 1 teachers in order to remediate individual student's weaknesses.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Following the FCIM, the LLT will monitor computer labs to ensure that they are being utilized for e2020 and student activity reports.	Formative: Bi-weekly reports of student activity on e2020. Summative: 2013 Algebra 1 EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The results of 2012 Algebra 1 EOC exam indicate that 13% of the students achieved levels 4 & 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving at levels 4 & 5 proficiency, by 1 percentage points to 14%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (46)	14% (50)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012. Administration of the	Teachers will meet at least once per month to ensure that everyone	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative	Following the FCIM model, the LLT will monitor the results of bi-	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments and

1	Algebra 1 EOC Test was Content Area 3. Teachers did not have time to cover on Rationals, Radicals, and Quadratics.	teaching Algebra 1 Honors is keeping up with the Pacing Guide in order to reach Content Area 3 before the Algebra 1 EOC in May and concentrating on the areas of Rationals, Radicals and Quadratics.	Team	weekly and interim assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Algebra 1 EOC
---	--	--	------	--	---

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Algebra Goal # Our goal is to decrease by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	43	48	54	59	64	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.					
Algebra Goal #3B:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.		NA			
Algebra Goal #3C:					
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
No Data Submitted				

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	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
No Data Submitted				

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	The results of 2012 Geometry EOC indicate that 30% of the students achieved a level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year, is to increase the percentage of student achieving a level 3 proficiency by 2 percentage points to 29%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (199)	32% (215)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 Geometry EOC is Content Area 2: 3-D Geometry. Students need improvement on the concept of Surface Area, Volume, Nets, and Cross- Sections of solids.	Common Geometry bell ringers will be used in Geometry classes, focused on 3-D problems from the respective Item Specifications.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Following the FCIM model, monitor the results of bi-weekly and interim assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Geometry EOC
2	Students have poor spacial visual perception.	projects that require students to create 3-D models. Visual arts teachers will assign work using real-world context to develop students' problem-solving skills Visual Arts teachers (Ceramics and Art 2D/3D) will assign real life projects in which students must construct 3-dimensional solids in order to develop students' spacial-visual perception. Visual Arts teachers (2D/ Drawing and Painting) will design lessons to develop spacial-visual perception and its translation onto paper.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Following the FCIM model, monitor the results of bi-weekly and interim assessments and adjust instruction as needed. Projects displayed in classroom.	Formative: Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Geometry EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	The results of 2012 Geometry EOC indicate that 37% of the students achieved levels 4 & 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving at levels 4 & 5 proficiency by 1 percentage points to 38%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

37% (248)					38% (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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 Geometry EOC is Content Area 3: Trigonometry.	Teachers will assign more real life projects that require students to calculate measurements using Trigonometry.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Following the FCIM model, monitor the results of bi-weekly and interim assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Geometry EOC
2	Students do not know how to use the Trig. Functions (including the inverse Trig. functions) on a scientific calculator.	Teachers will encourage and model the use of scientific calculators in class.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Following the FCIM model, monitor the results of bi-weekly and interim assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Geometry EOC

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target					
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Geometry Goal # Our goal is to decrease by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0. 3A :			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	48	54	59	64	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:					
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			NA		
Geometry Goal #3B:					
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	
No Data Submitted					

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.		NA		
Geometry Goal #3C:				
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
No Data Submitted				

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.		NA		
Geometry Goal #3D:				
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
No Data Submitted				

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.		NA		
Geometry Goal #3E:				
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
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
E2020 Training	Algebra 1 Grade 9	Susan Wonder	Algebra 1 Team Geometry Team	10/9 or 10/23	Teachers will monitor and print bi-weekly reports of student activity on e2020.	Administration Curriculum Leader
Algebra 1 & Geometry Dialogues	Grade 9 & 10	L. Gonzalez	Algebra 1 Team Geometry Team Algebra 2 Team	9/25, 10/9, 10/23, 10/25, 11/13, 12/13, 1/15, 1/29, 2/14, 3/12	Classroom visitations	Administration Curriculum Leader

