

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: BRIDGEPOINT ACADEMY
District Name: Dade
Principal: Director of Governing Agency: Jenny Rodriguez
SAC Chair: Joanne Muniz
Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho
Date of School Board Approval: Pending
Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Maria Saunders	D. Ed.	3	24	<p>2010-2011 School Grade: NG AYP: Y2 High Standards Rdg.: 87 High Standards Math: 74 Lrng. Gains-Rdg.: 50 Lrng. Gains-Math: 21 Gains-Rdg.-25%: 50 Gains-Math-25%: 21</p> <p>This is Dr. Saunders 3rd year as a charter school principal. Prior to that, Dr. Saunders served for 21 years as the principal of St. Paul Lutheran School. SAT-10 scores for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 averaged 70% for the full battery assessment.</p> <p>2011-2012 School Grade A Reading % Satisfactory or Higher 73% Math % Satisfactory or Higher 83%</p>

					Writing % Satisfactory or Higher 89% Science % Satisfactory or Higher 65% Reading Points for Gains 60 Math Points for Gains 82 Reading Gains for Low 25% 60 Math Gains for Low 25% 82
--	--	--	--	--	---

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)
Curriculum	Margaret Olson	M.S. Ed., Ed. S. (Reading)	3	3	2010-2011 School Grade: NG AYP: Y High Standards Rdg.: 87 High Standards Math: 74 Lrng. Gains-Rdg.: 50 Lrng. Gains-Math: 21 Gains-Rdg.-25%: 50 Gains-Math-25%: 21 This is Margaret Olson's 3rd year as a curriculum specialist for a charter school. Prior to that, Margaret Olson served as an assistant principal at St. Paul Lutheran School. . 2011-12 School Grade A Reading % Satisfactory or Higher 73% Math % Satisfactory or Higher 83% Writing % Satisfactory or Higher 89% Science % Satisfactory or Higher 65% Reading Points for Gains 60 Math Points for Gains 82 Reading Gains for Low 25% 60 Math Gains for Low 25% 82

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. Professional Growth Teams will meet monthly to assist with lesson plans, teaching strategies and classroom management.	Administration	June 5, 2013	
2	2. Grade -level or department chairpersons will assist teacher within their grade-levels and provide instructional support when needed.	Administration	June 5, 2013	
3	3. The mentoring and induction for new Teachers (MINT) program assists in providing guidance and support to new teachers by pairing them with an experienced teacher.	Administration	June 5, 2013	
4	4. For job vacancies, the administration will solicit referrals; recruit with district and university job fairs.	Administration	June 5, 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
6%(1)	Working toward ESOL endorsement/Administration will support staff member in completing ESOL classwork and testing requirements.

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
18	0.0%(0)	88.9%(16)	11.1%(2)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	77.8%(14)	11.1%(2)	0.0%(0)	66.7%(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
Dr. Maria Saunders	Amanda Valdivia	Dr. Saunders will use her experience to assist and support Ms. Valdivia in her first year of teaching.	Dr. Saunders will assist Ms. Valdivia in lesson planning and classroom management.
Dr. Maria Saunders	Elizabeth Perez Arche	Dr. Saunders will use her experience to assist and support Ms. Perez Arche in her first year of teaching.	Dr. Saunders will assist Ms. Perez Arche in lesson planning and classroom management.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, Curriculum Specialist, ESE Specialist, Grade Level Team Leaders

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 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.
 8. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for meeting Annual Measurable Objectives.

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.
4. 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 (Broad Screening, Progress Monitoring, Targeted Diagnostic Indicators, Broad Diagnostic Indicators, Ongoing Progress Monitoring Tools, Phonics Screening Inventory
- Oral Reading Fluency Measures
- Voyager Checkpoints
- Voyager Benchmark Assessments
- Baseline Benchmark Assessments
- Success Maker Utilization and Progress Reports
- Interim assessments
- State/Local Math and Science assessments
- FCAT
- Student grades
- School site specific assessments

Behavior

- Student Case Management System
- Detentions

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI process will be introduced during the Opening of School Meeting. Teachers will be trained during their grade level meetings and refresher workshops throughout the school year. The Professional Development Liaison will propose two PD sessions for Master Plan Points entitled: "RtI: Problem Solving Model: Building Consensus Implementing and Sustaining Problem-Solving/RtI" and "RtI" Challenges to Implementation Data-based Decision-making, and Supporting and Evaluating Interventions."

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS framework with district & school mission statements and organizational improvement efforts.
2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.
3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.
4. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.
5. Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.
6. Sufficient availability of coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.
7. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.
8. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Maria Saunders, Principal, Margaret Olson, Curriculum Specialist, Christina Carmona, ESE Specialist, Kristina Rocafort, Norma Corea, Mariana Mena, Jenny Camargo, Mercedes Becerra, and Raquel Tablado

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

The school-based literacy team is led by the Principal who helps to define instructional leadership to her coaches, and teachers. The Literacy Leadership team's primary goal is to meet the school population in its areas of greatest literacy need, and to meet that need through professional collaboration and support. This would include collaboration across the curriculum and support at the district and community level. This team functions to encourage literacy in the school community as well as to make sure that a multi-tiered approach to teaching is implemented at the school and individual level and works with the MTSS/RTI in a support capacity.

The LLT will meet monthly in the media center on the first Monday of the month at 7:45 am. Items of focus will include summative and formative assessments (FAIR, Baseline, FCAT, and SAT testing), fidelity of instruction (including differentiated instruction), while transitioning to the common core standards. Focus for the 2012-2013 school year will be on creating a community that values literacy while meeting the demands of state and national standards.

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

Family Literacy will be the focus of the LLT this year. The LLT will sponsor two book fairs to promote school wide reading and also to raise money to buy books for the school library. The school based literacy leadership team will sponsor 4 family literacy events throughout the school year. (Sept. – reading under the stars, October- meet the author, Nov., edible book night, Dec. share make a book night.). The LLT will also sponsor incentives to read such as awards for our Reading Plus and Accelerated Reader programs. The LLT will also encourage teachers to join Dade Reading Council sponsor an after-school club where children will make their own book and be part of the Books with Wings program.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 31% (40) students achieved a Level 3 in reading. Our 2013 expected level of performance would be to increase the Level 3 achievement in reading to 36% (49) students.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (40)	36% (49)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1a.1. Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT reading test was Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis.	For Grade 3, teach students to identify and interpret elements of story structure within a text. Help students understand character development, character point of view by asking "What does he think, what is his attitude toward...and what did he say to let me know?" Use poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. Note how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification. Use text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc) to locate, interpret, and organize information. For Grade 4, teach students to identify and interpret elements of story structure within and across texts. Help students understand character development, character point of view by asking "What does he think, what is his attitude toward... and what did he say to let	Administration	1. Walk-through 2. Lesson plans 3. Monitor PACES 4. Mentor staff 5. Monitor data 6. Bi-weekly LLT meetings 7. Data chats	On-going formative assessments: Baseline/Interims FAIR Graded assignment Portfolio Group project Self-evaluation Peer Evaluation Summative assessment: 2013 FCAT

1		<p>me know?" Use poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. Note how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification. Use how-to articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to identify text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc) and to locate, interpret and organize information.</p> <p>For Grade 5 Use biographies, diary entries, poetry and drama to teach students to identify and interpret elements of story structure within and across texts. Help students understand character development, character point of view by asking "What does he think, what is his attitude toward... and what did he say to let me know?" Use poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. Note how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification.</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:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Reading Goal #2a: The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicates that 39% (50) students achieved Levels 4 and 5 in Reading. Our goal is to increase students in Levels 4 and 5 proficiency to 41% (56) students
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (50)	41% (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	Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT reading test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Student approach challenging text structures without a variety of strategies to assist in comprehension of difficult text.	Provide activities to enhance achievement in identifying topics and themes within texts such as Reading Plus and Success Maker Teachers will model, think aloud strategies in small group for challenging texts that incorporate different text structures and practice and students apply.	Administration	1. Walk-through 2. Lesson plans 3. Monitor PACES 4. Mentor staff 5. Monitor data 6. Bi-weekly LLT meetings	On-going formative assessments: Baseline/Interims Graded assignment Portfolio Group project Self-evaluation Peer Evaluation FAIR IA Summative assessments: 2013 FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Reading Goal #3a: The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicates that 60% (42) of students achieved learning gains in reading. Our goal is to increase student learning gains by 10% to 70% (60).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (42)	70% (60)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on Vocabulary scores from . from FCAT 2012, students entering school with limited vocabulary will have difficulty being successful readers.	Teachers will focus on direct instruction of vocabulary and provide students with practice in recognizing word relationships and identifying the multiple meanings of words. Instruction will provide students with opportunities to read in all content areas, with increased emphasis on cross-content reading throughout the early grades. Implement pull-out intervention during the day. Teachers will implement Reading Plus program in classrooms to expand and enrich vocabulary Graphic Organizers, specifically 4 Squares, will be implemented school wide to expand and enrich vocabulary in every grade level	Administration LLT Interventionist	Interventionist will pull out small groups from grades 1-5 twice weekly for a total of 60 minutes. Review assessments from the intervention program and adjust placement and instruction as necessary. Administration and LLT will meet monthly with classroom teachers to review effectiveness of pullout program. Administration and LLT will meet monthly with classroom teachers to review effectiveness of Reading Plus Program Administration and LLT will meet monthly with classroom teachers to review effectiveness of graphic organizers	Formative: weekly mini assessments Baseline/Interims Summative: 2013 FCAT
2					

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 60% of students in the lowest 25% achieved learning gains in reading. Our goal is to increase student learning gains by 10% to 70%/.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (N<30)	70% (N<30)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT reading test was Category 2, Reading Application. Students fail to identify Author's Purpose in text and how Author's Perspective influences text	Students will use grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining or explaining. The author's perspective will be recognizable in text. Students will focus on what the author thinks and feels. Main idea may be stated or implied. Students will be able to identify causal relationships imbedded in text. Students will be familiar with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Provide practice in identifying topics and themes within texts Strategy: Pull out, Small groups, RTI, graphic organizers, Reading Plus, Success Maker, Before/After School tutoring?	Administration LLT	Administration and LLT will review baseline assessments and previous FCAT data to determine student need for appropriate intervention e on a monthly basis for a total of 30 minutes.	Formative: interim, baseline, weekly mini assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Strategy: Pull out, Small groups, RTI, graphic organizers, Reading Plus, Success Maker, Before/After School tutoring?

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 # The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicates that of students achieved learning gains in reading. Our goal is to increase student learning gains by ___ Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by
--	---

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

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicates that 72% of students achieved learning gains in reading. Our goal is to increase student learning gains by 6 percentage points to 78%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (82)	78% (89)

Problem-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	Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT reading test was Category 1, Vocabulary. Students entering school with limited vocabulary will have difficulty being successful readers.	Teachers will focus on direct instruction of vocabulary and provide students with practice in recognizing word relationships and identifying the multiple meanings of words. Instruction will provide students with opportunities to read in all content areas, with increased emphasis on cross-content reading throughout the early grades	Administration	1. Walk-through 2. Lesson plans 3. Monitor PACES 4. Mentor staff 5. Monitor data 6. Bi-weekly LLT meetings 7. Data chats	On-going formative assessments: FAIR Graded assignment Portfolio Group project Self-evaluation Peer Evaluation Summative assessment: 2013 FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	According to results of the 2012 FCAT, 63% of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory performance in reading. Our goal is to increase that percentage by 7% points to 70%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (34)	70% (38)

Problem-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 may have less time with parents who are struggling to work long hours.	Teacher will monitor student need for homework help.	Teacher and administration.	Teacher will monitor homework turned in or missing.	Formative: baseline, weekly mini assessments Summative:

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

Team Bldg.	K-5	Administration	Teachers of Gr. K-5	August 16, 2012	Walk through, observation	Administration
FAIR	3-5	Administrator	Teachers of Gr. 3-5	September 28, 2012	Interpreting Data, admin.	Administration
Task Cards for Instructional Focus	Gr. 3-5	Administrator	Administrator	September 28, 2012	Administration will monitor during classroom walkthroughs	Administration

Reading 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
Success Maker	Software license	Software license	\$3,000.00
Reading Plus	Software license	PTA	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$6,000.00
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: \$6,000.00

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:		Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 77% of ELL students were proficient in Listening/Speaking. Our goal is to decrease the % of non-proficient speakers by 10% going from 23% (10) non-proficient to 21% (9) non-proficient.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
77% (34)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	Students lack practice in responding orally to formal academic material.	Teacher/Student/Modeling The teacher models language patterns and structure used in the natural course of a classroom conversation ELL students work together in small intellectually and culturally mixed groups to achieve functioned, and an academic assessment tool for the instructor The teacher will increase opportunities for students to respond orally by assigning oral reports and presentations	Administration Grade Level Chair LLT Teachers	Administration, Grade Level Chairs, LLT will meet monthly with classroom teachers to monitor teacher performance and adjust instruction if necessary.	CELLA 2013 Teacher created assessments Interim Assessments
---	--	---	--	---	--

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:	. Based on the 2012 CELLA data, what percentage of students were proficient in Reading? Based on the 2012 CELLA 34% of ELL students were proficient in Reading. Our goal is to reduce the number of non-proficient ELL students in Reading by 10%. Our current percentage of non-proficient ELL students is 66% (29)which we would like to reduce by 10% to 26
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

34%
(15)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may lack knowledge of key vocabulary as grade appropriate	C16. Focus on Key Vocabulary Key vocabulary is emphasized and presented in various context to the students C18. Vocabulary Improvement Strategy (VIS) VIS guides students through an expository text with specific vocabulary. It helps learners recognize clues within the text and the explicit definition.	Classroom teacher	Classroom observation	Publisher made assessments. CELLA 2012 Interim Assessments

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Based on the 2012 CELLA data what percentage of students were proficient in writing? Based on the 2012 CELLA 49% of ELL students were proficient in Writing. Our goal is to reduce the number of non-proficient ELL students in Writing by 10%. Our current percentage of non-proficient ELL students is 51% (21)which we would like to reduce by 10% to 19.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

49%
(21)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not familiar with prewriting stage, planning, editing, grammar, punctuation, etc.	Graphic organizers and D11 Writing prompts Writing prompts may be used effectively by the teacher of ELLs to give students ideas that will motivate them into the process of writing. This in turn will allow students to see writing as an ongoing process involving several steps such as: planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing.	Administration LLT Team	Teacher observation and evaluation. Administration and LLT will meet to review effectiveness of school wide writing rubrics.	Schoolwide use of writing rubrics. Publisher made assessments. CELLA 2012 Interim Assessments

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicate that 41% (52) of students achieved FCAT Level 3 proficiency in Mathematics. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 1% to 42% (57).
--	--

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

41% (52)	42% (57)
----------	----------

Problem-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	Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT math test was Category 1, Number Sense.	Students are lacking knowledge of math facts and need daily practice in IXL.com and Math Stars for remediation to achieve proficiency in number operations.	Administration Math Literacy Team (MLT)	Administration and MLT will meet to review data monthly and change instruction as needed	On-going formative assessments: Graded assignments Portfolio Group project Self-evaluation Peer Evaluation Summative assessments: 2013 FCAT Reports from IXL.com and Math Stars

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	
---	--

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

--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicate that 39% (49) of students achieved FCAT Levels 4 and 5 proficiency in Mathematics. Our goal is to maintain student proficiency at 39% (53).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (49)	39% (53)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT math test was Category 4, Algebraic Thinking.	Teachers will work in small groups and focus on creating, analyzing, and representing patterns and relationships using words, variables, tables and graphs; and solve non-routine problems by making a table, chart, or list and searching for patterns. Students are lacking knowledge of algebraic thinking and need daily practice in IXL.com and Math Stars for remediation to achieve proficiency in number operations	Administration Math Literacy Team (MLT)	Administration and MLT will meet to review data monthly and change instruction as needed	On-going formative assessments: Graded assignments Portfolio Group project Self-evaluation Peer Evaluation Summative assessments: 2013 FCAT Reports from IXL.com and Math Stars

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
---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicate that 82% (51) of students achieved FCAT learning gains proficiency in Mathematics. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 87% (54).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (51)	87% (54)

Problem-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	Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT math test was Category 1, Operations.	Students are lacking knowledge of math facts and need daily practice to achieve proficiency in number operations through daily drills, bell work, and small groups	Administration MLT	Math Literacy Team will meet monthly and will work throughout year to analyze data to direct instruction for student learning gains.	Formative: Teacher observation, lesson plans Weekly mini assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT. Results from Daily Drills, Bell Work, and weekly Small Groups

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicate that 82 % of students in lowest % did not achieve learning gains. Our goal is to increase learning gains by 5 percentage points to 87%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (N<30)	87% (N<30)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT math test was Category 1, Operations Students are lacking knowledge of math facts and need daily practice to achieve proficiency in number operations	Daily practice in whole and small group instruction using Math Stars will emphasize the memorization of math facts to be used in number operations. Manipulatives will be used to aid in visualization. Interventionist will pull out small groups of students on a weekly basis will focus on multiplication facts. Math Literacy Team will work throughout year to analyze data to direct instruction for student learning gains	Administration MLT Interventionist	Math Literacy Team will meet monthly and will work throughout year to analyze data to direct instruction for student learning gains	Formative Weekly mini assessments Summative 2013 FCAT. Results from weekly Small Groups and Math Stars

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal # Mathematics Goal #5A: Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011 Math test indicate that 84% Hispanic students made adequate progress in mathematics.. Our goal is to increase learning gains by 2 percentage points to 86%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84% (96)	86% (98)

Problem-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	Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT math test was Category 1, Number Sense. Students are lacking knowledge of math facts and need daily practice to achieve proficiency in number operations	Daily practice in whole and small group instruction will emphasize the memorization of math facts to be used in number operations. Manipulatives will be used to aid in visualization. Math Literacy Team will work throughout year to analyze data to direct instruction for student learning gains	Administration	Lesson plans will reflect student practice of math facts and number operations.	Formative Weekly mini assessments Summative 2013 FCAT.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Results of the 2012 FCAT indicate that 76% of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math. Our goal is to increase the percentage by 1% to 77%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (41)	77% (42)

Problem-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 who are economically disadvantaged may not have parental help with homework due to parents long work hours.	Teachers will monitor homework turned in or missing.	Administration Math Literacy Team (MLT)	Administration and MLT will meet to review data monthly and change instruction as needed	Formative: baseline, interims weekly mini assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT

End of Elementary School Mathematics 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
Focus on NGSSS big ideas using next generation task cards	Gr. 3-5	Administration	Teachers gr. 3-5	September 28, 2012	Administration implements school wide problem of the day emphasizing math vocabulary	Administration
Common core standards	Gr. K-5	Administration	Teachers gr. K-5	Aug. 11, 12, 2012	Administration	Administration

Mathematics 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
IXL! Math	Software program for K-5 (300 students)	PTA	\$1,650.00

			Subtotal: \$1,650.00
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
Students fundraise to help charity using pennies	community partners and school stake holders	donations	\$500.00
Math "Stars" Program	PTA Math encouragement program	PTA	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
			Grand Total: \$2,250.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:		The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 45 % (15) of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 3 percentage point to 48%(18).			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
45% (15)		48% (18)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are lacking sufficient background knowledge to understand science concepts	Teachers will use hands on activities to teach key concepts. Concepts will be simplified for ready understanding and classroom demonstration. Hands on experiments	Administration	1. Walk-through 2. Lesson plans 3. Monitor PACES 4. Mentor staff 5. Data chats	On-going formative assessments: Graded assignments Portfolio Group project Self-evaluation Peer Evaluation Summative assessments: 2013 FCAT

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.		The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 15%(5) of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5).			
Science Goal #2a:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency levels 4 and 5 by 1%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
15% (5)		16% (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	Student work day does not allow sufficient time for enrichment in the teaching of science concepts. Current instructional time limited by focus on other subject areas.	Teachers will assign enrichment activities such as Brain Pop for building prior knowledge, vocabulary, and etc Provide students with more opportunities for hands projects and oral reports.	Administration Science Literacy Team (SLT	Administration and SLT will meet monthly to analyze data and adjust instruction as needed.	IA and FCAT Graded assignment Portfolio Group project Rubrics

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Hands on Science	K-5	NAEP	Teachers of math and science K-5	Aug. 11, 2012	Lesson plans	Principal

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 86%(32) of students achieved level 3 or higher.
--	---

Writing Goal #1a:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase that percentage by 2% to 88%(37).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (32)	88% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack vocabulary and the skills to make their writing more vivid and descriptive. Based on the FCAT Writing 2012 scores, students lack proficiency in the areas of grammar and conventions of writing.	Students will have more opportunities to perfect grammar and conventions through a biweekly expository writing prompt, edit using peer editing and re-write to improve writing	Administration LLT	Administration and LLT will meet monthly to analyze data and adjust instruction as needed.	On-going formative assessments: Graded assignments Portfolio Group project Self-evaluation Peer Evaluation Summative assessments: 2013 FCAT, IA

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Writing Tools for Young Writers	K-5	Administration	K-5 Teachers	October 5, 2012	Classroom observation, lesson plans, student work.	Principal
Writing across the curriculum	K-5	Administration	Academic subject area teachers K-5	August 16, 2012	Classroom observation, lesson plans, student work.	Principal

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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:	This year we will attempt to increase student attendance from 95.72%(300) to 96.22% (301).
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.72% (300)	96.22% (301)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
93	88
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
160	160

Problem-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 not completing short school weeks, or weeks where there is a holiday. Parents are not aware of the connection between education and attendance and the vital importance of attending school regularly to prevent loss of instruction	Special events to encourage attendance, including awards for best attended class. Parents will be addressed at special event assemblies and presented with data indicating how hours of loss instruction can accumulate. Schoolwork missed due to absences will be the responsibility of the parent to complete and submit to teacher	Administration Classroom Teachers	Monitoring attendance record	Attendance Records

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:		Continue to have 0 suspensions in the coming year 2012-13			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
0		0			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
0		0			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
0		0			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
0		0			
Problem-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 not aware of student code of conduct ; students lack sense of social responsibility	Students will continue to be made aware of student code of conduct through school wide assemblies. In addition, classroom teachers will reinforce school rules based on rewards and consequences of behavior.	Administration	Monitoring of any student suspensions	Disciplinary log
2					

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>Our goal is to have 100% of our families participate in some activity at school.</p>
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
95% (185)	100%(300)

Problem-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 might be unaware of activities at the school	All activities at the school will be posted on the internet, emailed and phone calls made	Administration	Monitoring participation	Volunteer logs, PTA membership

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. STEM

STEM Goal #1:

Students will learn to think analytically implementing their knowledge of math and science in innovative design and abstract thinking

Problem-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 do not have an understanding of the engineering design process. Students lack the motivation needed apply imaginative thinking, science, and math skills	Instruction will be given using EiE (Engineering is Elementary) curriculum to foster enthusiasm for science and engineering projects.	Administration	Administration and SLT will meet monthly to analyze data and adjust instruction as needed	Student Projects

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

Subtotal: \$0.00

Grand Total: \$0.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Success Maker	Software license	Software license	\$3,000.00
Reading	Reading Plus	Software license	PTA	\$3,000.00
Mathematics	IXL! Math	Software program for K-5 (300 students)	PTA	\$1,650.00
				Subtotal: \$7,650.00
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
Mathematics	Students fundraise to help charity using pennies	community partners and school stake holders	donations	\$500.00
Mathematics	Math "Stars" Program	PTA Math encouragement program	PTA	\$100.00
				Subtotal: \$600.00
				Grand Total: \$8,250.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

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
SAC funds will be used to tutor low achieving students.	\$1,500.00

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

The School Advisory Council will collaborate to design, approve and oversee implementation of the 2011-2012 SIP for Bridgepoint Academy Charter School. Meetings of stakeholders of the school community will emphasize group consensus to develop school-wide curriculum to increase student achievement. The SAC will continue to review SIP strategies and data throughout the year and make recommendations for adjustments in instructional focus.

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 BRIDGEPOINT ACADEMY 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	87%	74%	80%	57%	298	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	50%	21%			71	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	50% (YES)	21% (NO)			71	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					440	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*						Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

No Data Found