FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: ADA MERRITT K-8 CENTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: Carmen M. Garcia

SAC Chair: Ron Kauffman

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/9/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Carmen M. Garcia	Bachelor's Elementary Education Master's Elementary Education Master's Urban Education Certification Educational Leadership	7	19	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A AMO Y Y Y Y Y High Standards Rdg. 88 89 93 93 90 High Standards Math 87 93 94 94 90 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 82 69 78 78 84 Lrng Gains-Math 76 73 70 79 60 Gains-Rdg-25% 86 69 86 86 91 Gains-Math-25% 53 84 79 80 60
Assis Principal	Barbara M. Martin	Bachelor's - Elementary Education Master's - Reading, K-12 Certification - English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Certification - Educational Leadership	6	6	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A AMO Y Y Y Y Y High Standards Rdg. 88 89 93 93 90 High Standards Math 87 93 94 94 90 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 82 69 78 78 84 Lrng Gains-Math 76 73 70 79 60 Gains-Rdg-25% 86 69 86 86 91 Gains-Math-25% 53 84 79 80 60

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)
Math/ Science	Lourdes Cobas	Elementary Education English Speakers of other Languages (ESOL)	6	6	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A AMO Y Y Y Y Y High Standards Rdg. 88 89 93 93 90 High Standards Math 87 93 94 94 90 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 82 69 78 78 84 Lrng Gains-Math 76 73 70 79 60 Gains-Rdg-25% 86 69 86 86 91 Gains-Math-25% 53 84 79 80 60

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	Partnering new teachers with mentor teacher.	Principal	On-going	
2	Scheduling common planning time for each grade level to support new teachers.	Principal	August 2012	
3	Scheduling time for new teachers to meet with Lead Teachers and Reading Coach in order to familiarize teachers with school's IB and Dual Language Programs.	Principal	August 2012	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
1	Portuguese is not certifiable in the State of Florida.

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
51	5.9%(3)	39.2%(20)	33.3%(17)	21.6%(11)	45.1%(23)	64.7%(33)	3.9%(2)	13.7%(7)	47.1%(24)

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

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.

MTSS/RtI is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well-being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.

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

• Administrator(s) who will ensure commitment and allocate resources;
• Teacher(s) and Coaches who will extend and report on meeting the goals of the leadership team at grade level, subject area, intervention group, problem solving;
• Team members who will meet to review consensus, infrastructure, and implementation of building level.

2. The school's Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:
• School reading, math, science, and behavior specialists
• Special education personnel
• School guidance counselor
• School psychologist
• School social worker
• Member of advisory group
• Community stakeholders

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

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

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

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

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

The Leadership Team will:

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

• What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
• What progress is expected in each core area?
• How will we determine if students have made expected levels of progress towards proficiency? (common assessments)
• How will we respond when grades, subject areas, or class of, or individual students have not learned? (Multi-Tiered 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 meetings monthly team meetings and utilize 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.

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 the 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.

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

1. 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 district professional development and support will include:

1. Training for all administrators in the RtI problem solving at Tiers 1, 2, and 3 (SST), using the Tier 1 Problem Solving Worksheet, Tier 2 Problem Solving Worksheet, and Tier 3 Problem Solving Worksheet and Intervention Plan.
2. Providing support for school staff to understand basic RtI principles and procedures; and
3. Providing a network of ongoing support for RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the 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).

Carmen M. Garcia, Principal
Barbara M. Martin, Assistant Principal
Sonia D. Garcia, Media Specialist
Lourdes Cobas, Teacher
Jackeline Sanchez-Jimenez, Lead Teacher
Maud Clark, Lead Teacher
Para Hesami, School Counselor
Thelma Perez, Teacher
Yailin Jauregui, Teacher
Yolanda Velazquez, Teacher
Diane Davis, Teacher
Laura Cabrera, Teacher
Jessika Abdalah, Teacher

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

A key factor to an individual school's success is the building leadership. The principal sets the tone as the school's instructional leader, reinforcing the positive and convincing the students, parents and teachers that all children can learn and improve academically. In essence, the school principal has the potential to have a great impact on student learning through his or her support of teachers and coaches. In order for principals to become instructional leaders, it is imperative that they

understand the literacy challenges of the populations of students whom they serve. The reading/literacy coach is vital in the process of providing job embedded professional development at the school level. To describe the process for monitoring reading instruction at the school level, including the role of the principal and the reading coach, please address the following:

The purpose of the Reading Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal, reading coach, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees should serve on this team which should meet at least once a month.

The principal selects team members for the Reading Leadership Team (RLT) based on a cross section of the faculty and administrative team that represents highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum. The reading coach must be a member of the Reading Leadership Team. The team will meet monthly throughout the school year. School Reading Leadership Teams may choose to meet more often. Additionally, the principal may expand the RLT by encouraging personnel from various sources such as District and Regional support staff to join. The RLT maintains a connection to the school's Response to Intervention process by using the RtI problem solving approach to ensure that a multi-tiered system of reading support is present and effective.

Reading Leadership Teams will be encouraged and supported in developing Lesson Studies to focus on developing and implementing instructional routines that use complex text and incorporate text dependent questions. Multi-disciplinary teams will develop lessons that provide students with opportunities for research and incorporate writing throughout.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT this year will include: (1) aligning International Baccalaureate (IB) Planners with Common Core Standards, (2) increasing learning gains among students in grades 3-8, (3) implementing best practices to target instruction in the weakest content categories.

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.

The IB and Dual Language Programs provide students with a rigorous curriculum and high academic standards. With the students guiding instruction through inquiry, teachers have objectives but also have the opportunity to be flexible with the content being presented to students. At the same time, teachers incorporate differentiated instruction for all students and utilize progress monitoring data to tailor instructional focus to the needs of each student. The IB Curriculum requires that students be enrolled in a foreign language, humanities, technology and physical education courses the entire time students participate in the MYP Programme. Unit Planning and cross –curricula planning provide opportunities for students to make connections and teachers to teach reading strategies.

*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 25% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency to 26%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (132)	26% (138)

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					
2	Grade 3 – The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Grade 4 and Grade 5 – The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 – Literary Analysis Fiction/Non-Fiction. Grade 6 – The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary. Grade 7 – The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process. Grade 8 – The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 – Literary Analysis	Grade 3 – Incorporate the use of 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 should be recognizable in text. Students should focus on what the author thinks and feels. Main idea may be stated or implied. Students should be able to identify causal relationships imbedded in text. Students must be familiar with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Provide practice in identifying topics and themes within texts. Grade 4 and 5 – Provide students with strategies to identify and interpret elements of the story within and across texts. Utilize poetry and literature that focuses on the use of figurative language. Grade 6 – Utilize reading from a	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data Review Logs, Lesson Plans, Instructional Focus Calendar, Thematic Units, Student Folders, Interim Assessments	Formative Assessment: Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

	Fiction/Non-Fiction.	variety of texts and focus instruction in different levels of content-specific words. Engage students in affix or root word activities. Grade 7 – Provide students with opportunities to develop note-taking skills, summarization skills and encourage students to read from a variety of texts. Grade 8 – Incorporate the use of concept maps to help students understand relationships in literature.			

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:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 59% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to maintain Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency at 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (314)	59% (314)

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
	Grade 3 and 5-	Grade 3 and 5 -	MTSS/ RtI	Administrators will	Formative

1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 – Literary Analysis/Fiction/Nonfiction. Grade 4 – The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process. Grade 6 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary. Grade 7 and 8 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 – Literary Analysis/Fiction/Nonfiction.	Provide enrichment opportunities for 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. Grade 4 – Utilize real-world documents such as, how-to articles, brochures, fliers, and website to identify text features and locate, interpret and organize information and to provide enrichment opportunities for students. Grade 6 – Provide enrichment through the use of reading materials that provide higher level vocabulary in context. Grade 7 and Grade 8 – Provide enrichment through oral discussions and writing activities that develop the skills to identify the relationship between characters and compare/contrast ideas in fiction and non-fiction.	Leadership Team	conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data Review Logs, Instructional Focus Calendar, Thematic Units, Student Folders, Interim Assessments, Classroom Walkthroughs	Assessment: Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
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 results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 82% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 87%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (382)	87% (405)

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	Grade 3 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Grade 4 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary. Grade 5 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 – Informational Text / Research Process. Grade 6 and 8 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 – Literary Analysis – Fiction/Non-Fiction. Grade 7 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the	Grade 3- Utilize grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining and/or explaining. Grade 4 – Utilize pre-reading activities to build word meaning and relationships. Grade 5 – Utilize non-fiction articles and editorials for instruction. Grade 6 and 8 – Emphasize on recognizing implicit meaning or details within a text that support inferencing. Grade 7 - Provide opportunities for students to practice analyzing the author's perspective, choice of words, style, and technique to understand how these elements influence the meaning of text.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data Review Logs, Thematic Units, Student Folders, Interim Assessments, Classroom Walkthroughs	Formative Assessment: Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

	FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application.				

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 86% in the lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% subgroup increase achievement by 5 percentage points to 91%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (68)	91% (72)

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	Grade 3 and 4 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary. Grade 5 – The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process . Grade 6 and 8 –	Grade 3 and 4 – Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include vocabulary word maps, concept maps, word walls, personal dictionaries, instruction in shades of meaning and context, affix or root words, and reading from a variety of texts. Grade 5 – Use two-column notes to help students identify reliable and valid information	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data Review Logs, Thematic Units, Student Folders, Interim Assessments, Classroom Walkthroughs	Formative Assessment: Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Grade 7 – The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary.	Grade 6 and 8 – Provide graphic organizers such as mapping, note-taking, highlighting to help students understand the main idea, character development, word styles and author's purpose. Grade 7 – Provide explicit instruction in affix and root word activities through reading.			

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017, is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	84	86	87	89	90	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Reading Overview	K-3	Instructional Coaches	Grade Level Chairpersons	September 20, 2012	Monthly Progress Monitoring (OPM)	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team
Utilizing Data	K-8	Instructional Coaches	Reading Teachers	October 3, 2012	Data binders, vertical and horizontal team planning	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team

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
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core Reading Overview	Substitute Coverage	Elementary Basic Instruction	$1,600.00
			Subtotal: $1,600.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,600.00

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:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Listening/Speaking Test indicate that 73% (62) of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain student proficiency at 73%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening / speaking:	

73% (62)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Due to limited exposure to the English language, students need additional instruction in Listening g Skills. Limited opportunities to practice inhibit students from practicing Speaking Skills.	Model through read-aloud activities using a variety of text varieties. Incorporate the utilization of Role-Play where students assume the roles of characters and collaboratively create stories to enhance speaking skills.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Classroom Walkthroughs, Student Work Folders	Formative Assessment; 2013 CELLA

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Reading Test indicate that 36% (31) of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain student proficiency at 36%
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
36% (31)	

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 scored lowest in the area of Reading.	Utilize Reader's Theatre to involve students in oral reading through reading parts in a script with the emphasis on oral expression of the part. Reader's Theatre involves students in understanding their world, creating their own scripts, reading aloud, performing with a purpose, and bringing enjoyment to both themselves and their audiences.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Classroom Walkthroughs, Student Work Folders, Interim Assessments.	Formative Assessment; 2013 CELLA

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Writing Test indicate that 36% (31) of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain student proficiency at 36%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	

36% (31)

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 scored lowest in the area of Writing.	Develop students to utilize the writing process and write in these steps: planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing (according to each child's individual writing level), as well as, sharing and responding to writing.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Classroom Walkthroughs, Student Work Folders, District Writing Pre/Post Tests	Formative Assessment; 2013 CELLA

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 28% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (151)	31% (165)

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	Grade 3and 4 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Number Operations, Problems and Statistics. Grade 5 – Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Base Ten and Fractions.	Grade 3 and 4 - Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction , and multiplication and division of whole numbers, as well as addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals. Grade 5 – Develop an understanding of and fluency with division of whole numbers; develop an understanding of and fluency with addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals; identify and relate prime and composite numbers, factors and multiples within the context of fractions; describe real-world situations using positive and negative numbers; compare, order, and graph integers; and solve non-routine problems.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data chats will occur after every administration of the District Interim Assessments.	Formative Assessment: FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

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 Mathematics Test indicate that 58% of middle school students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency to 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (307)	59% (313)

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	Grade 3 and 4 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Number Operations Problems, and Statistics. Grade 5 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement.	Grade 3 and 4 - In order to provide enrichment opportunities for students, use technology such as Gizmos, Riverdeep, or the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives that include visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of numbers. Grade 5 – Provide hands-on enrichment opportunities for students to describe three-dimensional shapes and analyze their properties, including volume and surface area; identify and plot ordered pairs on the first quadrant; compare, contrast, and convert units of measures within the same dimension to solve problems; solve problems requiring attention to approximations,	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data chats will occur after every administration of the District Interim Assessments.	Formative Assessment: FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

		selections of appropriate tools, and precision in measurement; and derive and apply formulas for area.			

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 76% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 81%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (354)	81% (377)

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	Grade 3 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Number: Fractions. Grade 4 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Number Operations, Problems, and Statistics. Grade 5 – Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Geometry and	Grade 3 - Utilize common fractions to develop students' understanding of fraction equivalence. Grade 4 – Provide students the opportunity to develop quick recall of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division facts. Grade 5 – Utilize manipulatives to	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data chats will occur after every administration of the District Interim Assessments.	Formative Assessment: FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

	Measurement.	expand real world concepts relating to measurement.			

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 Mathematics Test indicate that 53% in the lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 63%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% (32)	63% (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	Grade 3, 4 and 5 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement.	Grade 3, 4 and 5 - Provide small group remediation utilizing manipulatives for hands-on activities to introduce concepts through discovery as well as demonstrate understanding.	MTSS/ Rtl Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Reports from FCAT Explorer	Formative Assessment: FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	5A : Our goal from 2011 to 2017, is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	89	90	91	92	93	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	

Mathematics Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 86% of middle school students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency to 87%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (259)	87% (261)

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	Grade 6 and Grade 8 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Grade 7 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Number: Base Ten.	Grade 6 and 8 - Provide teachers training in helping students move from the concrete to more abstract models: - Manipulatives (National Library of Virtual Manipulatives) - Interactive websites - Holt online textbook resources - Calculators Grade 7 – 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.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data chats will occur after every administration of the District Interim Assessments.	Formative Assessment: FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
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 Mathematics Test indicate that 58% of middle school students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency to 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

58% (307)	59% (313)

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	Grade 6 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Number and Fractions. Grade 7 – Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Statistics and Probability. Grade 8 – Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement.	Grade 6 - Provide enrichment opportunities for students to utilize manipulatives for hands-on activities to introduce concepts through discovery as well as demonstrate understanding. Grade 7 – Provide enrichment through the use of NCTM's Illuminations website to experiment with spinners and compare the experimental probability of a particular outcome to the theoretical probability. Grade 8 – Provide enrichment through the use of computer software (Geometer's Sketchpad or Geogebra) to draw various polygons and investigate their interior angles.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data chats will occur after every administration of the District Interim Assessments.	Formative Assessment: FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 76% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 81%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (354)	81% (377)

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	Grade 6 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Number Operations, Problems, and Statistics. Grade 7 – Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Statistics and Probability. Grade 8 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Expression, Equations and Functions.	Grade 6 - Provide students the opportunity to develop quick recall of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division facts. Grade 7 – Utilize manipulatives (coins, spinners, die) to explore outcome of an experiment and predict which events are likely or unlikely. Grade 8 – Use graphing calculators or computers with compatible software to explore slopes, graphs, and tables of linear functions.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data chats will occur after every administration of the District Interim Assessments.	Formative Assessment: FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
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 Mathematics Test indicate that 53% in the lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 63%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% (32)	63% (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	Grade 6, Grade 7 and Grade 8 - Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement.	Grade 6, Grade 7 and Grade 8 – Provide the opportunities for students to use similar triangles to solve problems that include height and distances.	MTSS/ Rtl Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Reports from FCAT Explorer	Formative Assessment: FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our goal for 2011-2017, is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	89	90	91	92	93	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC indicate that 57% of the students scored at Achievement Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 by 2 percentage points to 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (43)	59% (45)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Polynomials.	Provide all students with more practice in solving real-world problems involving relations and functions.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Formative Assessments, Interim Assessments, Summative Assessments	2013 Algebra EOC

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC indicate that 34% of the students scored at Achievement Level 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Level 4 and 5 by 2 percentage points to 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (26)	35% (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	Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics	Provide enrichment opportunities through the utilization of inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Formative Assessments, Interim Assessments, Summative Assessments	2013 Algebra EOC