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Cambridge AICE Program	Assessments	SBBS (02 Account)	\$3,000.00
Cambridge AICE Program	Textbooks	SBBS (02 Account)	\$3,500.00
			Subtotal: \$6,500.00
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: \$6,500.00

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 Biology Baseline Assessment 0% of students met proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase proficiency by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Biology 0% (1)	Biology 10% (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	Students are entering with underdeveloped preexisting knowledge in the Nature of Science question group.	Incorporate the use of daily bell work/start up activities to review/reteach Nature of Science question group. Increase use of Gizmo's aligned with pacing guide.	Administration	Monitor the results of student assessments and Gizmo Data reports and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative Assessments: Interim assessments and Gizmo reports. Summative Assessments on the Biology EOC.
2	Students are exhibiting deficiency in Reading/Writing comprehension based on writing samples and lab reports.	Writing across the curriculum with the Language Arts department with emphasis on writing authentic lab reports	Administration	Monitor the cross curriculum writing projects during walkthrough visits.	Formative Assessments: Interim assessments. Summative Assessments on the Biology EOC

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	The results of 2012FAA showed 100% of the students scoring in the independent level of 7 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year, is to increase the percentage of student achieving a level 7 proficiency by 50% to a level 8
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% at level 7	Increase 50% to a level 8

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points	Students need text and pictures from exploration and identification of key scientific concepts.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team SPED Dept. Chair	Formative assessments using access points.	Data results and review from access points formative assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	On the Biology Baseline Assessment 0% of students met proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase proficiency by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Biology 0% (1)	Biology 10% (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	Students are not exposed to Higher Order Thinking to solve real world questions/problems.	Development and incorporation of Scientific Heuristic Writing (SWH) techniques in lab write-ups.	Administration	Based on the Scientific Heuristic Writing (SWH) rubric developed by Hands et al. (1999), student higher order thinking will be demonstrated via lab activities and write-ups.	Formative Assessments: Interim assessments. EduSoft Reports Lab Reports and Lab Write-up in composition notebook. Summative Assessments on the Biology EOC

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.		NA		
Science Goal #1:				
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
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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.		The results of 2012FAA showed 100% of the students scoring in the independent level of 7 or higher.			
Science Goal #2:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year, is to increase the percentage of student achieving a level 7 proficiency by 50% to a level 8			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
100% at level 7		Increase 50% to a level 8			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points	Students need text and pictures from exploration and identification of key scientific concepts.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team SPED Dept. Chair	Formative assessments using access points.	Data results and review from access points formative assessments. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment

Biology 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 Biology. Biology Goal #1:	The result of the 2012 Biology I EOC Exam indicated that 31 percent of students received achievement level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student level 3 proficiency by 2 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31%(172)	33%(185)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the Biology I EOC was the cluster on Molecular and Cellular Biology.	Incorporate the use of daily bell work/start up activities to review/reteach Molecular/Cellular Biology. Increase the use of Gizmo's aligned with the benchmarks on Molecular/Cellular Biology. Both Bellringers and Gizmo's are aligned with District Pacing Guides. Students required to keep a journal/section of notebook for ECO Bellringers ONLY.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Following the FCIM model, the LLT will monitor the results of bi-weekly and interim assessments and adjust instruction as needed. Student scores on assessment. Teacher Data Chats to determine best practice to increase student proficiency.	Formative: District Interm assessments. Summative: 2013 Biology I EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	The result of the 2012 Biology I EOC Exam indicated that 37 percent of students received achievement levels 4 & 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student level 4 and 5 proficiency by 15 percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37%(205)	38%(211)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as noted on the Biology I EOC was the cluster on Molecular and Cellular Biology.	Incorporate the use of daily bell work/start up activities to review/reteach Molecular/Cellular Biology.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Following the FCIM model, the LLT will monitor the results of bi-weekly and interim assessments and adjust instruction as	Formative: District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Biology I EOC

1		Increase the use of Gizmo's aligned with the benchmarks on Molecular/Cellular Biology. Both Bellringers and Gizmo's are aligned with District Pacing Guides. Students required to keep a journal/section of notebook for ECO Bellringers ONLY.		needed. Student scores on assessment. Teacher Data Chats to determine best practice to increase student proficiency.	
---	--	--	--	--	--

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
Data Analysis	Science	APC/Science Department Chair	All Science Teachers	November 6, 2012	Analyzing data in subject level departmental meetings.	Science Department Chair
Data Chats	Science	Science Department Chair	All Science Teachers	February 1, 2013	Analyzing data in subject level departmental meetings.	Science Department Chair
Using Data to Drive Instruction	9-12	Elena Cabrera	Science teachers	May 2, 2013	Data Report debriefing	Administration and Curriculum Leader

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Lab Reports	Lab Materials	SBBS (02 Account)	\$2,000.00
Cambridge AICE Program	Assessments	SBBS (02 Account)	\$8,000.00
Cambridge AICE Program	Textbooks	SBBS (02 Account)	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$13,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$13,000.00

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 91% scored level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase The percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher 1 percentage points from 91% to 92%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
91% (523)	92% (528)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Writing FCAT was elaboration of supporting details.	During writing instruction, students will develop writing techniques that will focus on the use of figurative and descriptive language to convey style and tone. In addition, students will use supporting details such as concrete examples,, real life examples, and anecdotes by using graphic organizers to plan their writing and elaboration of supporting evidence.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, classroom teachers and administrators will administer and score, as well as monitor, monthly writing prompts to monitor student progress.	Formative: District Baseline Data and monthly writing prompts Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Writing FCAT was conventions.	Students will complete Bell ringer activities that will focus instruction on subject/verb and pronoun/antecedent agreement, sentence structure, improving sentences and paragraphs, word choice, punctuation, and capitalization and spelling.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, classroom teachers and administrators will administer and monitor quizzes and tests bi-weekly focused on grammatical area of instruction.	Formative: District Baseline Data and monthly writing prompts, bi-weekly quizzes or tests 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:	The results of 2012 FAA showed 30% scoring a level 6, 30% scoring a level 7, and 30% scoring a level 8. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year, is to increase the percentage of student by 50% scoring a level 7 or higher.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
100% scoring a level 6 or higher			100% scoring a level 7 or higher		
Problem-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	Train teachers to effectively implement Access point and teach students to use graphic organizers with pictures to draft their writing ideas.	Develop creative writing through journaling, letter writing, and/or applications and resumes.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team SPED Dept. Chair	Using the FCIM and the access points assessments, the LLT will monitor and evaluate progress	Formative assessments and data collection. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternative 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
FCAT Writing 2.0	9/10	Allison Ibarra	Language Arts teachers	November 7, 2012	Monthly Writing prompts/ team debriefing	Administration and Curriculum Leader
Using Data to Drive Instruction	9-12	Elena Cabrera	Language Arts and ESOL teachers	May 2, 2013	Data Report debriefing	Administration and Curriculum Leader

Writing Budget:

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

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.				
Civics Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History 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 U.S. History.		The results of 2012baseline US History EOC indicate that 0% of the students achieved at level 3 proficiency.			
U.S. History Goal #1:		Our goal is to have 10% of students receive level 3 proficiency on the 2013 US History EOC.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0% (1)		10% (44)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students have limited understanding and	Institute regular, on-going common planning	Literacy Leadership Team	Using the FCIM, the LLT will use data analysis of	Formative: District Interim

1	knowledge of the U.S. & the Defense of the International Peace.	for U.S. teachers to ensure that the U.S. History curriculum is taught with fidelity and is paced so as to address all State and District Benchmarks and curricular requirements.	(LLT) Administrative Team	assessments and compare benchmarks to evaluations.	Assessments Quarterly Exams developed by the Division of Social Sciences EduSoft Reports Summative: 2013 U.S. History EOC
---	---	---	---------------------------	--	---

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	The results of 2012baseline US. History EOC indicates that 0% of the students achieved at levels 4 & 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving at levels 4 & 5 proficiency by 10 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (1)	10% (44)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have limited understanding and knowledge of Historical Perspective.	Provide students with opportunities to discuss values, complexities, and dilemmas involved in social, political, and economic issues in history; assist students in developing well-reasoned positions on these issues.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, the LLT will use data analysis of assessments and compare benchmarks to evaluations.	Formative: District Interim Assessments Quarterly Exams developed by the Division of Social Sciences EduSoft Reports Summative: 2013 U.S. History EOC

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Analysis: US History Baseline Assessment	11th grade Social Studies	District	All U.S. History teachers	September 24, 2012	Evidence in Lesson Plans	Department Chair
District Pacing Guides and Item specifications	11th grade Social Studies	Department Chair	All U.S. History teachers	Department Meetings	Evidence in Lesson Plans	Department Chair

for the U.S. EOC Exam						
Using Data to Drive Instruction	9-12	Elena Cabrera	Social Studies teachers	May 2, 2013	Data Report debriefing	Administration and Curriculum Leader

U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Cambridge AICE Program	Assessments	SBBS (02 Account)	\$8,000.00
Cambridge AICE Program	Textbooks	SBBS (02 Account)	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$11,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$11,000.00

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase attendance to 95.49% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94.99% (2264)	95.49%(2276)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
805	765
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

903					858
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	There is a history of students arriving late to school or not attending school due to extended vacations out of the country.	New software will allow for better tracking of tardies and early releases to ensure reduction of absenteeism. A progressive discipline plan and counseling have been set up to decrease the amount of absences and tardies. Also, we will be meeting with the parents to reiterate policy and procedures.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team Attendance Committee	Using the FCIM, the Attendance Committee will use data analysis of the number of students who are tardy or absent each month.	COGNOS will be used to track the absences and tardies.

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						

Attendance Budget:

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the number of suspensions by 10% .
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
948	853
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
447	402
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
274	247
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
163	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	Lack of awareness of the new procedures and tardy tracking software may lead to a temporary increase of suspensions through the progressive discipline plan.	The TRUST Counselor/Administrators/ Assistant principal in charge of detentions/and-or CSI Instructor will offer counseling bi- weekly to students in indoor/outdoor suspension to decrease the amount of repeat offenders.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, the Student Services Dept. will use data analysis to compare the amount of suspended students in 2012 to the number of suspended students in 2013. The focus will be on the amount of students suspended multiple times. Administrators/ Assistant principal in charge of detentions/and-or CSI Instructor will analyze data every nine weeks to determine increase or decrease of detentions during those periods of time.	Comparison of data analyzed every nine weeks and final analysis of 2013 data at the end of the school year. ISIS system will be utilized to analyze the 2013 data at the end of the school year.

				The results will be used to determine other actions that help minimize students absences from class.
--	--	--	--	--

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						

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School - F.S., Sec. 1003.53

* 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. Dropout Prevention

Dropout Prevention Goal #1:

*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the dropout rate by 0.1 percentage points and to maintain the graduation rate at 89.8 percent.

2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
2.09%(50)	1.99%(47)
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
89.8% (442)	89.8% (442)

Problem-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 and students are not aware of the graduation requirements and current status of the student.	Credit histories and graduation requirements will be reviewed by the first month of school with parents and students.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team Student Services Team	Administrators will review the senior credit histories log.	The 2012-2013 graduation rate will indicate the number of students graduating and their future plans.
2	At-risk students are not enrolling in alternative programs.	Identify and meet with at-risk students and discuss the Student Progression Plan options and credit recovery programs.	MTSS/RtI Team Student Services Team	Monitor how many at-risk students register for an alternative program.	Enrollment Log

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
Graduation Requirements	9-12	Student Services Dept.	Parents & Students	October 10 – December16, 2012	Review sign-in sheets/logs to determine the number of parents attending.	School Administration

Dropout Prevention 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
Credit Check Forms	Colored Paper	SBBS (02 Account)	\$150.00
			Subtotal: \$150.00
			Grand Total: \$150.00

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of parents participating in school wide activities by 3 percentage points.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
35% (800)		38% (875)			
Problem-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 high school requirements.	Invite parents to Graduation Requirement meetings, AP meetings, and all education information meetings with personnel that speaks native language. Informational tidbits announced at the beginning of all concerts/school events to remind parents of things that are happening in the school. Flyers to be inserted in programs in both English/Spanish announcing and sharing vital information with parents.	Administrative Team Student Services Team	Administrators will monitor sign-in rosters to determine and ensure an increase in the number of parents attending school functions and/or meetings.	ConnectEd Phone Logs Sign-in Sheets / Agendas

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
Graduation Requirements	9-12	Student Services Dept.	Parents & Students	October 10 – December 16, 2012	Review sign-in sheets/logs to determine the number of parents attending.	School Administration

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 is to incorporate the following program, Junior Engineering Technical Society (JETS) in addition to the continuation of the 2011-2012 programs. Which are the following continue with the following programs: Florida International University Science Brain Bowl sponsored by US Department of Energy SECME (National Engineering Competition) District wide Science Fair
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	Students' exposure to up to date technology.	Participate in more competitions to expose students to advanced technology. Increasing higher order thinking	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team	Using the FCIM, the administrative team will monitor the participation in competitions. Amount of qualified students participating in events.	Participation in competitions

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						

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
	In 2011, we had a 60% passing rate in the Adobe Certified Associate Exam and a 33% passing rate in the

1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	ServSafe Exam. In 2012, we had an 85% passing rate in the Adobe Certified Associate Exam and a 66% passing rate in the ServSafe Exam. Therefore, on the Adobe Certified Associate Exam, we had an increase of 25percentage points and on the ServSafe Exam, we had an increase of 33 percentage points. Increase in the number of students completed a career and technical education program
------------------------	---

Problem-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 are not aware of the requirements needed to be an industry certified program completer.	The Student Services Department will target students to participate in the industry certification track and emphasize the requirements for a four year career plan.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Administrative Team Student Services Team	Using the FCIM, the administrative team will monitor the Student Services Logs to ensure that students who qualify for the Industry Certification Exams are registered.	The number of students in 2012-2013 that pass the industry certification exam and become program completers.

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						

CTE Budget:

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

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	Cambridge AICE Program	Assessments	SBBS (02 Account)	\$9,000.00
Reading	Cambridge AICE Program	Textbooks	SBBS (02 Account)	\$3,500.00
CELLA	NA			\$0.00
Mathematics	Cambridge AICE Program	Assessments	SBBS (02 Account)	\$3,000.00
Mathematics	Cambridge AICE Program	Textbooks	SBBS (02 Account)	\$3,500.00
Science	Lab Reports	Lab Materials	SBBS (02 Account)	\$2,000.00
Science	Cambridge AICE Program	Assessments	SBBS (02 Account)	\$8,000.00
Science	Cambridge AICE Program	Textbooks	SBBS (02 Account)	\$3,000.00
Writing	NA			\$0.00
U.S. History	Cambridge AICE Program	Assessments	SBBS (02 Account)	\$8,000.00
U.S. History	Cambridge AICE Program	Textbooks	SBBS (02 Account)	\$3,000.00
Attendance	NA			\$0.00
Suspension	NA			\$0.00
Parent Involvement	NA			\$0.00
STEM	NA			\$0.00
CTE	NA			\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$43,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Dropout Prevention	Credit Check Forms	Colored Paper	SBBS (02 Account)	\$150.00
				Subtotal: \$150.00
				Grand Total: \$43,150.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

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
Incentives (recognition, awards, etc.)	\$2,999.00
EESAC will review proposals for projects that benefit the education of students and align with the educational support document in the School Improvement Plan. Funds will be allocated to approved proposals throughout the year.	\$7,126.00

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

The EESAC at Reagan/Doral Senior High School is the sole body responsible for final decision making at the school relating to the implementation of the SIP goals. The committee assists and evaluates the SIP, assists the principal in the development of the budget, and determines the allocations of the EESAC's budget. The function of the EESAC is to bring together all stakeholders and to involve them in decisions that impact the delivery and instruction of programs at the school site.

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 RONALD W. REAGAN/DORAL SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	60%	86%	89%	54%	289	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	60%	75%			135	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?	61% (YES)	65% (YES)			126	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					560	
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 RONALD W. REAGAN/DORAL SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	63%	87%	96%	56%	302	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	68%	83%			151	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	64% (YES)	76% (YES)			140	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					603	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested