

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: MATER ACADEMY (MIAMI BEACH)

District Name: Dade

Principal: Roberto Blanche

SAC Chair: Anabel Maldonado

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/23/2012

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	Marisol Gomez	BS- Elementary Education (K-6) with ESOL Endorsement from Florida Intl. University; MS in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University; Certified in all areas above	3	6	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades A B A A A High Standards – Rdg 59% 75% 88% 82% 81% High Standards – Math 59% 60% 91% 93% 94% Lrng Gains – Rdg 80% 77% 83% 71% 67% Lrng Gains – Math 80% 53% 50% 64% 83% Gains – R – 25 85% 77% 94% 61% 65% Gains – M – 25 69% 63% 50% 64% 83%

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
N/A					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Professional Development	Principal	June 6, 2013	
2	Competitive salaries	Principal	August 20, 2012	
3	Mentoring/Buddies	Principal	June 6, 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
24% (7)	Ensuring that staff is aware of necessary steps to attain highly qualified status. Providing information on PDs available to complete requirements in order to be in-field.

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
29	24.1%(7)	31.0%(9)	41.4%(12)	3.4%(1)	13.8%(4)	75.9%(22)	3.4%(1)	0.0%(0)	48.3%(14)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

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

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS team for Mater Beach Academy is comprised of the following members: Principal, Lead Teacher, and ESE Coordinator. The Principal provides a common vision towards data-driven decision making, ensures implementation of intervention and proper documentation as well as adequate professional development to support MTSS/RtI, and communicates plans, strategies, and activities with parents. Instructional staff provides information about core instruction, delivers interventions, collects data, and integrates materials/resources with curricular activities. Test chair identifies patterns and identifies appropriate intervention strategies, assists with programs that provide early intervening services, assists with progress monitoring, data collection, analysis, and assists in disaggregation of data to target "at risk" students.

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 MTSS leadership team will meet weekly with a focus of data analysis to target instruction and raise student achievement. Meetings will focus on reviewing data and linking to instructional decisions, providing resources and opportunities for professional development and building support for instructional programs.

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?

The MTSS Leadership Team will meet with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team will discuss goals, areas of need and align procedures.

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.

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Edusoft
Midyear: FAIR, Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Interim Assessments, Edusoft
End of year: FAIR, FCAT, Interim Assessments, Edusoft

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Mater Beach Academy will provide training and professional development during faculty meetings to be held a minimum of once a month. Furthermore, professional development provided by MDCPS will be reviewed through IPDP (Individual Professional Development Plan).

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS team will disaggregate data a minimum of once a month in order to provide support to areas in need of improvement as well as provide coaching and support to assist with problem solving measures.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The LLT is comprised of the Principal (Marisol Gomez), Reading teachers (Anabel Maldonado and Jennifer Menendez), and ESE liaison (Maggie Estrada).

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

The LLT will meet bi-weekly to review data and make program decisions. Reading teachers will model effective strategies, provide professional development and assist with monitoring progress and differentiated instruction. The principal will meet with the LLT regularly to discuss and plan professional development, as well as, district and state reading requirements.

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

This year the LLT will focus on utilizing the Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN) to determine accommodations in order to best impact student achievement. Data from interim assessments and FAIR will be utilized to address areas of need and guide instructional and intervention planning. The Principal will work collaboratively with the LLT to analyze data in order to drive instruction across the curriculum. Furthermore, students will be encouraged to participate in school wide reading activities such as book clubs, book fairs, reading contests, and Accelerated Reader.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Reading teachers share their knowledge with all instructional staff through curriculum planning and resource discussions. They assist in identifying students in need of intervention and share effective strategies to improve reading achievement. They provide current research-based instruction and evaluation practices. They assist in providing workshops, professional development, and may initiate school-wide reading incentives. Furthermore, professional development opportunities for all teachers will be made available in order to include reading across the curriculum. Implementation of these strategies will be monitored through classroom visits, observations (formal and informal), and lesson plan reviews.

*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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](#)

N/A

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:	Results from the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 27% of the students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 2 percentage points to 29%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (77)	29% (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	Data indicates specific needs to target deficiencies in reporting category 2 - Reading Application by focusing on main idea and author's purpose.	Students will use a grade appropriate text to identify author's purpose. Students will focus on author's thoughts and feelings and reading will be infused in all content areas.	Literacy Leadership Team	The administration will review formative assessment tools to monitor progress and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative – Baselines, Interim Assessments, Bi-Weekly Assessments & FAIR Summative – 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.	Results from the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 32% of the students achieved level 3 proficiency.
--	--

Reading Goal #2a:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 1 percentage points to 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32 % (92)	33% (95)

Problem-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	Data indicates specific needs to target deficiencies in reporting category 4 - Information Text/Research Process by identifying text features.	Real world documents such as brochures, fliers, and articles will be utilized to identify text features and to interpret information	Literacy Leadership Team	The administration will review formative assessment tools to monitor progress and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative – Baselines, Interim Assessments, Bi-Weekly Assessments & FAIR Summative – 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Results from the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 80% of the students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 2 percentage points to 85%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (158)	85% (168)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data indicates specific needs to target deficiencies in reporting category 2 - Reading Application by increasing silent reading opportunities through programs such as Reading Plus.	Reading Plus will be integrated as a school wide program and interventions will be put in place daily utilizing the Voyager program.	Literacy Leadership Team	The administration will review formative assessment tools to monitor progress and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative – Baselines, Interim Assessments, Bi-Weekly Assessments & FAIR Summative – 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Results from the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 85% of the students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 2 percentage points to 90%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (43)	90% (45)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in the lowest 25% are in need of remediation and intervention strategies to target reporting category 2 – Reading Application by increasing silent reading opportunities through programs such as Reading Plus	Students will be identified utilizing data from baseline assessments and Reading Plus to scaffold on concepts learned in order to build new concepts.	Literacy Leadership Team	The administration will review formative assessment tools to monitor progress and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative – Baselines, Interim Assessments, Bi-Weekly Assessments, Reading Plus, Voyager & FAIR Summative – 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	57%	61%	65%	69%	73%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Results from the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 73% of students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase those students in the White subgroup by 7 percentage points to 80%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 73% (25)	White: 80% (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	White: As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test, Hispanic students are in need of remediation and intervention strategies to target reporting category 2 – Reading Application by increasing silent reading opportunities through programs such as Reading Plus	Data will be reviewed and students in need of intervention will be monitored for progress on a monthly basis utilizing Reading Plus	Rtl Team	Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and effectiveness of program and intervention delivery. Data collected from weekly Reading Plus reports	Formative – Baselines, Interim Assessments, Bi-Weekly Assessments & FAIR Summative – 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Results from the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 43% of students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase those students by 10 percentage points to 53%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (35)	53% (43)

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	As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test, ELL students are in need of remediation and intervention strategies to target reporting category 2 – Reading Application by increasing silent reading opportunities through programs such as Reading Plus	Data will be reviewed and students in need of intervention will be identified and monitored for progress on a bi-weekly basis by utilizing Reading Plus	RtI Leadership Team	The administration will review formative assessment tools to monitor progress and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative – Baselines, Interim Assessments, Bi-Weekly Assessments & FAIR Summative – 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
RtI Training	K-8	District	K-8	October 22, 2012	Observations	Principal
Reading Plus	K-8	Reading Plus	K-8	August 14, 2012	Observations & Usage Report	Lead Teacher
Achieve 3000	K-8	Achieve 3000	K-8	November 6, 2012	Observations & Usage Report	Lead Teacher

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
2.1	Time for Kids	School Based Budget	\$2,663.00
3.1	Voyager	SAC funds	\$2,450.00
			Subtotal: \$5,113.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
3.1	Reading Plus	School Based Budget	\$19,000.00
			Subtotal: \$19,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
4.1	Substitutes	School Based Budget	\$1,750.00
			Subtotal: \$1,750.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$25,863.00

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:	Results from the 2011-2012 CELLA test indicate that 48% (87) of ELL students achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase listening/speaking proficiency.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
48% (87)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need opportunities to participate in teacher led discussions and oral conversation	Teacher led groups will be initiated and utilized to discuss material, summarize what is learned and gauge learning outcomes.	RtI	Reading Teachers and RtI team will monitor progress and assessment data monthly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Interim Assessments; Weekly Classroom Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA Test

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:

Results from the 2011-2012 CELLA test indicate that 32% (58) of ELL students achieved proficiency.

Our goal is to increase reading proficiency.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

32% (58)

Problem-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	Instructional strategies will be varied in order to meet the needs of all ELL students.	A variety of strategies will be used to guide students with new vocabulary. Context clues, multiple meanings, and word relationships will be utilized to vary instruction and target all ELL students.	RtI	Reading teachers and the RtI team will gather data from FAIR and classroom assessments and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, FAIR Summative: 2013 CELLA

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

Results from the 2011-2012 CELLA test indicate that 34% (62) of ELL students achieved proficiency.

Our goal is to increase writing proficiency.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

34% (62)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students require additional opportunities	Monthly writing prompts will be used to ensure	RtI	Reading teachers and RtI team will review	Formative: District Interim

1	to complete the writing process.	that students work through the entire writing process. Reading response journals will be used as a form of note taking and questions that arise throughout their reading. Furthermore, they provide a platform for reading discussion groups.	monthly writing prompts and make necessary adjustments to instruction.	Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA
---	----------------------------------	---	--	--------------------------------------

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 30% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 1 percentage point to 31%.
--	--

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

30% (86)	31% (90)
----------	----------

Problem-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	Reporting category 3 – Geometry & Spatial Sense was noted as an area of deficiency based on the results from the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Test. Manipulatives will be utilized to provide opportunities for practice.	Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice	Leadership Team	The administrative team will review data from formative assessments, monitor progress and make necessary adjustments to instructional program.	Formative – Baselines, Bi-weekly assessments, Interim Assessments Summative – 2013 FCAT Math 2.0

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

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

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

N/A	N/A
-----	-----

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.	The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 29% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency.
--	---

Mathematics Goal #2a:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 1 percentage point to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (84)	30% (87)

Problem-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	Data indicates that Level 4 and 5 students need to focus on reporting category 2 – Measurement by providing the use of web based tutorial programs such as IXL Math.	Students will increase understanding of skills through hands-on experiences with grade level appropriate concepts and apply learning to solve real-life problems Web based programs such as Carnegie will be utilized to maximize learning outcomes	Leadership Team	The administrative team will review data from formative assessments, monitor progress and make necessary adjustments to instructional program.	Formative – Bi-weekly assessments, Interim Assessments Summative – 2013 FCAT Math 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 80% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 5 percentage points to 85%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (158)	85% (168)

Problem-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	Reporting categories 1 - Number Sense and 2 - Measurement were identified as deficient by the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test. Students will focus on practical applications through the use of Math journals.	Concrete real-world examples will be utilized as well as math journals to show transfer of mathematical theory to practical applications	Rtl Team	The administrative team will review data from formative assessments, monitor progress and make necessary adjustments to instructional program.	Formative – Bi-weekly classroom assessments and student generated math journals Summative-2013 FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 69% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 schoolyear is to increase by 5 percentage points to 74%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (35)	74% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Reporting categories 1 - Number Sense and 2 - Measurement were identified as deficient by the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test. Students will focus on	Students will be identified based on data from baseline assessments and early intervention will be made available Concrete real-world	Rtl Team	The administrative team will review data from formative assessments, monitor progress and make necessary adjustments to instructional program.	Formative-weekly assessment and data reports Summative-2013 FCAT Math 2.0

practical applications through the use of Math journals.	examples will be utilized as well as math journals to show transfer of mathematical theory to practical applications		
--	--	--	--

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	48	53	57	62	67	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	N/A				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
N/A	N/A				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	N/A				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
N/A	N/A				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 30% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 1 percentage point to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

30% (86)			31% (90)		
Problem-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	Reporting category 3 – Geometry & Spatial Sense was noted as an area of deficiency based on the results from the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Test. Manipulatives will be utilized to provide opportunities for practice.	Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice	Leadership Team	The administrative team will review data from formative assessments, monitor progress and make necessary adjustments to instructional program.	Formative – Baselines, Bi-weekly assessments, Interim Assessments Summative – 2013 FCAT Math 2.0

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 29% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 1 percentage point to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (84)	30% (87)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Data indicates that Level 4 and 5 students need to focus on reporting category 2 –	Students will increase understanding of skills through hands-on experiences with grade	Leadership Team	The administrative team will review data from formative assessments, monitor progress and	Formative – Bi-weekly assessments, Interim

1	Measurement by providing the use of web based tutorial programs such as IXL Math.	level appropriate concepts and apply learning to solve real-life problems Web based programs such as Carnegie will be utilized to maximize learning outcomes		make necessary adjustments to instructional program.	Assessments Summative – 2013 FCAT Math 2.0
---	---	---	--	--	--

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 80% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 schoolyear is to increase by 5 percentage points to 85%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (158)	85% (168)

Problem-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	Geometry & Measurement were identified as deficient areas in middle school by the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test.	Instruction will provide students with opportunities to develop spatial sense and investigate geometric properties.	Rtl Team	The Rtl Team will review data from formative assessments, monitor progress and make necessary adjustments to instructional program.	Formative – Bi-weekly classroom assessments and student generated math journals Summative-2013 FCAT

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in	
--	--

mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 69% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 schoolyear is to increase by 5 percentage points to 74%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (35)	74% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Geometry & Measurement were identified as deficient areas in middle school by the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test.	Instruction will provide students with opportunities to develop spatial sense and investigate geometric properties. After school tutoring will be offered in order to increase experiences with geometry and measurement.	Rtl Team	The administrative team will review data from formative assessments, monitor progress and make necessary adjustments to instructional program.	Formative-weekly assessment and data reports Summative-2013 FCAT Math 2.0

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	48	53	57	62	67	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:		N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:		The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 44% of students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 1 percentage point to 45%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
44% (36)		45% (36)			

Problem-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 ELL subgroup needs improvement in Number Operations.	Provide a variety of models to develop understanding of multiplication and division with fractions and decimals.	RtI Team	The administrative team will meet monthly to review data from formative assessments, monitor progress and make necessary adjustments to instructional program.	Formative – Baselines, Interim Assessments, Bi-Weekly Assessments Summative – 2013 FCAT Math 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4	
--	--

and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	N/A
---	-----

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	N/A
--	-----

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	N/A
---	-----

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 #				
	N/A				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:		N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:		N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:		N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
Differentiated Instruction	K-8	Math Coach	K-8	October 17, 2012	Small Group Schedule, Usage Reports	Leadership Team

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
2.1	IXL Math	School Based Budget	\$822.00
			Subtotal: \$822.00
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
Differentiated Instruction	Substitutes	School Based Budget	\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Grand Total: \$1,422.00			

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 for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 38% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 schoolyear is to increase by 4 percentage points to 41%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
38% (26)			41% (28)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The anticipated barrier is in the area of reporting category 4 - Scientific Thinking will be targeted through hands-on lab activities	Students will be provided opportunities to explain scientific thinking using hands-on lab activities and classroom activities All schedules will reflect 150 minutes of science with a 45-60 minute consecutive block for science lab work	Leadership Team	Monitor student progress through classroom assessments and lab participation reports and make adjustments to instruction as necessary.	Formative – classroom assessments, lab reports Summative – 2013 FCAT

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

1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 16% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 1 percentage point to 17%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (11)	17% (12)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The anticipated barrier is in the area of reporting category 4 - Scientific Thinking will be targeted through hands-on lab activities and science experiments	Students will be provided opportunities to participate in the design of experiments to increase scientific thinking, analysis of data, and decision making	Leadership Team	Monitor student progress through classroom assessments and lab participation reports and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative – classroom assessments, lab reports Summative – 2013 FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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						

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.		The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 82% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency.			
Writing Goal #1a:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 2 percentage points to 84%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
82% (54)		84% (55)			
Problem-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 will focus on	Students will maintain a	Leadership Team	The Leadership team	Formative –

1	the use of incorporating figurative language in their writing	writer's journal utilizing various forms of expressive writing to include sensory words and idioms Rubrics will be utilized to enhance writing and refine drafts		will meet monthly with reading teachers to monitor progress based on writing journal entries and make adjustments to instruction as necessary.	writing journals Summative – 2013 FCAT
---	---	---	--	--	--

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing 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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	Our goal is to increase students scoring at achievement level 3 in Civics to 10% (7).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited opportunities to research topics utilizing a variety of material	Provide opportunities for students to use print and non print resources to research specific issues.	Leadership Team	Research assignments will be reviewed and adjustments to instructions will be made as necessary.	Summative: Interim Assessments Formative: 2013 Civics EOC Exam

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:	Our goal is to increase the amount of students scoring at or above achievement level 4 in Civics to 10% (7).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Prior knowledge and	Classroom assessments	Leadership Team	Classroom assessments	Summative:

1	experience with EOCs	will be aligned to benchmarks tested on EOC in order to maximize opportunities to master content.		will be analyzed and necessary adjustments to instruction will be made.	Classroom assessments Formative: 2013 End of Year Civics Exam
---	----------------------	---	--	---	---

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
2	Interim Exams	School Based Budget	\$75.00
			Subtotal: \$75.00
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: \$75.00

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:	Data indicates that our 2012 attendance rates were 95.47% Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by .5 percentage points to 95.97%

2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.47% (475)	95.97% (478)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
147	140
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
95	90

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need to be made aware of attendance policies and review wellness policy	Monitor attendance patterns and truancy issues to address through intervention services	Guidance Counselor	Review attendance monthly	COGNOS

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Data indicates that we had 4 in-school suspensions and 3 out-of-school suspensions. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain or decrease current suspension rates.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
4	4
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
3	3
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
3	3
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
3	3

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of access to guidance counselor and behavior modification process	Utilize Guidance Counselor twice a week to intervene with behavior problems and utilize behavior modifications	Guidance Counselor	Review SCMS and Referrals on a quarterly basis	Behavior Modifications

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>Our goal is to involve at least 75% of parents in at least one activity throughout the school year.</p>
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

75% (388)		75% (388)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited use of the English language is a barrier in providing knowledge of activities	Communication will be sent in English and Spanish for all parent activities Activities will be conducted in both languages and /or translators will be provided	Principal	Review sign-in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school or community events	Sign-In Sheets

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:			Our goal is to increase enrollment in STEM courses by 10% (7).		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Minimal opportunities for teachers to participate in professional development	The leadership team will provide faculty with a variety of professional development available to gain knowledge on STEM courses.	Leadership Team	IPDPs will be reviewed and discussed in order to increase attendance to professional development related to STEM.	Review IPDP

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:			Our goal is to increase increase enrollment in middle school CTE courses by 10% (7).		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Enrollment is not strong enough for student completion of CTE program or acquiring skills necessary for certification.	CTE Teachers implement CTE program state curriculum standards, program sequence of courses, including pacing of activities for industry certification as outlined within CTE professional development activities.	Leadership Team	Monitor and review student schedules with CTE teachers and guidance, to ensure enrollment of intermediate and advanced level courses, building strong academies.	Review practice/readiness tests

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	2.1	Time for Kids	School Based Budget	\$2,663.00
Reading	3.1	Voyager	SAC funds	\$2,450.00
Mathematics	2.1	IXL Math	School Based Budget	\$822.00
Civics	2	Interim Exams	School Based Budget	\$75.00
				Subtotal: \$6,010.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	3.1	Reading Plus	School Based Budget	\$19,000.00
				Subtotal: \$19,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	4.1	Substitutes	School Based Budget	\$1,750.00
Mathematics	Differentiated Instruction	Substitutes	School Based Budget	\$600.00
				Subtotal: \$2,350.00
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: \$27,360.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Purchase of reading intervention materials (Voyager Passport)	\$2,450.00

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) contributes to the academic success of Mater Beach Academy and listed below are some of its functions:

- Reach out to community to obtain more partners in education.
- Organize parent and community events, such as Open House, Literacy Night and FCAT Family Night Event.
- Assist in coordinating for the school-wide tutoring program for students in need of intervention.
- Assist the school to create and analyze school climate surveys for parents and students.
- Assist in development, approval, and monitor the implementation of the SIP.

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District MATER ACADEMY MIAMI BEACH 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	75%	60%	73%	32%	240	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	77%	53%			130	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	77% (YES)	63% (YES)			140	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					510	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

No Data Found