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

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

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:	The results of the 2012 EOC Geometry Test indicate that 100% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain Levels 4 and 5 proficiency at 100%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (17)	100% (17)

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 scored lowest in the Reporting Category of Two-Dimensional Geometry.	Provide students with enrichments opportunities using methods of direct and indirect proof to determine whether a proof is logically valid.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Formative Assessments, Interim Assessments, Summative Assessments.	2013 Geometry EOC

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will	Geometry Goal #

reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	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
Data Analysis	3-8	Lourdes Cobas	Third – Eighth Grade Teachers	November 13, 2012	Monthly Progress Monitoring	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team

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
Data Analysis	Substitute Coverage	6010	$2,400.00
			Subtotal: $2,400.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,400.00

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% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 47%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (86)	47% (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	Grade 5 and Grade 8 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was the Reporting Category of Nature of Science.	Grade 5 - Utilize online resources from Scott Foresman to conduct virtual labs and to assist students in understanding abstract concepts. Grade 8 – Conduct at least one hands-on activities per week. Each hands-on activity should be identified by the benchmark and include solid science content to ensure that full hands-on minds-on activities are addressed.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Data Chats after administration of the District Interim Assessments to monitor student progress.	Formative Assessment: Interim Assessments Summative Assessment: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 34% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency at 34%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (64)	34% (65)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Grade 5 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was Life/Environmental. Grade 8 – The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was Physical Science.	Grade 5 - Provide enrichment activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase inquiry-based activities. Grade 8 – Provide enrichment opportunities in the classroom for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and discussion of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Thematic Units	Formative Assessment: Interim Assessments Summative Assessment: 2013 FCAT 2.0

		hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design as it relates to the Physical and Chemical Sciences (i.e., Science Fair, SECME, Fairchild Challenge).			

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
Data Analysis	5-8 Science	Science Liaison, Teachers, PD Liaison	5th and 8th Grade Science Teachers	August 23, 2012-December 21, 2012	Data binders, vertical and horizontal team planning, Data Log Charts	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team
Best Practices-Science	5-8 Science	Science Liaison, Teachers, PD Liaison	5th and 8th Grade Science Teachers	August 22, 2012-December 21, 2012	Submit sample lesson plans/ideas Team Planning	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team
Florida Continuous Improvement Model Training	5-8 Science	Science Liaison, Teachers, PD Liaison, Administrators	5th and 8th Grade Science Teachers	August 23, 2012 – June 6, 2013	Common planning – Minutes will be reviewed to ensure data trends are discussed and lesson plans are developed in accordance with District Pacing Guide.	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team

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. Writing Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 97% of students scored Level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher at 97%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
97% (159)	97% (159)

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
	Level 3 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing was the utilization of conventions in the area of expository essays. Level 4 - The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing was elaboration in the area of expository essays.	Level 3 - Use revising/editing chart and conferencing with teachers for capitalization, punctuation, subject/verb and pronoun agreement in simple and compound sentences by: • using left to right progression and sequencing, • utilizing conventional spelling of sight words and spelling patterns,	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the use of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) as it relates to Administration will monitor writing samples by reviewing student work along with the Writing Team.	Formative Assessment: District Baseline Writing Test and Mid-year Test Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT Writing Test 2.0

1		and then apply to other spelling generalizations • correctly spelling approximations previously circled, • capitalizing the first word in each sentence, • completing sentences with correct capitalization including proper nouns, names and the proper noun I, • using ending punctuation including periods, questions marks and exclamation points, apostrophes, commas, colons, quotations to assist with creating voice within a writing piece, • using subject/verb and noun/pronoun agreement in simple and compound sentences within the writing piece, including present/past tense agreement, subjective/objective pronouns, and plurals or irregular nouns. Level 4 - Utilize anchor papers to model elaboration and ways to extend ideas in 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
No Data Submitted						

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:	
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
		Utilize District-published	MTSS/RtI	As part of the Florida	Civics EOC 2013

1		lesson plans with assessments aligned to tested End of Course Exam Benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content.	Leadership Team	Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), data analysis chats will take place after the Fall and Winter Interim Assessments to monitor progress.	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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:	The goal of Ada Merritt K-8 Center is to maintain the Attendance Rate at 97.35% for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
97.35% (728)	97.35% (728)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
103	98
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
260	247

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	Absences: Parents schedule travel dates during the school calendar. Tardies: Parents and students are not familiar with the District Attendance Policy.	Increase parent contact and attendance communication via Connect Ed, monthly newsletter, and parent meetings.	Attendance Review Committee	Administrators will monitor Attendance Rate and Truancy Reports.	2012-2013 School 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
Truancy Prevention	K-8	Staff Attendance Services and Counselor	All teachers, counselor, and attendance clerk.	October 10, 2012	Counselor will monitor the implementation of the Truancy Intervention Program.	Administrators

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the total number of suspensions.
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
3	3
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
3	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	Outdoor Suspensions: Students must become familiar with the Code of Student Conduct and the consequences for infractions. Indoor Suspensions: Students must participate in Anti-Bullying Curriculum.	Provide students with information on the Code of Conduct and the expectations for behavior and clearly identify the consequences for incidents.	Administration	Classroom walkthroughs, Monitor Truancy Report and Attendance Rate.	Indoor/Outdoor Suspension Report

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The Student Code of Conduct Orientation	K-8	School-wide	School-wide	August 23, 2012 – June 6, 2013	Utilize classroom walkthroughs to monitor teachers' enforcement of the Code of Student Conduct.	Administration and Counselor

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.*	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of parents participating in curriculum-based informational workshops from 5% to 10%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
5% (37.45)	10% (72)

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 work schedules conflict with scheduled events.	Provide/schedule parent workshops and school functions at various times whenever possible to help increase the number of parents who attend.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Review Parent Attendance Sign-In Sheets, PTA Membership	Parent Attendance 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						

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:	A review of the school's current STEM Practices indicate that : - All third through fifth grade students participate in the annual Science Fair. - Nineteen seventh graders are taking Algebra. - Fifty-two eighth graders are taking Algebra. - Twenty eighth graders are taking Geometry. - All sixth graders will participate in the Invention Convention. - All the eighth graders enrolled in the Technology or Advanced Academics will complete the Middle Years Programme Culminating Project. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to incorporate the STEM Best Practices to provide students with preparation needed to continue participating in STEM courses in middle school and beyond.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need to understand preparation that is required to enter fields of mathematics, science, and engineering.	Provide students with the opportunities to participate in the Science Fair; introduce to scientific process.	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team		Algebra and Geometry EOC Results, Science Fair Results

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 opportunities for STEM applied learning by increasing opportunities for students to participate in CTSO career and technical skill competitions by 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	Teachers are not trained as CTSO advisors to provide technical and leadership support required for CTSO student achievement.	Utilize Career Technical Student Organization (CTSO) Career Development Events and related curriculum aligned to appropriate CTE program to increase rigor, relevance, and opportunities for STEM activities.	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	Monitor the implementation of the guidelines and timeline for the teacher training and the progress of the CTE student competition projects.	Participation in CTE.

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

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
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Common Core Reading Overview	Substitute Coverage	Elementary Basic Instruction	$1,600.00
Mathematics	Data Analysis	Substitute Coverage	6010	$2,400.00
				Subtotal: $4,000.00
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: $4,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

( ) Priority ( ) Focus ( ) Prevent (•) NA

Are you a reward school: (•) Yes ( ) No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/9/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

☑ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Brain Pop	$2,300.00
Smart Board Clickers	$1,500.00

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

The Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) has a team approach to the overall function of the school and the decision making process. Listed below are some of the functions of the EESAC:

• The EESAC is the sole body responsible for the final decision making at the school relating to the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP).

• The EESAC implements opportunities for professional growth of teachers, parental involvement, and the implementation of the school's Primary Years Program (PYP) and Middle Years Program (MYP).

• The EESAC reviews the EESAC and General School budgets.

• The EESAC provides a forum for professional discussions of issues that affect student achievement.

• The EESAC makes recommendations as to which instructional materials/resources/software are essential to the SIP.

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 ADA MERRITT K-8 CENTER 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	93%	87%	76%	345	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	69%	73%			142	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	69% (YES)	84% (YES)			153	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					640	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District ADA MERRITT K-8 CENTER 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	93%	98%	82%	366	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	78%	70%			148	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	77% (YES)	78% (YES)			155	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					669	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested