FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: ACADEMIR CHARTER SCHOOL MIDDLE

District Name: Dade

Principal: Dr. Tirso Alonso

SAC Chair: Marylin Lopez

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/13/2012

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	Albert Mancebo	Elementary Education Gifted Endorsement ESOL Endorsement Educational Leadership	1	9	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C B B C B AYP - N N N N High Standards Rdg. 55 67 67 62 60 High Standards Math 49 57 63 58 60 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 65 64 63 61 61 Lrng Gains-Math 65 61 62 64 70 Gains-Rdg-25 65 71 54 67 64 Gains-Math-25% 52 66 63 58 66

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. Provide continuous support within the classrooms by providing professional developments on RTI, differentiated instruction, and classroom management.	Educational Consultant	Ongoing	
2	2. Will provide opportunities for teachers in order to allow ownership of school projects such as Black History month and Hispanic Heritage events.	Teachers/Administrator	Ongoing	
3	3. Conduct faculty meetings to discuss and plan effectively for an increase in academic development	Principal	Ongoing	
4	4. Teachers will participate in on-going professional development.	Principal and Consulting Educational Team	Ongoing	
5	5. Teachers will have common planning/collaboration on a regular basis.	Principal	Ongoing	
6	6. Teachers will meet for Learning Team Meetings on a rotational basis.	Principal	Ongoing	

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
2	Two teachers pending waivers for science/ss.

Will work on certification in social science and science during this school year, by engaging in certification preparation coursework. |

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
4	25.0%(1)	25.0%(1)	50.0%(2)	0.0%(0)	25.0%(1)	50.0%(2)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)

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
Bobby Williams	Dwayne Andrews	Veteran teacher working with first year teacher.	Monthly visit to ACSW for planning and collaboration.

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 (Administrators): Provides a common vision for the use of data-driven decision-making.
Communicates with parents and staff about the early intervention programs. Ensures implementation of MTSS model.
General Education Teachers: Participate in student data collection; provides information and data about core instruction; and maintains communication with staff for input and feedback. Develop intervention strategies for failing students.
Exceptional Student Education Teacher (ESE): Participate in student data collection; provides information and data about core instruction; maintains communication with general education teacher; and collaborates with teachers, counselors, and resource psychologist.

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

1. MTSS Leadership Team meets regularly to analyze data from the baseline benchmark assessment, interim assessment, FCAT scores, pre and posttest. At the meetings the data is reviewed, disaggregated, instructional practices are evaluated, and modified as the data indicates areas in need of improvement.
2. The MTSS team keeps in constant communication with the EESAC committee, by sending at least one representative to each EESAC meeting. Recommendations made by the EESAC on their review of the SIP are then brought to the MTSS Leadership meetings to review and implement.
3. The goal of the MTSS team is to ensure that instructions and interventions bring us to meeting AMO goals.

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

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

MTSS Implementation

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

1. Managed data sources include:
• FAIR Assessments
• CELLA
• Baseline Assessments
• Pre and Post Tests
• Interim Assessments
• FCAT Scores
• Teacher Formative and Summative Assessments
• Student Portfolios
• IEP's
• Suspension Rates
• Attendance Rates

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

1. Training for all administrators in the MTSS problem solving, data analysis process;
2. Providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS principles and procedures; and
3. Providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Based upon the information from http://www.florida-rti.org/educatorResources/MTSS_Book_ImplComp_012612.pdf, but not limited to the following:

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.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal-Albert Mancebo
Lead Chair-Tobias Hernandez
Reading/Science Teacher-David Ulloa
SPED Coordinator-Azalia Fajardo

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

1. The Literacy Team will meet monthly to analyze and disaggregate data.
2. The role of the LLT is to work on constantly reviewing and modifying our literacy efforts for the school year based on areas of needed improvement.
3. The LLT will train faculty and staff on the school's literacy initiatives through professional development and departmental meetings
4. There will be at least one member of the LLT to attend all EESAC meetings to report the LLT efforts to all stakeholders

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

• Use data constantly available to LLT and teachers to evaluate ALL students and find ways to constantly improve their literacy.
•All teachers will have small libraries set up in their classrooms.
•All teachers will set up word walls in their room to enhance the print-rich environment for the students for each subject area.
•The LLT will also create five words of the week that will be used school wide and each word will reflect a word used in the four core subject areas and one elective.

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.

At Academir Charter School Middle, all teachers are teachers of reading. This responsibility of teaching reading has always been a major focus at our school. Training has been held and more are planned to assist teachers in becoming teachers of reading. The establishment of a literacy team will help to facilitate many professional developments that cover a gamut of reading areas from benchmark unwrapping to clustering. In addition, content area teachers participate in all the Reading workshops which provide them with strategies to infuse within the content curriculum. The Literacy Leadership Team will be responsible for monitoring that reading strategies are taught across the curriculum and in every classroom.

*High Schools Only

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

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:	As a new school, we will use the District averages to establish the current and expected levels of performance. The district average for the 2012 FCAT indicates 25 percent or 9 students achieved a t a Level 3 proficiency or higher. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students earning a Level 3 or higher by five percentage points to 30 percent or 11 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (9)	30% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test for grades 6-8 was Reading Category 1- Vocabulary Limited use of higher order questioning techniques, and effective use of vocabulary implementation in lessons.	Implement a school wide program using before, during, and after reading strategies where uniformly higher level vocabulary is introduced and incorporated, such as: interactive word walls, learning affixes and roots, reading from a variety of text, concept mapping, and instruction in different levels of content specific words (shades of meaning).	Administrator, NAEP Literacy Director, and LLT	Following the FCIM model results of the biweekly assessment data reports will be reviewed by administration to ensure progress in being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FAIR, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Test 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	As a new school, we will use the District averages to establish the current and expected levels of performance. The district average for the 2012 FCAT indicates 28 percent or 10 students achieved a t a Level 4 proficiency or higher. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students earning a Level 4 or higher by two percentage points to 30 percent or 11 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (10)	30%(11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test for grades 6-8 was Reading Category 1-Vocabulary Limited use of higher order questioning techniques, and effective use of vocabulary implementation in lessons.	Provide students with real world/project based learning activities where high order vocabulary and critical and creative thinking are required. An example of this strategy may be the use of journal where students keep their own synonym or antonyms for words they find in the texts or novels being read.	Administrator, NAEP Literacy Director, and LLT	Following the FCIM model results of the biweekly assessment data reports will be reviewed by administration to ensure progress in being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FAIR, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Test 2.0

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
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:	The district average of the 2012 FCAT indicates68 percent or 25students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the number of students who make learning gains by five percentage points to 73percent or 27 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%(25)	73%(27)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test for grade 6 was Reading Category 1- Vocabulary Limited use of higher order questioning techniques, and effective use of vocabulary implementation in lessons.	Implement a small group intervention program using before, during, and after reading strategies where uniformly higher level vocabulary is introduced and incorporated during small group differentiated instruction interventions 3 times a week using the literature text or novels.	Administrator, NAEP Literacy Director, and LLT	Following the FCIM model, Reading Coach, LLT, and classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category and make adjustments as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FAIR, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Test 2.0

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The district average of the 2012 FCAT indicates 70 percent or 26 students in the lowest 25 percent made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the number of students who make learning gains in the lowest 25% by five percentage points to75 percent or 28 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70%(26	75% (28)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test for grade 6-8 was Reading Category 1- Vocabulary Limited use of higher order questioning techniques, and effective use of vocabulary implementation in lessons.	Implement daily study hall where students in the lowest 25% will be provide with the opportunity to use the reading plus program 3 times a week for 45 minutes.	Administrator, NAEP Literacy Director, and LLT	Following the FCIM model, Reading Coach, LLT, and classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FAIR, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Test 2.0

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # Our goal for the next five years is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50 percent. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	58	62	66	69	73	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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
Implementation of NGSS	6-8	Principal	6-8 grade teachers	PD Days	Monitoring by LLT will occur year-long during PLCs	Principal/LLT
Lessons from last year's assessments FY12	6-8	Principal	6-8 grade teachers	PD Days	Year-long monitoring by LLT during PLCs	Principal/LLT

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
All	Lab cart and laptops for students	School budget	$15,000.00
			Subtotal: $15,000.00
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

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:	During the 2011-12 school year 45 percent or 2 students scored at the proficient level on the Listening/Speaking subtest of the CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:
45% (2)

Problem-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 at the early stages of English acquisition tend to be embarrassed by the way they sound to other students and therefore shy away from speaking in English	Utilize the Language Experience Approach (LEA) to have students produce language in response to first-hand, multi-sensorial experiences. The LEA uses the students' ideas and their language to develop reading and writing skills	Administration and LLT	Following the FCIM model, administration and the LLT will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FAIR, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	During the 2011-12 school year28 percent or 1 students scored at the proficient level on the Reading subtest of the CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:
28% (10)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Amount of reading in the students' home language is not sufficient.	Utilize differentiated instruction as a teaching tool that adapts instruction to student differences. Teachers will modify their instruction to	Administration and LLT	Following the FCIM model, administration and the LLT will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category and	Formative: Interim Assessments, FAIR, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-

		meet students' varying readiness levels, learning preferences, and interests. Teachers will differentiate three aspects of the curriculum: content, process, and products.		make adjustments to instruction as needed.	generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Test 2.0 and CELLA
1					

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	During the 2011-12 school year 27percent or 1 students scored at the proficient level on the Writing subtest of the CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
27%(1)	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students at the early stages of English acquisition do not have the organizational skills necessary to attack a prompt in any language.	A graphic organizer is usually a one-page form with blank areas for the student to fill in with related ideas and information. Some organizers are very specific; others can be used with many topics. For the most part, the information on a graphic organizer could just as easily be filled in on a form or written as a list. The organizer gives the student another way to see the information. Some of the organizers allow for the information to be written or drawn. This allows students with different levels of language proficiency to use them effectively.	Administration and LLT	Following the FCIM model, administration and the LLT will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, Monthly Writing Prompts and Mid Year Writing Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test and CELLA

CELLA Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

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

Other

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	As a new school, we will use the District averages to establish the current and expected performance. The district average of the 2012 FCAT indicates 28 percent or 10 students achieved a Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students earning a Level 3 by five percentage points to 32 percent or 12 students
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (10)	32% (12)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 6 was Reporting Category 3 Geometry and Measurement.	Provide students with models both digital and tangible to enable them to visualize, draw and measure cross-sections of a range of geometric solids.	Administration, NAEP Math Director	Following the FCIM model, administration and the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test 2.0
2	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 7 was Reporting Category 4 Statistics and Probability	Use manipulatives (coins, spinners, die) to explore outcome of an experiment and predict which events are likely or unlikely. Increase opportunities for enrichment activities.	Administration, NAEP Math Director	Following the FCIM model, administration and the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test 2.0
3	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 8 was Reporting Category 1 Number, operations, Problems and statistics.	Provide the opportunities for students to add, subtract, multiply, and divide integers ,fractions, and terminating decimals, and perform exponential operations with rational bases and whole number exponents including solving problems in everyday contexts with workbooks like Florida Ready.	Administration, NAEP Math Director	Following the FCIM model, administration and the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test 2.0

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

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The district average of the 2012 FCAT indicates 28 percent or 10 students achieved at Levels 4 or higher Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the number of students earning a Levels or higher by two percentage points to 30 percent or 11 students
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (10)	30% (11)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students in grades 6 -8 was Reporting Category 3 Geometry and Measurement.	Provide students with the opportunity to work on real world service learning projects that will allow them to use math skills to solved real world problems. An example of such a project is the design of a city map where students incorporate building locations utilizing different geometric shapes with different angles and lines.	Administration, NAEP Math Director	Following the FCIM model, administration and the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test 2.0

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The district average of the 2012 FCAT indicates that 68 percent or 25 students made learning gains in math. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the number of students making learning gains by five percentage points to 73 percent or 27 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (25)	73% (27)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 6-8 was Reporting Category 3 Geometry and Measurement.	Utilize FCAT Explorer during study hall to provide students with additional independent practice in deficient skills areas 2 to 3 times a week.	Administration, NAEP Math Director	Following the FCIM model, administration and the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test 2.0

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

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

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

No Data Submitted

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments indicate that 66 percent or 24 students in the lowest 25 percent 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 4 percentage points to 71 % (26).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%(24)	71% (26)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students in grades 6-8 was Reporting Category 3 Geometry and Measurement.</td><td>Provide students with a tutorial program where students use item bank FCAT type questions written at appropriate complexity level to work with tutor on areas of deficiency.</td><td>Administration, NAEP Math Director</td><td>Following the FCIM model, administration and the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data repots to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.</td><td>Formative: Interim Assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer, and teacher-generated assessments

Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test 2.0</td></tr>
</table>

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 :	In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	57	61	65	69	73	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC assessments indicate that 36 percent of District students or 2 students in the school scored at a Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC by 3 percentage points to 39 % or 3 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36%(2)	39%(3)

Problem-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	Most of the students in 7th and 8th grade have never been exposed to the mathematics skills necessary to be successful in algebra.	Provide students with a small group intense Algebra I curriculum with additional time through tutoring to allow them to quickly enhance the skills necessary for success in algebra.	Administration and NEAP Math Director	Following the FCIM model, administration and the math director will review formative bi-weekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Algebra 1 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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target					
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A :				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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
FCAT Item Specs	6-8th	NEAP	6rd-8th grade teachers	October 2012	Follow up with Principal's walkthroughs	Principal and NAEP Director

---

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
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 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:	As a new school, we will use the District averages to establish the current and expected performance. The district average of the 2012 FCAT indicates 32 percent or 2 students achieved at a Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the number of students earning a Level 3 by two percentage points to 36 percent or 3 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (2)	36%(3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Test results show area of deficiency to be life science and physical science.	Ensure that instruction includes teacher-demonstrated as well as student-centered laboratory activities that apply, analyze, and explain concepts related to matter, energy, force, and motion.	Administration, NAEP Science Director	Following in the FCIM model, Baseline/Interim and classroom assessments will be used to determine students mastery of benchmarks	Formative: Baseline, Interim Assessments, Teacher generated classroom assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Science Test

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The district average for the 2012 FCAT indicates 13 percent or 1 student achieved Level 4-5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase Level 4-5 student proficiency by two percentage points to 15 percent or 2 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (1)	15% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Test results show area of deficiency to be life science and physical science.	Utilize Real World/Project Based activities that will allow students to use skills learned in real world situations. Examples of such projects are participation in the science fair or SECME.	Administration, NAEP Science Director	Following the FCIM Baseline/Interim and classroom assessments will be used to determine students mastery of benchmarks	Formative: Baseline, Interim Assessments, Teacher generated classroom assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Science Test

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

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
Writing Lab Reports	6-8	NAEP Science Director	Grades 6-8	Professional Development Days	Follow-up monitoring during monthly PLCs with Science Director	Administration and NAEP Literacy Director
Hands-on Science	6-8	NAEP Science Director	Grades 6-8	Professional Development Days	Classroom Observations and observation of student work during PLCs	Administration and NAEP Science Director

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 district average of the 2012 FCAT indicates 80 percent or 5 students achieved or higher.

Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the |

	Writing Goal #1a:	number of students earning a 3 or higher by two percentage points to 82 percent or 6 students.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80%(5)	82% (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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Writing FCAT was Writing Application (Grammar and Conventions, writing persuasive accounts	Edit for correct spelling of high frequency and phonetically regular words, using a word bank, dictionary, or other resources as necessary.	Administrator, NAEP Literacy Director, and LLT	Monthly writing prompts will be administered and scored in order to monitor students progress and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Classroom assessments and monthly writing prompts

Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing |

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
PLC-Reading student Writing	6-8	NEAP Literacy Director	Language Arts Teachers 6-8	The first and third Monday of every month.	Principal and teachers will meet monthly to discuss student work and effectiveness of	Administration and NAEP Literacy Director

					instruction	

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	Scores from 2012 Civics Baseline Assessment indicate that no student was proficient. During the 2012-13 school year 50 percent or 8 students will score at the proficient level on the Civics EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0	50%()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	Students lack the vocabulary needed to understand concepts that are being taught.	Utilize District-published lesson plans with assessments aligned to test End of Course Exam Benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content.	Administration	Monthly school assessments will be created and scored in order to monitor student progress and to adjust instructional focus.	Formative: Monthly assessments, Chapter and Unit assessments, Summative: District Spring Assessment.

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

in need of improvement for the following group:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 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

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:	During the 2011-12 school year the average daily attendance for the school district was 93.69 percent or 34 students present daily. During the 2012-13 school year the goal will be to increase the school daily attendance rate by one percentage point to 94.69 percent or 35 students.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93.69% (34)	94.69% (35)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
3	1
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
2	1

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	In order to maintain high attendance rates, parents need to fully understand the correlations between student attendance and academic achievement.	Teachers will review the MDCPS Attendance Policy with parents at Open House in order to stress the importance of student attendance.	Administration	Parent Attendance Contract	Attendance Reports
2	Students are not the only cause of tardiness.	Work with families to educate them on the strategies needed to prevent tardiness.	Administration	Parent Attendance Contract	Attendance Report

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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:	During the 2011-2012 no students were suspended. During the 2012-13 school year the goal is to remain at 0 students suspended.
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 attending the school for the first time come with many habits initiated at other schools.	Implement positive behavior interventions.	Principal and teachers	Monthly monitoring of suspension reports	Suspension Reports

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

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	As a new school we did not have any parental involvement activities last year. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to have at least 60% of parents attend 1 or more parental involvement activities.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
0	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	Parents have difficulty attending school activities and events due to their work schedules.	Parents and family members will be offered a variety of workshops at flexible times with multiple opportunities for parental attendance during school wide events.	Leadership Team. Teachers	Sign in sheets per workshop	Sign in Sheets

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

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

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

	Problem-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	Limited resources of a first year school hinder the amount of STEM offerings available.	Implement a technology based graphic design program using software such as Photoshop for students to develop ability to increase technology proficiency	Administration	Administration will monitor implementation of STEM activities during Critical Thinking elective.	Critical Thinking Grade Reports

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

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

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	Increase the career themed curriculum activities during the 90 minute Critical Thinking Block.

	Problem-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 CTE offerings available due to small enrollment numbers.	Utilize Critical Thinking course to infuse graphic design activities using programs such as Photoshop.	Administration	Administration will monitor implementation of STEM activities during Critical Thinking elective.	Critical Thinking Course Grade Report

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

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

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	All	Lab cart and laptops for students	School budget	$15,000.00
				Subtotal: $15,000.00

Professional Development

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

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $15,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	j n NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/13/2012)

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.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Student incentives	$180.00

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

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found