FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: EUGENIA B. THOMAS K-8 CENTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: Mayra Barreira

SAC Chair: Edric Valdes

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

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	Mayra B. Falcón	BA in Elementary Ed. MS in Elementary Ed. Specialist in Ed. Leadership Gifted Endorsement	9	18	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A High Standards Rdg. 72 84 84 85 84 High Standards Math 68 79 82 81 80 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 78 70 73 79 73 Lrng Gains-Math 78 69 70 77 67 Gains-Rdg-25% 80 74 71 78 69 Gains-Math-25% 74 65 63 69 58 AMOs Reading_____No ___NA___NA___NA__NA AMOs Math No NA NA NA NA
Assis Principal	Maribel Rivera	BA in Psychology MS in Business Administration Specialist in Educational Leadership Certification in Vocational Business 6-12	2	2	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A B A A A High Standards Rdg. 72 34 84 79 76 High Standards Math 68 64 82 72 77 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 78 50 73 72 63 Lrng Gains-Math 78 70 70 56 65 Gains-Rdg-25% 80 59 71 67 60 Gains-Math-25% 74 66 63 68 67 AMOs Reading_____No ___NA___NA___NA__NA AMOs Math No NA NA NA NA

Assis Principal	Anna Navarro	BS-Elementary Education, Boston College; Master of Science in Educational Leadership – Florida State University	3	4	'12 '11 '10* '09 '08 School Grade A A * A A High Standards Rdg. 72 72 85 84 High Standards Math 68 83 81 80 Lrng Gains-Rdg 78 67 79 73 Lrng Gains-Math 78 65 77 67 Gains-Rdg-25% 80 63 78 69 Gains-Math-25% 74 66 69 58 AMOs Reading_____No ___NA___NA___NA__NA AMOs Math No NA NA NA NA *Not at a School site (Region Center 1)
Principal	Celia Fernandez	BA in Elementary Education MS Elementary Education Certification in ESOL Endorsement and Educational Leadership	2	20	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A C C C C High Standards Rdg. 72 33 33 31 30 High Standards Math 68 64 69 68 62 Lrng Gains-Rdg 78 45 47 53 49 Lrng Gains-Math 78 66 73 75 76 Gains-Rdg-25% 80 52 46 56 54 Gains-Math-25% 74 60 67 70 82 AMOs Reading_____No ___NA___NA___NA__NA AMOs Math No NA NA NA NA
Assis Principal	Mathew Welker	BS in Chemistry BS in Science Ed. MS in Science Ed. Ed. D in Educational Leadership	2	20	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A B A High Standards Rdg. 72 57 55 51 48 High Standards Math 68 83 82 78 78 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 78 57 57 41 59 Lrng Gains-Math 78 76 82 76 81 Gains-Rdg-25% 80 51 71 54 45 Gains-Math-25% 74 67 71 65 75 AMOs Reading_____No ___NA___NA___NA__NA AMOs Math No NA NA NA NA

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)
Instructional Coach/ ESOL Teacher	Cristina Madrigal	BA in Elementary Ed. MS in Reading Certification in ESOL	10	1	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A High Standards Rdg. 72 84 84 85 84 High Standards Math 68 79 82 81 80 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 78 70 73 79 73 Lrng Gains-Math 78 69 70 77 67 Gains-Rdg-25% 80 74 71 78 69 Gains-Math-25% 74 65 63 69 58 AMOs Reading_____No ___NA___NA___NA__NA AMOs Math No NA NA NA NA
Instructional Coach/ ESOL Teacher	Angie Gonzalez	BA in Elementary Ed. Certification in ESOL	9	4	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A High Standards Rdg. 72 84 84 85 84 High Standards Math 68 79 82 81 80 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 78 70 73 79 73 Lrng Gains-Math 78 69 70 77 67 Gains-Rdg-25% 80 74 71 78 69 Gains-Math-25% 74 65 63 69 58 AMOs Reading_____No ___NA___NA___NA__NA AMOs Math No NA NA NA NA

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1.Mentoring program for beginning teachers.	Principal/Assistant Principal	June 2013	
2	2. Communicate with local universities to increase the number of internships at Eugenia B. Thomas K-8 Center consequently increasing the number of Highly Qualified candidates for employment at Eugenia B. Thomas K-8	Principal and Assistant Principal	August 2012	

	Center.			
3	3. Continue the Implementation on proven techniques and research based strategies for improving teacher morale which will consequently retain highly qualified teachers.	Principal/Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
4	4. Recognize and reward outstanding teacher performance throughout the school year during faculty meetings.	Principal/Assistant Principal	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Out-of-Field: 11.39% (9) Not Highly Effective: 0% (0)	Teachers will be mentored by highly effective teachers within their grade level and/or department. In addition, they will have the opportunity to collaborate coursework and lesson plans with teachers within their grade level.

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
103	1.9%(2)	29.1%(30)	50.5%(52)	18.4%(19)	34.0%(35)	68.0%(70)	3.9%(4)	3.9%(4)	65.0%(67)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
N/A			

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

We are a Title II District.

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.

Eugenia B. Thomas K-8 Center's MTSS/RtI is an extension of the school's Leadership Team. It has been 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 share the common goal of improving instruction for all students; and
• team members who will work to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time.

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:
• Instructional Coaches
• School Guidance Counselors

• Special Education Personnel
• School Psychologist
• School Social Worker
• EESAC Chair
• Community Stakeholder

3. 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 that are 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.

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. Monitor academic and behavioral data evaluating progress by addressing the following important questions:
• What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
• How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments)
• How will we respond when students have not learned? (response to intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
• How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (enrichment opportunities)

2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs;

3. Hold regular team meetings;

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

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

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

7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

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

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

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

MTSS Implementation

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

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:
• Adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
• Adjust the delivery of behavior management system
• Adjust the allocation of school-based resources
• Drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
• Create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions

2. Managed data will include:
Academic
• FAIR/PMRN
• Interim assessments
• FCAT 2.0 Reading, Math, Writing and Science Assessments (grades 3-8)
• SESAT/SAT -10
• CELLA K-8
• Student grades
• School site specific assessments
• Edusoft Reports

Behavior
• Student Case Management System
• Ten-Step Discipline Plan
• Detentions
• Indoor/outdoor suspensions
• Referrals by student behavior
• Office referrals per day/per month
• School Climate Surveys
• Attendance records
• 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, data analysis process;

2. providing training and support for teachers and 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. Providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RtI organized through feeder patterns.

2. Providing sufficient coaching support to assist staff and school team with interventions

3. On-going data driven meetings to align student's needs and interventions

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
The Literacy Leadership Team consists of the following staff members:
• Mayra Barreira, Principal
• Celia Fernandez, Assistant Principal Community Education
• Anna Navarro, Assistant Principal
• Maribel Rivera, Assistant Principal
• Matthew Welker, Assistant Principal
• Angie Gonzalez, Instructional Coach
• Cristina Madrigal, Instructional Coach
• Sonia Eidinger, SPED Chair
• Zenaida Barrera, Kindergarten Chair

• Lydia Bon, First Grade Chair
• Gloria Rauda, Second Grade Chair
• Yesenia Esquijarosa, Third Grade Chair
• Gladys Romagosa, Fourth Grade Chair
• Cristina Hamzavi, Fifth Grade Chair
• Cristina Delgado-Ruiz, Sixth Grade Chair
• Rossana Marrero, Seventh Grade Chair
• Michelle Gutierrez, Eighth Grade Chair
• Jose Vazquez, Media Specialist
• Amalia Sanchez, ESOL Chair
• Mario Fernandez, Bilingual Chair

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

The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal, 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.

2.1 What process will the principal use to form and maintain a Literacy Leadership Team?

The principal selects team members for the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) based on a cross section of the faculty and administrative team that represents highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum. The Reading Coach must be a member of the Literacy Leadership Team. The team will meet monthly throughout the school year. School Literacy Leadership Teams may choose to meet more often. Additionally, the principal may expand the LLT by encouraging personnel from various sources such as Just Read, Florida! support staff to join.

2.2 What role will the principal and coach play on the Literacy Leadership Team?

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

2.3 How will the principal promote the Literacy Leadership Team as an integral part of the school literacy reform process?

The principal, as the instructional leader of the school supports literacy instruction and will promote membership on the Literacy Leadership Team by:
• holding meetings at convenient times;
• providing adequate notice of meetings;
• providing time/coverage (if needed) to attend meetings;
• providing Master Plan Points (MPP) and team building activities for member's commitment and participation; and
• offering professional growth opportunities through monthly in-services.

The Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly to focus on developing and maintaining an ongoing system that will maximize student achievement. The team meets once a month to engage in the following activities: review District and feeder pattern data and link to instructional decisions, review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the information, the team will identify professional development and resources to be implemented as part of the intervention. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills.

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

Eugenia B. Thomas K-8 Center's Literacy Leadership Team will develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards and programs. Provide support for the implementation of the Common Core State Standards, identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum, behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children considered "at-risk" in reading, assist in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

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.

All teachers will implement strategies for reading instruction which include but are not limited to departmentalization, reciprocal teaching, use of graphic organizers, guided groups, differentiated instruction and the use of Smart boards. Therefore every teacher will be responsible for students' understanding of the text by carefully reading it, drawing conclusions and formulating responses to comprehension questions which address the question entirely. The Literacy Leadership Team will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of 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 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 26% of students achieved a Level 3 in proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the proficiency of Level 3 students proficiency by 3 percentage points to 29%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (273)	29% (303)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test were Reporting Categories: Grade 3: Reading Application Grade 4: Vocabulary Grade 5: Reading Application Grade 6: Informational Text Grade 7: Informational Text Grade 8: Vocabulary Students are deficient in the necessary skills to critically analyze text, and synthesize details to draw conclusions due to the hindrance of our large ELL population.	Students will use text features in real-world documents such as, how-to-articles, brochures, newspapers, flyers and websites while using text features to locate, interpret and organize information.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, formative bi-weekly or monthly assessment data reports are analyzed and then shared with the third through eighth grade teachers to ensure students are making progress in the area of Informational Text/Research Process and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Bi-weekly or monthly assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Program (CAP) reports generated from FCAT Explorer and Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Reading Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students require multiple reads of a selection prior to responding to comprehension questions.	Provide students with opportunities for read alouds, auditory tapes and text readers that provide print with visuals and or symbols.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Assessments will be provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2013 Florida Alternate Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 43% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 44%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (445)	44% (459)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area which showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category: Informational Text/Research Process. Students are deficient in the necessary skills to critically analyze text, and synthesize details to draw conclusions.	Provide students with an opportunity for enrichment with real-world text such as, how-to- articles, brochures, flyers and websites. Use text features to locate, interpret and organize information. Implement the Reading Plus programs that target acceleration strategies in reading as well as instruction in the content areas with a focus on reading real-world documents.	Literacy Leadership Team	Following the FCIM model, third through eighth grade teachers will analyze their student data monthly to determine the effectiveness of their ongoing classroom assessments and other strategies implemented which focus on students' ability to read advanced text. In addition, teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided reading groups.	Formative: Bi-weekly or monthly assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Program (CAP) reports generated from FCAT Explorer and Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Reading Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students should be guided to read fiction, nonfiction and informational text to identify the differences.	Students will be provided opportunities to improve comprehension, reading selections should be taught at a level that does not frustrate the student (high interest low readability). Students must have continuous review/practice when learning reading concepts.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Assessments will be provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2013 Florida Alternate Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicates that 78% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 83%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (602)	83% (641)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The limited use of reading application techniques and instruction has hindered progress due to the large population of ELL students.	Emphasis will be placed on strategies for summarizing, brainstorming, appropriate use of task cards, and think-alouds as well as provide additional instruction on Author's perspective.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, third through eighth grade teachers will use ongoing classroom assessments and monthly progress monitoring focusing on students' knowledge of author's perspective, main idea, cause and effect, and all areas in Reading Application. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided reading groups, tutoring and usage of Reading Plus.	Formative: Bi-weekly or monthly assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Program (CAP) reports generated from FCAT Explorer and Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Reading Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students should be guided to read fiction, nonfiction and informational text to identify the differences.	Students will be provided opportunities to improve comprehension, reading selections should be taught at a level that does not frustrate the student (high interest low readability). Students must have continuous review/practice when learning reading concepts.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Assessments will be provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2013 Florida Alternate Reading Assessment

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicates that 80% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase in the lowest 25% of students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 85%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (159)	85% (169)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, this increase indicates that students in the lowest 25% benefitted from the remediation in our structured tutoring programs. We will continue providing remediation to our lowest 25% in order for the students to continue to make learning gains.	Continue before, after, and in-house tutoring programs with a focus on reading application and informational text/research process. Programs will be monitored on a weekly basis to ensure fidelity.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, administrators will monitor programs weekly to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity. Third through eighth grade teachers will review bi-weekly data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust interventions as needed.	Formative: Bi-weekly or monthly assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Program (CAP) reports generated from FCAT Explorer and Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : To increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above by increments of 2.8 and to reduce the proportion of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years (by 2016-2017) using 2010-2011 as the baseline year.

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

	74	77	79	81	84	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that : White: 75% Black: 65% Hispanic: 71% Asian: 81% of student subgroups by ethnicity are not making satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase reading achievement of student subgroups by ethnicity that are not making satisfactory progress by: White: 3 Black: 8 Hispanic: 5 Asian: 10 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 75% (80) Black: 65% (12) Hispanic: 71% (635) Asian: 81% (18) American Indian: N/A	White: 78% (83) Black: 73% (13) Hispanic:76% (679) Asian:91% (20) American Indian: N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	White: No Black: No Hispanic: No Asian: No American Indian: N/A	Continue before, after, and in-house tutoring programs with a focus on reading application and informational text/research process. Programs will be monitored on a weekly basis to ensure fidelity.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity. Third through eighth grade teachers will review bi-weekly data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust interventions as needed. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided reading groups, tutoring and usage of software/web based intervention programs such as SuccessMaker and Reading Plus.	Formative: Bi-weekly or monthly assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Program (CAP) reports generated from FCAT Explorer and Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 51% of students in the English Language Learners subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 12 percentage points to 63%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (123)	63% (152)

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	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading administration, the ELL subgroup has not made satisfactory progress when compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading administration. Challenges in this area involve a lack of English language base including grammar and vocabulary, which hinder students from grasping meaning in reading.	Provide students with a print rich environment and exposure to vocabulary and grammar skills and activities such as word of the week and word walls. Provide FCAT Boot Camp where students are exposed to weekly Reading Benchmarks.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity. Third through eighth grade teachers will monitor monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided reading groups, tutoring and usage of software/web based intervention programs such as Imagine Learning/SuccessMaker. Reports will be used to determine student progress in areas of deficiency.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports. Success Maker and Waterford Cumulative Gains Report Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 40% of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 45%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (24)	45% (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	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading administration, the SWD subgroup has made satisfactory progress when compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading administration. Targeted intense interventions are necessary to continue to increase learning gains for these students.	Provide students with a print rich environment and exposure to vocabulary and grammar skills and activities such as word of the week and word walls. Provide FCAT Boot Camp where students are exposed to weekly Reading Benchmarks.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity. Third through eighth grade teachers will monitor monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports. Success Maker and Waterford Cumulative Gains Report Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading

				Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided reading groups, tutoring and usage of software/web based intervention programs such as Imagine Learning/SuccessMaker. Reports will be used to determine student progress in areas of deficiency.	Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 64% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged (ED) subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 6 percentage points to 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (280)	70% (307)

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	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading administration, the ED subgroup has not made satisfactory progress when compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading administration. Targeted intense interventions are necessary to continue to increase learning gains for these students.	Provide students with a print rich environment and exposure to vocabulary and grammar skills and activities such as word of the week and word walls. Implement tutorial services during school hours using SuccessMaker program and small group tutoring groups.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity. Third through eighth grade teachers will review bi-weekly data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust interventions as needed. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided reading groups, tutoring and usage of software/web based intervention programs such as SuccessMaker and Reading Plus.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports, SuccessMaker Report. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core State Standards	Grades K-8	Instructional Coach and Language Arts Chairperson	School-wide	August 17, 2012	Lesson Plans and classroom visits	Principal, Assistant Principals
Vocabulary Instruction	Grades 3-8	Instructional Coach and Language Arts Chairperson	School-wide	December 10 and 12, 2012	Lesson Plans and classroom visits	Principal, Assistant Principals
Four Square Writing	Grade K-8	Instructional Coach and Language Arts Chairperson	School-wide	November 19, 2012	Lesson Plans and classroom visits	Principal, Assistant Principals

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category: Reading Application and Process. Reporting Category: Informational Text/Research Reporting Category: Vocabulary Students need additional opportunities to practice using and identifying details from a passage to determine main idea, plot, and purpose.	Word of the week and Time for Kids Program as a supplemental Reading program	PTSA funds	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $5,000.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening / speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Listening/Speaking portion indicate that 54% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by

	5 percentage points to 59%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

54% (297)

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	On the 2012 CELLA Listening/Speaking administration, ELL students 54% made satisfactory progress when compared to the 2011 CELLA Listening/Speaking administration. Challenges in the area of listening involve a lack of English language base including vocabulary skills. Challenges in the area of speaking involve a lack of English language base including communication skills.	Provide students with a print rich environment and exposure to vocabulary and grammar skills and activities such as word of the week. Teachers will use strategies such as Language Experience Approach (LEA), Total Physical Response (TPR), and usage of Illustrations/Diagrams.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Monitor monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment. Utilize Waterford and Imagine Learning reports to determine student progress in words and phrases.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports. Waterford, Imagine Learning, Achieve 3000, Cumulative Gains Report Summative: Results from the 2013 CELLA Listening/Speaking Assessment.

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 2011-2012 CELLA Reading portion indicate that 36% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 41%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

36% (194)

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	On the 2012 CELLA Reading administration, ELL students 36% made satisfactory progress when compared to the 2011 CELLA Reading administration. Challenges in this area involve a lack of English language base including grammar and vocabulary, which hinder students from	Provide students with a print rich environment and exposure to vocabulary and grammar skills and activities such as word of the week. Teachers will use strategies such as Question-Answer Relationship (QAR), use task cards and differentiated instruction (DI).	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Monitor monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment. Utilize Waterford and Imagine Learning reports to determine student progress in words and phrases.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports. Waterford, Imagine Learning, Achieve 3000, Cumulative Gains Report Summative: Results from the

	grasping meaning in reading.				2013 CELLA Reading Assessment.

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 portion indicate that 38% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 43%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
38% (204)	

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	On the 2012 CELLA Writing administration, ELL students 38% made satisfactory progress when compared to the 2011 CELLA Writing administration. Challenges in this area involve a lack of English language base including vocabulary and grammar skills.	Provide students with a print rich environment and exposure to vocabulary and grammar skills and activities such as word of the week and the Four Square Writing Method. Teachers will use strategies such as graphic organizers, process writing and rubrics.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Monitor monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment. Utilize Waterford, Achieve 3000 and Imagine Learning reports to determine student progress in words and phrases.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports. Waterford, Imagine Learning, Achieve 3000, Cumulative Gains Report Summative: Results from the 2013 CELLA Writing Assessment.

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 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 30% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (310)	31% (324)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Number: Fractions. Students must receive more practice and instruction in the use and development of fractions in order to solve problems.	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.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, third through eighth grade teachers will review data from progress monitoring assessments on a monthly basis and adjust instruction as needed. Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided math groups and usage of the software/web based intervention program SuccessMaker.	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports, Gizmos, and student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Provide students with opportunities to learn concepts using manipulatives visuals, number lines and assistive technology.	Repetition for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Students will provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2013 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 36% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 37%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (377)	37% (387)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test were: Grade 3: Number: Fractions Grade 4: Number: Operations & Problems Grade 5: Geometry and Measurement. Students must receive more practice and instruction in the use and development of fractions in order to solve problems.	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 through enrichment.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, third through eighth grade teachers will review data from progress monitoring assessments on a monthly basis and adjust instruction as needed. Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided math groups and usage of the software/web based intervention program SuccessMaker.	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports and student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students must have continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts.	Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Students will provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2013 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 78% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 83%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (597)	83% (636)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test were: Grade 3: Number: Fractions Grade 4: Number: Operations & Problems Grade 5: Geometry and Measurement.	Use literature in mathematics to provide the necessary meaning for children to successfully grasp Number: Fraction concepts and allows students to make connections with real-world situations. Infusing literacy in the mathematics classroom may include the use of mathematics terminology embedded throughout each lesson by the teacher and students, journals written by students reflecting about the math they learned, interactive “Word Walls” created by the teacher and students in conjunction with each lesson, or books used as a lesson lead-in, guided practice or closure of the lesson.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, administrators will ensure mathematics literature and terminology is reflected in lesson plans and is aligned with the most recent data results. Third through eighth grade teachers will review data from progress monitoring assessments on a monthly basis and adjust instruction as needed. Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided math groups, tutoring programs and usage of the software/web based intervention program SuccessMaker.	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports and student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students must have continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts.	Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Students will provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2013 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 74% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 79%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (148)	79% (158)

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	As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics administration, students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics increased by 9 percentage points when compared to the 2011 administration. The areas of deficiencies are: Grade 3: Number: Fractions Grade 4: Number: Operations & Problems Grade 5: Geometry and Measurement.	Identify lowest performing students in grades 3-8 based on instructional needs. Provide before, after and in-house tutoring sessions including the pull-out and push-in model that correlate instruction to deficiencies. Monitor students' attendance and contact parents regularly.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, third through eighth grade teachers will review formative progress monitoring assessment data as well as intervention assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust interventions as needed. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided math groups, tutoring programs and usage of the software/web based intervention program SuccessMaker. Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports and intervention assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

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 : To increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above by increments of 2.2 and to reduce the proportion of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years (by 2016-2017) using 2010-2011 as the baseline year.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	68	71	74	77	80	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math Test indicate that: White: 69% (74) Black: 71% (13) Hispanic: 67% (600) Asian: 90% (20) of student subgroups by ethnicity are not making satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase math achievement of student subgroups by ethnicity that are not making satisfactory progress by White: 3 Black: 2 Hispanic: 3 Asian: 1 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 69% (74) Black: 71% (13) Hispanic: 67% (600) Asian: 90% (20) American Indian: N/A	White: 72% (77) Black: 73% (13) Hispanic: 70% (627) Asian: 91% (20) American Indian: N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	White: Yes Black: Yes Hispanic: Yes Asian: Yes American Indian: N/A	Identify lowest performing students by subgroups in grades 3-8 based on instructional needs. Provide before, after and in-house tutoring sessions that correlate instruction to deficiencies. Monitor students' attendance and contact parents regularly.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, third through eighth grade teachers will review formative progress monitoring assessment data as well as intervention assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust interventions as needed.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports and intervention assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 57% of students in the English Language Learners subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 61%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (138)	61% (148)

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	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics administration, the ELL subgroup did make adequate progress when compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics administration. Students are in need of more hands-on opportunities with math manipulatives.	Provide real life contexts for mathematical explorations and develop student understanding through the supports of manipulatives, oral discussions, and demonstrations. Promote the analyzing of graphs with words such as most, least, minimum, and maximum to provide a conceptual foundation for the more formal terms such as mode and range that they will learn in later grades.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, third through eighth grade ELL teachers will monitor monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 43% of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 45%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (26)	48% (29)

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	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics administration, the SWD subgroup did make adequate progress when compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics administration. Students are in need of more hands-on opportunities with math manipulatives.	Provide real life contexts for mathematical explorations and develop student understanding through the supports of manipulatives, oral discussions, and demonstrations. Promote the analyzing of graphs with words such as most, least, minimum, and maximum to provide a conceptual foundation for the more formal terms such as mode and range that they will learn in later grades.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, third through eighth grade teachers will monitor monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 58% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged (ED) subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 63%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (255)	63% (277)

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	On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics administration, the ED subgroup has not made adequate progress when compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics administration. Students are in need of more hands-on opportunities with math manipulatives to develop exploration and inquiry activities.	The implementation of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards will provide students the opportunity to develop exploration and inquiry activities to increase understanding of mathematics skills through hands on experiences. These activities will engage students in more abstract reasoning, planning, analysis, judgment and creative thought (high cognitive complexity level.) Additionally we will provide FCAT Boot Camp where students are exposed to weekly Mathematics Benchmarks.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review student's progress through logs of activities and intervention groups as well as reviewing lesson plans. Conduct grade level discussions during common planning to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategies being implemented. Monitor monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 30% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (310)	31% (324)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test were: Grade 6: Geometry &	Provide opportunities to find the perimeters and areas of composite two-dimensional figures, including non-rectangular figures (such as	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, sixth through eighth grade teachers will review data from progress monitoring assessments on a	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim

1	Measurement Grade 7: Geometry & Measurement Grade 8: Geometry and Measurement.	semicircles), the use of various tools (on-line and off-line manipulatives) will aid the variety of learning styles.		monthly basis and adjust instruction as needed. Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided math groups and usage of the software/web based intervention programs such as GIZMOS and SuccessMaker.	Data Reports, Gizmos, and student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Provide students with opportunities to learn concepts using manipulatives visuals, number lines and assistive technology.	Repetition for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Students will provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2013 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 36% 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 to 37%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (377)	37% (387)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics	Develop an understanding of and fluency with division of whole numbers; develop an	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, sixth through eighth grade teachers will review data from	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly

1	Test were: Grade 6: Geometry & Measurement Grade 7: Geometry & Measurement Grade 8: Geometry and Measurement.	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 through enrichment.		progress monitoring assessments on a monthly basis and adjust instruction as needed. Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided math groups and usage of the software/web based intervention programs such as GIZMOS and SuccessMaker.	assessments, District Interim Data Reports and student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students must have continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts.	Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Students will provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2013 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 78% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 83%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (597)	83% (636)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as	Use literature in	Multi-Tiered	Following the FCIM	Formative:

1	noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test were: Grade 6: Geometry & Measurement Grade 7: Geometry & Measurement Grade 8: Geometry and Measurement.	mathematics to provide the necessary meaning for children to successfully grasp Number: Fraction concepts and allow students to make connections with real-world situations. Infusing literacy in the mathematics classroom may include the use of mathematics terminology embedded throughout each lesson by the teacher and students, journals written by students reflecting about the math they learned, interactive “Word Walls” created by the teacher and students in conjunction with each lesson, and on books used as a lesson lead-in, guided practice or closure of the lesson.	System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	model, administrators will ensure that mathematics guided groups are reflected in lesson plans and are aligned with most recent data results. Administrators will review Computer Assisted Programs reports monthly to ensure student usage and adequate progress. These reports will be shared with grade levels.	Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports and student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students must have continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts.	Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Students will provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2013 Florida Alternate Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 74% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 79%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (148)	79% (158)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test were: Grade 6: Geometry & Measurement Grade 7: Geometry & Measurement Grade 8: Geometry and Measurement.	Identify lowest performing students in grades 3-8 based on instructional needs. Provide before, after and in-house tutoring sessions both push-in and pull-out model that correlate instruction to deficiencies. Monitor students' attendance and contact parents regularly.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, sixth through eighth grade teachers will review formative progress monitoring assessment data as well as intervention assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust interventions as needed. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided math groups, tutoring programs and usage of the software/web based intervention program SuccessMaker. Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports and intervention assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Middle School Mathematics Goal #

5A : To increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above by increments of 2.2 and to reduce the proportion of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years (by 2016-2017) using 2010-2011 as the baseline year.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	68	71	74	77	80	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math Test indicate that: White: 69% Black: 71% Hispanic: 67% Asian: 90% of student subgroups by ethnicity are not making satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase math achievement of student subgroups by ethnicity that are not making satisfactory progress by: White: 3 Black: 2 Hispanic: 3 Asian: 1 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 69% (74) Black: 71% (13) Hispanic: 67% (600) Asian: 90% (20) American Indian: N/A	White: 72% (77) Black: 73% (13) Hispanic: 70% (627) Asian: 91% (20) American Indian: N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	White: Yes Black: Yes Hispanic: Yes Asian: Yes American Indian: N/A	Identify lowest performing student by subgroups in grades 3-8 based on instructional needs. Provide before, after and in-house tutoring sessions that correlate instruction to deficiencies. Monitor students' attendance and contact parents regularly.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, third through eighth grade teachers will review formative progress monitoring assessment data as well as intervention assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust interventions as needed. Teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided math groups, tutoring programs and usage of the software/web based intervention program SuccessMaker. Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports and intervention assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 57% of students in the English Language Learners subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 61%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (138)	61% (148)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test were: Grade 6: Geometry & Measurement Grade 7: Geometry & Measurement Grade 8: Geometry and Measurement.	Provide real life contexts for mathematical explorations and develop student understanding through the supports of manipulatives, oral discussions, and demonstrations. Promote the analyzing of graphs with words such as most, least, minimum, and maximum to provide a conceptual foundation for the more formal terms such as mode and range that they will learn in later grades.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, administrators will review bi-weekly or monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment. Sixth through eighth grade teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided math groups, tutoring programs and usage of the software/web based intervention program Imagine Learning/SuccessMaker.	Formative: Progress bi-weekly or monthly monitoring assessment data reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

				Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 43% of students in the Students With Disabilities subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 48%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (26)	48% (29)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test were: Grade 6: Geometry & Measurement Grade 7: Geometry & Measurement Grade 8: Geometry and Measurement.	Provide real life contexts for mathematical explorations and develop student understanding through the supports of manipulatives, oral discussions, and demonstrations. Promote the analyzing of graphs with words such as most, least, minimum, and maximum to provide a conceptual foundation for the more formal terms such as mode and range that they will learn in later grades.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, administrators will review bi-weekly or monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment. Sixth through eighth grade teachers will use the data to determine placement of students into guided math groups, tutoring programs and usage of the software/web based intervention program Imagine Learning/SuccessMaker. Administrators will monitor programs on a weekly basis to ensure they are being implemented with fidelity.	Formative: Progress bi-weekly or monthly monitoring assessment data reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 58% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged (ED) subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 63%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (255)	63% (277)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test were: Grade 6: Geometry & Measurement Grade 7: Geometry & Measurement Grade 8: Geometry and Measurement.	The implementation of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards will provide students the opportunity to develop exploration and inquiry activities to increase understanding of mathematics skills through hands-on experiences. These activities will engage students in more abstract reasoning, planning, analysis, judgment and creative thought (high cognitive complexity level). Additionally we will provide FCAT Boot Camp to expose students to weekly Mathematics Benchmarks.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, review student's progress through logs of activities and intervention groups as well as reviewing lesson plans. Conduct grade level discussions during common planning to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategies being implemented. Monitor monthly progress monitoring assessments and adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment.	Formative: Progress monitoring assessment data reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

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 assessment indicate that 49% of students scored at Achievement Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving proficiency level 3 at 49%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% (31)	49% (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	According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category: Quadratics.	Teachers will provide additional practice in quadratics using hands-on experiences to facilitate the conceptual learning and understanding of algebraic concepts and apply the learning to solve real-world problems.	Administrators, Department Chairpersons, and Instructional Coach.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review data from progress monitoring assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports, Gizmos, and student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra EOC assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicate that 49% of students scored a level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving proficiency (level 4 or 5) at 49%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% (31)	49% (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	According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category: Quadratics.	Teachers will provide additional enrichment in quadratics using hands-on experiences to facilitate the conceptual learning and understanding of algebraic concepts and apply the learning to solve real-world problems.	Administrators, Department Chairpersons, and Instructional Coach.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review data from progress monitoring assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports, Gizmos, and student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra EOC assessment

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:	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicate that 13% of students scored in middle third. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving proficiency at the middle third at 13%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (3)	13% (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	According to the results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment, the standard of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category: Trigonometry/Discreet Mathematics.	Provide additional practice with solving real-world problems using trigonometric ratios (sine, cosine, and tangent).	Administrators, Department Chairpersons, and Instructional Coach.	Following the FCIM model, review data from progress monitoring assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports, Gizmos, and student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicate that 83% of students scored in the upper third. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the

Geometry Goal #2:	percentage of students achieving proficiency in the upper third at 83%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (19)	83% (19)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment, the standard of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category: Trigonometry/Discreet Mathematics.	Provide additional enrichment with solving real-world problems using trigonometric ratios (sine, cosine, and tangent) and/or area of polygons.	Administrators, Department Chairpersons, and Instructional Coach.	Following the FCIM model, review data from progress monitoring assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports, Gizmos, and student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC assessment

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

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Geometry and Measurement	2-8	Instructional Coach	School-wide	November 19, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs and documentation in lesson plans	Administration, Instructional Coach
Number: Fractions	3-8	Instructional Coach	School-wide	October 1, 2012	Modeling lessons, Classroom Walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans	Administration, Instructional Coach
GIZMOS	3-8	Instructional Coach	School-wide	December 10 and 12, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, and student reports	Administration, Instructional Coach

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 36% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 39%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (124)	39% (134)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was: Grade 5: Physical Science Grade 8: Nature of Science Students are in need of more hands-on opportunities through inquiry-based learning in Physical Science and Nature of Science.	Provide opportunities for teachers to integrate literacy in the science classroom in order for students to enhance scientific meaning through writing, talking, and reading science. Also provide instruction in Physical Science and Nature of Science utilizing technology through a process that engages, explores, explains, extends and evaluates using an established rubric.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM Model, teacher in grades 3-8 will review the results of progress monitoring assessment data to monitor students' progress and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports, Student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students are in need of more hands-on opportunities through	Students must have continuous review/practice when	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team	Review the results of progress monitoring assessment data to	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-

1	inquiry-based learning.	learning science concepts and teacher's instruction must be hands on so student can manipulate and explore actions and outcomes.	(MTSS/RtI)	monitor students' progress and adjust instruction as needed. The students must be provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports, Student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Florida Alternate Science Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 23% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (80)	25% (84)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was: Grade 5: Physical Science Grade 8: Nature of Science Students are in need of more hands-on opportunities through inquiry-based learning in Physical Science and Nature of Science.	Enrichment must be hands on so students can manipulate and explore actions and outcomes. Students must have continuous review/practice when learning science concepts.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Following the FCIM model, review projects utilizing a rubric to ensure students are making progress. Teachers will provide students with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	Formative: School-developed Rubrics, Lab Reports and results from projects. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Science Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need objects/ pictures for exploration and identification of key scientific concepts.	Instruction must be hands on so students can manipulate and explore actions and outcomes. Students must have continuous review/practice when learning science concepts.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS/RtI)	Review projects utilizing a rubric to ensure students are making progress. Teachers will provide students with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	Formative: School-developed Rubrics, Lab Reports and results from projects. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Hands-on Science	K-8	Instructional Coach	Science Teachers	September 5, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs and technology reports.	Administrators, Grade Level/Department Chairpersons
GIZMOS	3-8	Instructional Coach	Science Teachers	December 10 and 12, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs, Science lab journals	Administrators, Grade Level/Department Chairpersons

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide enrichment activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Life Science.	Materials for conducting scientific investigations	EESAC	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
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: $100.00

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 2.0 Writing Test indicate that 96% of students in fourth grade achieved a Level 3 and above in proficiency. The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test indicate that 87% of students in eighth grade achieved a Level 3 and above in proficiency. The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test indicate that 69% of students in fourth grade achieved a Level 4 and above in proficiency. The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test indicate that 43% of students in eighth grade achieved a Level 4 and above in proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
91% (300)	92% (303)

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 entering fourth grade will need additional practice and instruction in the areas of organization and support. Students entering eighth grade will benefit from additional instruction in persuasive writing.	Continue the use of the 4 Square Writing Method as a daily technique for structuring their writing. The primary focus in 4th grade will be expository and persuasive in 8th grade.	Literacy Leadership Team	Following the FCIM model, review and discuss with teachers data from monthly progress monitoring writing prompts to determine student growth and make adjustments in skills needed.	Formative: Students' scores on monthly writing assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Writing Assessment indicate that there are not enough students to generate a goal statement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students must have continuous repetition/practice when learning writing concepts.	Students must use visuals with sentences to facilitate matching them to an appropriate topic. Students must use picture cards to create sentences and paragraphs on topic.	Literacy Leadership Team	Teachers must provide students with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2013 Florida Alternate Writing Assessment

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
4 Square Writing Method	K-8	4th and 8th Grade Teachers	School-wide	November 14 and 19, 2012	Classroom walkthroughs, Student work samples	Administrators
4 Square Writing Method (after FCAT 2.0)	K-8	Instructional Coach	School-wide	April 1 and 3, 2013	Classroom walkthroughs, Student work samples	Administrators

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

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:	The results of the 2012 Baseline Civics Assessment indicate that 100% of students were non proficient. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for the percentage of students achieving a level 3 proficiency will be 11%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (1)	11% (18)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers will need to institute regular, on-going common planning sessions to ensure that the Civics curriculum is taught with fidelity and is paced so as to address all State and District Benchmarks and curricular requirements. Students will encounter difficulties in reading comprehension as pertinent to Civics curriculum.	Teachers will utilize District-published lesson plans with assessments aligned to tested End of Course Exam Benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to write to inform and to persuade.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	Administrators will review and discuss with teachers data from monthly progress monitoring writing prompts to determine student growth and make adjustments in skills needed.	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports, Student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 District Spring Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Baseline Civics Assessment indicate that 100% of students were non proficient. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for the percentage of students achieving a level 4 or 5 proficiency will be 11%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (1)	11% (18)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Teachers will need to institute regular, on-going common planning sessions to ensure that the Civics curriculum is taught with fidelity and is paced so as to address all State and District Benchmarks and curricular requirements. Students will encounter difficulties in reading comprehension as pertinent to Civics curriculum.	Teachers will utilize District-published lesson plans with assessments aligned to test End of Course Exam Benchmarks to maximize enrichment for students to master tested content. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to write to inform and to persuade.	Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	Administrators will review and discuss with teachers data from monthly progress monitoring writing prompts to determine student growth and make adjustments in skills needed.	Formative: Progress Monitoring bi-weekly or monthly assessments, District Interim Data Reports, Student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Civics EOC assessment.

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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:	Our goal for this year is to increase attendance by .50 percent from 96.57% to 97.07% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated. Our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive tardies from 248 to 236.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.57% (1662)	97.07% (1671)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
360	342
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
248	236

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance rate decreased by .09% in the 2011-2012 school year as compared to the 2010-2011 school year. Student excessive tardy rate increase in 2011-2012. This is due to the excessive absences experienced throughout the year by our students who have immigration issues or travel frequently out of the country.	Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of excessive absences and excessive tardies to the Attendance Review Committee for intervention services. Counselors will also identify students in order to meet with them and/or their parents to establish an improved attendance goal. The EESAC and the City of Doral will continue to provide incentives for student attendance which will be monitored on a monthly basis.	Assistant Principal and Counselor	Incorporate an Attendance Review Committee and provide monthly updates to Administration and to the entire faculty during faculty meetings. Teachers will monitor attendance weekly and communicate with Assistant principals.	Attendance logs and rosters. COGNOS reports.

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Truancy Prevention	K-8	Counselors	School-wide	August 23, 2012 through May 31, 2013	Monitoring of attendance bulletins and Attendance Review Committee	Assistant Principals

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attendance Incentive	Provide monthly incentives for students with perfect attendance.	City of Doral	$450.00
Attendance Incentive	Provide monthly incentives for students with perfect attendance.	PTSA	$100.00
			Subtotal: $550.00
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: $550.00

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 decrease the total number of suspensions by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
5	5
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

5	5
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
17	15
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
12	11

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The total number of indoor and outdoor suspensions increased from 17 incidents during the 2010-2011 school year to 19 incidents in the 2011-2012 school year. Students need to learn tolerance, appropriate socialization skills and the Student Code of Conduct.	Continue to implement a school-wide detention program that will serve as alternatives to suspension in cases where appropriate. Maintain a Ten-Step Discipline Plan that will begin with parental contacts on the first infraction led by conferences for the second infraction and followed by detention hall after school for subsequent infractions.	Administration Team Response to Intervention Team	Monitor COGNOS report on student's suspension rates. Monitor Parent Contact Logs for evidence of communication with parents.	Parent communication logs and monthly COGNOS suspension report.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Ten - Step Discipline Plan	K-8	Administrators	School-wide	October 23, 2012	Review of COGNOS reports	Administrators

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
The administration will contact parents of students who have been placed on indoor suspension. Parents will be provided with training on building an understanding of the Student Code of Conduct.	Printing of the Student Code of Conduct	EESAC	$60.00

			Subtotal: $60.00
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: $60.00

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.*	The total number of attendees at the Parent Academy workshops as well as School-wide events throughout the 2011-2012 school year was 8453. Our goal for the 2012-2013school year is to increase the number of parents participating in school wide events to 8600.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
8453	8600

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	Parental involvement in the 2011-2012 school year showed an increase of 19% attendees as compared to the 2010-2011 school year. Parents may have a limited understanding of student data and how it affects teaching and learning.	Inform parents of events such as FCAT 2.0 and SESAT/SAT-10 Parent Nights and informational sessions for all assessments through Connect-Ed messages, school-wide flyers, posters and information placed on the marquee.	Administration	Collect parent Academy sign-in sheets and EESAC and PTSA meeting attendance sheets.	Parent Academy sign-in sheets, EESAC and PTSA meeting attendance sheets.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT 2.0 /SESAT/SAT -10 Parent Nights	1-8	Classroom Teachers	Parents	October 16, 18, 24 and 25, 2012 November 7, 8, 13 and 14, 2012	Review sign-in sheets	Administration, Professional Development Survey
Science Fair Night	2-8	Instructional Coaches	Parents	September 19, 2012	Parent Satisfaction Surveys	Administration

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Inform parents of events and informational sessions for all assessments through Connect-Ed messages, school-wide flyers, posters and information placed on the marquee.	Technology Funds for toner, ink, etc.	EESAC	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,000.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Increase opportunities for STEM applied learning by increasing opportunity for students to participate in CTSO (National Junior Honor Society and SECME) career and technical skill competitions by 75% (5). Increase the enrollment of students participating in Honors courses in math and science.
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 not trained as SECME and NJHS advisors to provide technical and leadership support required for CTSO student achievement.	Teachers attend curriculum and leadership CTSO advisor training at the district and/or state level.	Administration	Collect professional development registration and monitor the implementation of the program.	Professional development portal and competition registration reports

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	Increase student enrollment in middle school Business Technology Education courses by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Insufficient computers to accommodate an increase in enrollment.	Create an additional computer lab to accommodate increase in enrollment. Articulate with feeder pattern schools.	Administration	Student enrollment	Student enrollment

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
Create an additional computer lab	30 computers	School funds	$15,870.00
			Subtotal: $15,870.00
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: $15,870.00

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
Reading	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category: Reading Application and Process. Reporting Category: Informational Text/Research Reporting Category: Vocabulary Students need additional opportunities to practice using and identifying details from a passage to determine main idea, plot, and purpose.	Word of the week and Time for Kids Program as a supplemental Reading program	PTSA funds	$5,000.00
Science	Provide enrichment activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Life Science.	Materials for conducting scientific investigations	EESAC	$100.00
Attendance	Attendance Incentive	Provide monthly incentives for students with perfect attendance.	City of Doral	$450.00
Attendance	Attendance Incentive	Provide monthly incentives for students with perfect attendance.	PTSA	$100.00
Suspension	The administration will contact parents of students who have been placed on indoor suspension. Parents will be provided with training on building an understanding of the Student Code of Conduct.	Printing of the Student Code of Conduct	EESAC	$60.00
Parent Involvement	Inform parents of events and informational sessions for all assessments through Connect-Ed messages, school-wide flyers, posters and information placed on the marquee.	Technology Funds for toner, ink, etc.	EESAC	$3,000.00
CTE	Create an additional computer lab	30 computers	School funds	$15,870.00
				Subtotal: $24,580.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $24,580.00

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

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
ESSAC funds will be used to assist the school in purchasing technology-related items, such as toner and ink.	$3,000.00
EESAC funds will be used to support the science department by purchasing materials needed to conduct scientific investigations.	$100.00
EESAC funds will be used to print the copies of the Student Code of Conduct that will be provided to parents during the Student Code of Conduct meeting.	$60.00

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

To align, develop, implement, and monitor the School Improvement Plan for the upcoming school year.

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 EUGENIA B. THOMAS K-8 CENTER 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	84%	79%	97%	63%	323	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	70%	69%			139	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	74% (YES)	65% (YES)			139	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					601	
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 EUGENIA B. THOMAS K-8 CENTER 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	84%	82%	99%	64%	329	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	73%	70%			143	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	71% (YES)	63% (YES)			134	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					606	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested