

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: CORAL REEF MONTESSORI ACADEMY CHARTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: Wendall Carr

SAC Chair: Juliet King

Superintendent: Mr. Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 11/2/2012

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.*

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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	Lucy Canzoneri-Golden	B.S. Elem. Ed M.S. Mon/Elem. Ed. ELLs Cert. K – 12 Drama Cert. K – 12 Directors' Credential Early Childhood	14	14	School Grade A A A A A AYP No Yes No Yes High Standards Rdg. 71 82 82 70 75 High Standards Math 64 80 82 74 66 Learning Gains-Rdg. 80 75 74 65 65 Learning Gains-Math 75 77 78 77 76 Gains-Rdg-25% 83 63 61 77 63 Gains-Math-25% 77 80 82 76 84
Assis Principal	Juliet King	B.S. Business Administration Certification Elementary Ed Cert. Urban Education M.S. Elem. Ed M.S. Montessori/Elementary Education	14	14	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A AYP No Yes No Yes High Standards Rdg. 71 82 82 70 75 High Standards Math 64 80 82 74 66 Learning Gains-Rdg. 80 75 74 65 65 Learning Gains-Math 75 77 78 77 76 Gains-Rdg-25% 83 63 61 77 63 Gains-Math-25% 77 80 82 76 84

### 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.

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)
No data submitted				

## 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.Competitive pay and benefits	Administrators	06/08/2012	
2	2. Sponsor qualified teachers for Montessori Training	Administrators	06/08/2013	
3	3. Advertise in local papers	Administrators	06/08/2013	
4				

## 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
22% (6)	The 14% (4) teachers all have waivers and are within the three year time limit and are enrolled or will be enrolled in ESOL classes. The 3% (1) ESE teacher will be taking the Elementary Education and Middle School language arts test before the end of the school year. The 3% (1) Intensive reading teacher will complete the course work in December 2012 and will immediately apply for certification.

## 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
26	11.5%(3)	46.2%(12)	26.9%(7)	15.4%(4)	73.1%(19)	80.8%(21)	80.8%(21)	3.8%(1)	53.8%(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
Ms. Ana Gomez	Ms. Monica Johnson	Same grade level and experienced teacher	Review lessons plans together, observe the mentor in the classroom
Ms. Carla Holloway	Ms. Charmonique Scaife	Same grade level, co-teacher, experienced teacher	Review lessons plans together, observe the mentor in the classroom

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

## Adult Education

## Career and Technical Education

## Job Training

## Other

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Administrators, ESE Teacher and Classroom Teachers. They were chosen because they are leaders within the school. They are organized, understand how children learn and have been very successful in meeting the needs of their 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 school-based MTSS Leadership Team has data chats with their team members throughout the year. At the end of the year, they meet with homeroom teachers to identify all at-risk students and develop Student Performance Plans for the upcoming school year.

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?

Through data analysis, the MTSS Leadership team is able to recognize trends and they are able to identify specific strands where the grade levels demonstrate weakness. The team meets to adjust the instructional focus calendar to address the instructional priorities after each interim is analyzed. Half of the people who are on the EESAC team are also on the leadership team. There is constant communication between the two. The MTSS Leadership Team will monitor collection and utilization of assessment data including progress monitoring data (FAIR Assessments) District Interim assessment data, observational data, and in program assessment 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.

The interim and FAIR assessments are the data sources used. They are managed by Edusoft and PMRN. Progress monitoring and interim data will be collected a minimum of three times a year. Observational data is collected via Co-Directors, classroom walkthroughs. In program assessments will be administered as the program dictates (weekly or monthly). This data will be used to determine intervention and support needs of students by participating in the data analysis meetings after each FAIR and District Assessments. The Co-Directors will conference with all teachers individually to analyze their students' data and determine strengths and weaknesses. If the data demonstrates any weaknesses in reading, math, science, writing, the Co-Directors will encourage the teacher to incorporate the subject area into their SMART goals which is part of the IPEGS Goal Setting process. A conversation will take place relative to progress to meeting the goal. The interim and FAIR assessments are the data sources used. They are managed by Edusoft and PMRN. Progress monitoring and interim data will be collected a minimum of three times a year. Observational data is collected via Co-Directors, classroom walkthroughs. In program assessments will be administered as the program dictates (weekly or monthly). This data will be used to determine intervention and support needs of students by participating in the data analysis meetings after each FAIR and District Assessments. The Co-Directors will conference with all teachers individually to analyze their students' data and determine

strengths and weaknesses. If the data demonstrates any weaknesses in reading, math, science, writing, the Co-Directors will encourage the teacher to incorporate the subject area into their SMART goals which is part of the IPEGS Goal Setting process. A conversation will take place relative to progress to meeting the goal.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Selected staff will attend the MTSS training during the summer. They in turn will train the rest of the school.

The administration will conduct a professional development on September 17, 2012 on the MTSS process. There will be ongoing support through the PLC Teams within the grade groups.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The administration will conduct a professional development on September 17, 2012 on the MTSS process. There will be ongoing support through the PLC Teams within the grade groups.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Mrs. Golden and Ms. J. King (Administrators), Mrs. McNaughton (ESE Teacher), Mrs. T. King and Mrs. Manresa (classroom teachers) Ms. Woolley (Middle school). They were chosen because they are leaders within the school. They are organized, understand how children learn and have been very successful in meeting the needs of their students. These team members were selected based on a cross section of the faculty and administrative team that represent highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum.

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

The function of the school-based LLT is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concerns across the school. The Co-Directors, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other appointees should serve on this team which should meet at least four times a year. The Co-Directors will cultivate the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by being active participants in all Reading Leadership Team meetings and activities. The Co-Directors will provide necessary resources to the RLT. The ESE Teacher will serve as a member of the RLT. She will share her expertise in reading instruction, assessment and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. The Co-Directors will work with the reading Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP. The four teachers on the team will provide motivation and promote a spirit of motivation within the Reading 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. The Co-Director and RLT will consider student assessment data, classroom observational data, and professional development listed on the teachers' IPEGS Goal Setting Form and the School Improvement Plan, when planning professional development for the school. The Co-Directors and RLT will meet regularly to collaborate about the needs of teachers and students and follow the Florida Continuous Improvement Model to ensure overall effectiveness of School improvement goals. The Co-Directors will also update the RLT about district and state reading requirements that could impact reading instruction at the school

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

The major initiatives to be used this year will be to utilize the components of the two resources the district is using such as Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan and the School Level Self Reflection Tool. The Co-Directors will promote the RLT as a major part of the school literacy reform to promote a culture of reading by: 1) including representation from all curricula areas on the RLT; 2) offering professional growth opportunities for team members; 3) creating a collaborative environment that fosters sharing and learning and 4) encouraging the use of data to improve teaching and student achievement.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

### \*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 are reinforcing reading skills in across the curriculum. They have had the appropriate professional development. One of the Middle School teachers is part of the LLT and serves as a direct support to the other Middle School teachers when planning and implementing lessons reinforcing reading.

### \*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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 30% of students (67) achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to (71) students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30%(67)	32% (71)

#### Problem-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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 30% of students (67) achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to (71) students.	Use how-to articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to identify text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc) and to locate, interpret and organize information. Help students recognize the characteristics of reliable and valid information. The student should be able to identify the relationships between two or more ideas or among other textual elements found within or across texts. Use non-fiction articles and editorials for instruction. Use a two-column note to list conclusions and supporting evidence to teach.	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Study Island, District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim assessments, Study Island Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Students will use the Study Island Program twice a week to synthesize, analyze, evaluate information and determine the validity and reliability of information (all within/across texts).	. MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Administrators will review Study Island reports four times a year with teachers and will adjust instruction as needed	Study Island Reports

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:  
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.

Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 Reading Test indicate that 41% (90) of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 by 1 percentage point to 42% (93).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (90)	42% (93).

Problem-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 was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Provide enrichment opportunities for students to critically analyze text and synthesize details to draw correct conclusions by participating in Socratic dialogue and debates. Students should explore shades of meaning to better identify nuances by reading from a wide variety of texts such as, editorials from newspapers, magazine articles, etc.	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Study Island, District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim assessments, Study Island Summative: Results from 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 group:

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



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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 Reading Test indicate that 80% (133) of students achieved learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase learning gains by 5percentage points to 85% (141)..
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (133)	85% (141)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Use how-to articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to identify text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc) and to locate, interpret and organize information. Help students recognize the characteristics of reliable and valid information. The student should be able to identify the relationships between two or more ideas or among other textual elements found within or across tests. Use non-fiction articles and editorials for instruction. Use a two-column note to list conclusions and supporting evidence to teach.	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Study Island, District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim assessments, Study Island Summative: Results from 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 group:

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

reading.	
Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT indicated that 83% (34) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 Percentage points to 88% (36).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (34).	88% (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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Students will participate 20 minutes per day on the Success Maker Program to read and organize informational text and text features, such as graphs, legends, illustrations, diagrams, charts and keys.	MTSS Leadership Team Classroom Teachers and Administrators	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Success Maker Reports and District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed as reflected on the Student Progression Plan (SPP).	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim assessments, Success Maker Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Third grade students are receiving one hour of tutoring before school Monday through Friday.	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Success Maker Reports and District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed as reflected on the Student Progression Plan (SPP).	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim assessments, Success Maker Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
3	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Third grade students are receiving one hour of tutoring before school Monday through Friday.	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Success Maker Reports and District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed as reflected on the Student	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim assessments, Success Maker Summative: Results from 2013

				Progression Plan (SPP).	FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
4	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Students will receive 15 minutes of small group and one on one instruction using the Response to Intervention Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, such as Buckle Down and Florida Ready	MTSS Leadership Team, Classroom Teachers and Administrators	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Success Maker Reports and District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed as reflected on the Student Progression Plan (SPP).	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim assessments, Success Maker an mini assessments from Buckle Down and Florida Ready. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
5	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Students will receive 15 minutes of small group and one on one instruction using the Response to Intervention Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, such as Buckle Down and Florida Ready	MTSS Leadership Team, Classroom Teachers and Administrators	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Success Maker Reports and District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed as reflected on the Student Progression Plan (SPP).	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim assessments, Success Maker an mini assessments from Buckle Down and Florida Ready. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 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 # Based on the results of the 2010 - 2011 FCAT 2.0, 18 percent of students were non-proficient in reading. 5A : Our goal for 2011- 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	72	74	77	79	82	

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.	Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0, 21% (26) of white students, 40% (27) of black students, 48% (12) of SD and 65% (47) of ED students were non-proficient in reading.
Reading Goal #5B:	Our goal for 2012- 2013 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 79% (26) Black: 60% (27)	White: 89% (29) Black: 68% (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					
	Black: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012	Students will participate 20 minutes per day on the Success Maker	MTSS Leadership Team Classroom	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Success Maker	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District

2	administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Program to read and organize informational text and text features, such as graphs, legends, illustrations, diagrams, charts and keys.	Teachers and Administrators	Reports and District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed as reflected on the Student Progression Plan (SPP).	Interim assessments, Success Maker Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
3	White: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Students will participate 20 minutes per day on the Success Maker Program to read and organize informational text and text features, such as graphs, legends, illustrations, diagrams, charts and keys	MTSS Leadership Team Classroom Teachers and Administrators	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Success Maker Reports and District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed as reflected on the Student Progression Plan (SPP).	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim assessments, Success Maker Summative: Results from 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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5D:	Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0, 52 percent of students were non-proficient in reading.  Our goal for 2011- 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (12)	69% (17)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test	Students will participate 20 minutes per day on the Success Maker Program to read and	MTSS Leadership Team Classroom Teachers and	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Success Maker Reports and District	Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim

1	was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process	organize informational text and text features, such as graphs, legends, illustrations, diagrams, charts and keys.	Administrators	Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed as reflected on the Student Progression Plan (SPP).	assessments, Success Maker Summative: Results from 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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0, 35 percent of EL students were non-proficient in reading.  Our goal for 2011- 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (47)	73% (53)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 4 Informational Text/ Research Process.	Students will participate 20 minutes per day on the Success Maker Program to read and organize informational text and text features, such as graphs, legends, illustrations, diagrams, charts and keys.	MTSS Leadership Team Classroom Teachers and Administrators	Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Success Maker Reports and District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed as reflected on the Student Progression Plan (SPP).	5E.1. Administrators will review formative reports, such as FAIR, Success Maker Reports and District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed as reflected on the Student Progression Plan (SPP). 5E.1. Formative: Report generated from FAIR, District Interim assessments, Success Maker Summative: Results from 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
How to Utilize Success Maker for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Instruction	K – 8	Success Maker	Classroom teachers and reading tutors	08/29/2012 @ 2:15/2012 Early Release Day	Grade level planning sessions/ classroom walkthroughs	Administrators
Analyzing Data to Modify Instruction through Success Maker	1 – 8	Success Maker	Classroom teachers and reading tutors	11/07/2012 Early Release Date	Grade level planning sessions/ classroom walkthroughs	Administrators

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Success Maker	Individualized Reading Program utilizing technology	ESSAC	\$2,090.00
			Subtotal: \$2,090.00
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: \$2,090.00

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Test indicate that 81 % (26) of students were proficient in Listening/ Speaking skills.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
81% (26)	

Problem-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 CELLA Listening and Speaking Test was providing more meaningful language practice.	ELLs will be given opportunities to use the (A1.LEA) Language Experience Approach in the classroom by immediately following an experience, students will interact with each other to discuss the experience and what it meant to them. They will draw or paint a picture about something interesting about the experience. They will share or retell his /her picture.	Teachers , MTSS Team and the LEP Committee	The RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments and the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)..	The CELLA, FAIR, Success Maker Assessment, District Interim and school site assessment data intervention assessments Summative 2013 FCAT Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening and Speaking Test was providing more meaningful language practice.	Students will use the Montessori Command Grammar Boxes to demonstrate their comprehension of verbal commands.	Teachers , MTSS Team and the LEP Committee	The RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments and the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)..	The CELLA, FAIR, Success Maker Assessment, District Interim and school site assessment data intervention assessments Summative 2013 FCAT Assessment
3	1.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening and Speaking Test was providing more meaningful language practice.  1.3. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Listening and Speaking Test was providing more meaningful language practice.	Students will be given the opportunity to role play (B-6) by assuming the roles of characters in classic fairy tales read in the class. They will also be given the opportunity to alter the endings of the stories by acting out the story.	Teachers , MTSS Team and the LEP Committee	The RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments and the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)..	The CELLA, FAIR, Success Maker Assessment, District Interim and school site assessment data intervention assessments Summative 2013 FCAT 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 2012 CELLA Test indicate that 41 % (13) of students were proficient in Reading Skills.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

41% (13).

Problem-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 CELLA Reading Test was providing more meaningful materials that relates to knowledge the learner already possesses.	Teachers will use C1 (Activate prior knowledge), C4 (KWL), C6 (Task cards) and C7 (Teacher made questions) C16-C19 the Montessori Command, Object Word Study boxes to build vocabulary.	Teachers , MTSS Team and the LEP Committee	The RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments and the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)..	The CELLA, FAIR, Success Maker Assessment, District Interim and school site assessment data intervention assessments Summative 2013 FCAT 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 Test indicate that 25 % (8) of students were proficient in Writing Skills.
--	--

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

25% (8).

**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Writing Test was providing more meaningful opportunities that relates to the writing process.	Teacheres will utilize strategies acquired through the Melissa Forney writing professional development. D6 (process writing).D11 (writing prompts)	Teachers , MTSS Team and the LEP Committee	The RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments and the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)..	The CELLA, FAIR, Success Maker Assessment, District Interim and school site assessment data, writing prompts, intervention assessments Summative 2013 FCAT 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
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of CELLA Goals*

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate the 38 % of students (85) achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 -2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 41% ( 91 ).
---	---

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

38% (85)	41% (91)
----------	----------

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category 3 – Geometry and Measurement.	Conduct vertical planning once a month to reinforce attributes of shapes, size and position, dimensional geometric shapes and transitive properties in the primary grades to prepare and support applications of 2 and 3 dimensional shapes in the intermediate grades.	MTSS Leadership Team and Administration	Administrators will review formative reports, such as, Study Island, District Interims four times a year and they will adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Report generated from District Interim assessments, Study Island Summative: Results from 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:	
---	--

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

--	--

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate the 26% of students (57) achieved proficiency (Level 4 and 5). Our goal is to maintain and/or increase student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 27% (60).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (57)	27% (60)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category Geometry and Measurement	Utilize student note books to record meaningful mathematical problem solving in a real world context. Provide teacher feedback on a weekly basis.  Provide enrichment activities daily using Gizmos. Provide higher level achievers the opportunity to take virtual classes for high school credits in algebra and geometry	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Conduct bi-weekly assessment and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports	Formative Student authentic work, Monthly assessments.  Summative Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test 75% of students (125) 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 80 % (133).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (125)	80% (133)

Problem-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 lowest Reporting Category was Geometry and Measurement.	Conduct vertical planning once a month to reinforce attributes of shapes, size and position, dimensional geometric shapes and transitive properties in the primary grades to prepare and support applications of 2 and 3 dimensional shapes in the intermediate grades	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Conduct bi-weekly assessment and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports	Formative Student authentic work, Monthly assessments.  Summative Result: from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 4:	On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test 77% (30) of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation in order to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 82% (32).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (30)	82% (32)

Problem-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 lowest Reporting Category was Geometry and Measurement.	<p>Develop problem solving process or protocol for students to use on a daily basis.</p> <p>Provide teachers with training four times a year in using problem solving to create meaning in a real-world context for students to apply new concepts and skills.</p> <p>Provide pull out tutoring three times a week for 30 minutes a day and individualized instruction using Success Maker 20 minutes a day.</p> <p>Provide tutoring once a month from October 2012 through February 2013 on Saturdays for two hours and in March 2013, two times a week four hours a week for four weeks in word problems with Geometry and Measurement.</p>	Teachers, MTSS Leadership Team Tutors and Administrators	Conduct bi-weekly assessment and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports	<p>Formative Student authentic work, Monthly assessments.</p> <p>Summative Result: from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.</p>

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 #				
		Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0, 37 percent of our students were non-proficient in mathematics.				
		5A : Our goal for 2011- 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	63	67	70	73	77	

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:	<p>Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0, 30 percent of our white students were non-proficient in mathematics.</p> <p>Our goal for 2011- 2017 is to reduce the percent of white non-proficient students by 50%.</p>
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (23)	85% (28)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	White: The lowest Reporting Category was Geometry and Measurement.	Develop problem solving process or protocol for students to use on a daily basis.  Provide teachers with training four times a year in using problem solving to create meaning in a real-world context for students to apply new concepts and skills.  Provide pull out tutoring three times a week for 30 minutes and individualized instruction using Success Maker 20 minutes a day.  Provide tutoring once a month from October 2012 through February 2013 on Saturdays for two hours and in March 2013, two times a week four hours a week for four weeks in word problems with Geometry and Measurement.	Teachers, Tutors, MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Conduct bi-weekly assessment and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports	Formative Student authentic work, Weekly assessments from Buckle Down and Florida Ready and data results from Success Maker.  Summative Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:	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:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal E:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate the 67% (46) of the Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup made learning gains.  Our goal for the 2011 -2012 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup making learning gains by 2 percentage points to 70% (48).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Economically Disadvantaged; 67% (46)	Economically Disadvantaged: 70% (48)

Problem-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	5D.1.  Economically Disadvantaged students scored lowest in Reporting Category 2 Measurement.	5D.1..  Use literature in mathematics to provide the meaning necessary for children to successfully grasp mathematical concepts and make connections with real-world situations.  Provide students with grade-level appropriate opportunities to solve problems that require the child to explain his/her reasoning. Provide pull out tutoring and individualized instruction based on Edusoft reports	5D.1  RtI Leadership Team and Administrators	5D.1.  Review formative bi-weekly assessment data reports as well as intervention assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	5D.1.  Formative: Bi-weekly assessment data reports, such as Gizmos, intervention assessments  Summative: 2012 FCAT 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 Mathematics Test indicate the 38 % of students (85) achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 -2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 41% ( 91 ).
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (85)	41% (91)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category 3 – Geometry and Measurement.	Students will find the perimeters and areas of composite two-dimensional figures, including Montessori manipulatives and on-line manipulatives on a weekly basis.  Use Hands-on activities and Study Island bi-weekly to explore area and volume using non-traditional units of measure. (i.e., using nets, construct cubes, prism and tetrahedrons of different scales and compare the ratios of edge length, area, and volume of the models.	Teachers, MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Conduct bi-weekly assessment and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports	Formative: Report generated from District Interim assessments and Study Island  Summative: Results from 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:	
--	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate the 26% of students (57) achieved proficiency (Level 4 and 5). Our goal is to maintain and/or increase student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 27% (60).
---	---



2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (57)	27% (60)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category Geometry and Measurement	Enrichment opportunities will be given to students to explore, investigate, collect data, analyze and conjecture real-world problem solving situations utilizing a graphing calculator.  Provide enrichment activities daily using Gizmos and Study Island.	Teachers, MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Conduct bi-weekly assessment and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports	Formative: Report generated from District Interim assessments and Study Island  Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:  
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  
  
Mathematics Goal #2b:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  
  
Mathematics Goal #3a:

On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test 75% of students (125) 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 80 % (133).

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (125)	80% (133)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category 3 – Geometry and Measurement.	Students will find the perimeters and areas of composite two-dimensional figures, including Montessori manipulatives and on-line manipulatives, such as Study Island on a weekly basis.  Use Hands-on activities bi-weekly to explore area and volume using non-traditional units of measure. (i.e., using nets, construct cubes, prism and tetrahedrons of different scales and compare the ratios of edge length, area, and volume of the models.	Teachers, MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Conduct bi-weekly assessment and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports	. Formative: Reports generated from District Interim assessments and Study Island  Summative: Results from 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:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test 77% (30) of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-1013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation in order to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 82% (32).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (30)	82% (32)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category 3 – Geometry and Measurement.	<p>Develop problem solving process or protocol for students to use on a daily basis.</p> <p>Provide teachers with training four times a year in using problem solving to create meaning in a real-world context for students to apply new concepts and skills.</p> <p>Provide pull out tutoring three times a week for 30 minutes a day and individualized instruction using Success Maker 20 minutes a day.</p> <p>Provide tutoring once a month from October 2012 through February 2013 on Saturdays for two hours and in March 2013, two times a week four hours a week for four weeks in word problems with Geometry and Measurement.</p>	Teachers, Tutors, MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Conduct bi-weekly assessment and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports	<p>Formative: Report generated from District Interim assessments, Success Maker and Study Island Reports.</p> <p>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment</p>

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 # Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0, 37 percent or our students were non-proficient in mathematics. 5A : Our goal for 2011- 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	63	67	70	73	77	

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:	Based on the results of the 2010 – 2011 FCAT 2.0, 30 percent or our white students were non-proficient in mathematics.  Our goal for 2011- 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (23)	85% (28)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	White: Students scored lowest in the Reporting Category 3 – Geometry and Measurement.	Develop problem solving process or protocol for students to use on a daily basis.  Provide teachers with training four times a year in using problem solving to create meaning in a real-world context for students to apply new concepts and skills.  Provide pull out tutoring three times a week for 30 minutes a day and individualized instruction using Success Maker 20 minutes a day.  Provide tutoring once a month from October 2012 through February 2013 on Saturdays for two hours and in March 2013, two times a week four hours a week for four weeks in word problems with Geometry and Measurement.	Teachers, Tutors, MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Conduct bi-weekly assessment and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports	Formative: Report generated from District Interim assessments, Success Maker and Study Island Reports.  Summative: Results from 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:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

## Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Problem-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 scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicate that 73% (8) of students scored Level 3.				
	Our goal for the 2012 -2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving proficiency Level 3.				
73% (8)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	73% (8)				

1	EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 3 – Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics.	graphing quadratic equations, both with and without technology, that involve real world applications.	and Administrators	biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.  District Interim Data reports will be reviewed by EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed.	assessments and District Interim Data reports.  Summative Results form the 2013 Algebra EOC assessment
2	According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 3 – Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics	Use Venn diagrams in a variety of ways to illustrate intersection, union, difference, null and disjoint sets and to solve a variety of real world problems.	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	. During Grade group meetings, results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.  District Interim Data reports will be reviewed by EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed.	Formative: Biweekly assessments and District Interim Data reports.  Summative Results form the 2013 Algebra EOC assessment
3	According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 3 – Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics	Develop guidelines for students to use writing and journaling to identify learned concepts and to eliminate misconceptions	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	During Grade group meetings, results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.  District Interim Data reports will be reviewed by EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed.	Formative: Biweekly assessments and District Interim Data reports.  Summative Results form 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 27% (3) of students scored (Levels 4 – 5).  Our goal for the 2012 -2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving Levels 4 -5
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (3)	27% (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 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 3 – Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and Discrete	Provide enrichment practice in solving and graphing quadratic equations, both with and technology, that involve real world applications such as creating a business plan	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	During Grade group meetings, results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.	Formative: Biweekly assessments and District Interim Data reports.  Summative Results form the

Mathematics.	with the funds generated from their fundraisers for their upcoming Utah trip.	District Interim Data reports will be reviewed by EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed.	2013 Algebra EOC assessment
--------------	---	---	-----------------------------

End of Algebra EOC Goals

## Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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
Aligning Data to Common Core Standards	K – 8 Mathematics	Success Maker	K – 8 Teachers	August 10 and 13, 2012	Grade level planning sessions/Classroom walkthroughs	Administrators
Data Analysis Workshop	K – 8 Mathematics	Administrator	K – 8 Teachers	September 19, 2012	Data Chats	Administrators
Montessori Workshop: Using Geometric Materials	K – 8 Mathematics	Dr. Tulloss	K – 8 Teachers	September 26, 2012	Teachers' Lesson Plans and Walkthroughs	Administrators

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:	On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT, 30% of students (17) achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) The expected level of performance for 2012-2013 school year is 34% (19) achieving proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:



30% (17)			34% (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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was Earth and Space Time. Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities that are link to increased rigor through inquiry-based learning in Earth Space Science.	Provide students opportunities 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 Earth and Space Science.	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	RtI Problem Solving Process  The MTSS Team along with administrators will review students work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor school based assessment and interims to ensure adequate progress and to adjust intervention.	Formative District Baseline data and school based assessments Summative 2013 FCAT Science Test.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.  Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 18% of students (10) achieved proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5).  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency levels 4 and 5 by 1percentage point to 19% (11).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (10)	19% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was Life Science. Students need additional support in developing and analyzing independent projects and to incorporate inquiry-based virtual science experiments in addition to hands on experiments and growing their own gardens.	Provide a variety of enrichment hands-on activities, such as Speed Bags from the Boot Camp Science Curriculum, that provide inquiry based learning opportunities for student to analyze, draw appropriate conclusions, apply key concepts and to experience the scientific method by participating in the annual School Science Fair.	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	The Administrative Team will review students' work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor school based assessment and interims to ensure adequate progress and to adjust instruction.	Formative District Baseline data and school based assessments, projects entered at the Regional Science and Engineering fair and Gizmos Assessments. Summative 2013 FCAT Science Test.

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
1.1 PLC focus on Earth/Space	Grades 3 - 8	JJ Boot Camp	3 – 8 Grade Teachers	February 19, 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrators

2.1 PLC focus on Life/Environmental	Grades 3 - 8	JJ Boot Camp	3 – 8 Grade Teachers	August 15, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrators
-------------------------------------	--------------	--------------	----------------------	-----------------	------------------------	----------------

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.1 and 2.1 Provide students opportunities to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze and explain science concepts during hands-on lab activities and classroom discussions to reinforce higher order thinking skills.	JJ Boot Camp Science Materials	General Funds	\$7,107.00
			Subtotal: \$7,107.00
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
			<b>Grand Total: \$7,107.00</b>

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal # 1a:		The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 84% of students (54) scored level 3 or above.  Our goal for the 2012 -2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving level 3.0 and above by 2 percentage points to 86% (55) of students achieving proficiency.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
84% (54)		86% (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
	The area of deficiency	During writing	MTSS Leadership	Administer and score	Formative:

1	as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test is elaboration. Students lack the necessary vocabulary needed to incorporate expressive visuals in their writing in order to increase the number of students achieving Levels 5 and 6.	instruction, students will use a graphic organizer/plan to write a draft organized with a logical sequence of beginning middle and end, using supporting details or providing facts and/or opinions through (concrete examples, statistics, comparisons, real life examples, anecdotes, and amazing facts) to reinforce focus and develop elaboration.  Utilize Melissa Forney's strategies on elaboration.	Team and Administrators	students' bi-monthly writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust elaboration as needed	Students' scores on monthly writing prompts and Edusoft reports  Summative 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment.
2	Students in Elementary and Middle School demonstrated weaknesses in Grammar and Conventions in the FCAT Writing Test	Utilize the Montessori Grammar Boxes and Sentence Analysis Materials to provide Hands-on practice with Grammar and writing conventions.	MTSS Leadership Team and Administrators	Administer and score students bi-monthly writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust elaboration as needed	Formative: Students' scores on monthly writing prompts and Edusoft reports  Summative 2013 FCAT 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:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Using Figurative Language to Bring a Story Alive	Grades 3-8	Melissa Forney	Classroom Teachers	July 19 – 21, 2012	Grade groups will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of the writing instruction	Student scores on bi-weekly writing assessments. Classroom walk-through documenting the use of editing techniques.

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.1 Training on how to use figurative language in Narrative Language to increase writing proficiency	Writing hand outs and Writing Consultant	General Funds	\$330.00
			Subtotal: \$330.00
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: \$330.00

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:	To increase the number of proficient students from 0 percent to 20 percent.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	20% (6)
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 are coming into the course with an inability to demonstrate an understanding of the origins and purposes of government, law and the American political system.	Students will recognize how enlightenment ideas including Montesquieu's view of separation of power and John Locke's theories related to natural law and how Locke's social contract influenced the Founding Fathers.  Identify how the weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation led to the writing of the Constitution.	MTSS Leadership Team, Teachers and Administrators	The MTSS Team along with administrators will review students work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor school based assessment and interims to ensure adequate progress and to adjust intervention	Formative District Baseline data and school based assessments, Summative: Civics EOC Test.
2					
3					

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:	To increase the number of students scoring Levels 4 and 5 from 0 percent to 10 percent.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (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	Teachers need to utilize District-published lesson plans with assessments aligned to test End of Course Exam Benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content.	Through enrichment activities, students will demonstrate an understanding of the principles, functions, and organization of government by evaluating ,analyzing and identifying sources and types (civil, constitutional, military) of law.	. MTSS Leadership Team, Teachers and Administrators	The MTSS Team along with administrators will review students work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor school based assessment and interims to ensure adequate progress and to adjust intervention.	Formative District Baseline data and school based assessments, Summative: Civics EOC Test.

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 to 95.36% (380) to 95.86% (382) 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.  In addition, our goal is for this year to decrease the number of student with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 5
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.27% (398)	x. 96.77% (400)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

89	85				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
110	105				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of consequences for students and parents who have excessive absentees and/or tardies	Conference with parents whose children have excessive absentees and /or tardies	Teachers and Attendance Clerk	Teachers will check daily the Attendance Bulletin against their online grade book to ensure there are no discrepancies	Attendance Bulletin
2	Lack of consequences for students and parents who have excessive absentees and/or tardies.	Conference with parents whose children have excessive absentees and /or tardies.	Teachers and Attendance Clerk	Teachers will check daily the Attendance Bulletin against their online grade book to ensure there are no discrepancies	Attendance Bulletin

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
How to establish an inclusive classroom	K - 8	Peter Nelson	School-wide	August 14, 2012	Students who are absent or tardy five or more times within a grade period will be monitored by Critical Friends Group.	Teachers, Attendance Clerk and Administrators

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide professional development on how to establish an inclusive classroom.	Facilitator will conduct a whole day workshop with staff using cooperative learning, team building and hands on activities.	General Funds	\$875.00
			Subtotal: \$875.00
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: \$875.00

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 reduce our suspension rate by 50%.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
7		6			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
7		6			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
4		4			
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	Inconsistency with classroom community meetings and use of the Peace Table	Utilize community meetings to discuss situations that could lead to problems affecting the members of the classroom community.	Teachers and Administrators	Monitor COGNOS report on student outdoor suspension	Walkthroughs and Grades group meetings with Administrators
2	. Limited knowledge of what constitutes bullying, in all of its forms	1.2 .Attend a workshop on bullying	1.2. Administrators	1.2. Decrease in the number of bullying incidents	1.2. Student Bullying Surveys

3	1.3. Inconsistency with classroom community meetings and use of the Peace Table	1.3.Students will receive additional support from a newly hired counselor	1.3.Administrators and Counselor	1.3. Monitor COGNOS report on student outdoor suspension	1.3. Walkthroughs and Grades group meetings with Administrators
---	---	---	----------------------------------	--	---

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
Improving Montessori Communication for all Stakeholders Workshop	K - 8	Dr. Tulloss	School-wide K - 8	August 16, 2012	Utilize classroom walkthroughs to monitor teachers' enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct	Administrators

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1:	During the 2011 -2012 school year, parental participation in school wide activities was approximately 85% of volunteer hours required for each child enrolled in the

*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.	school. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase parent participation by 2 percentage points to 87% for each child enrolled in the school.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
85% (229)	87% (235)

Problem-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	1.2. Lack of effective communication from School to Parents	1.2.The School will hire a professional website designer in addition to a writing consultant to launch a brand new website,	1.2 Board of Directors, PTA and Administration	Number of hours recorded for each child through the new online program.	Program Data Results
2	Not all parents are registered on our volunteer data base	PTA will provide the school with monthly reports on the number of parents registered per class.	PTA and administration	Parental Feedback	School Climate Survey

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM	(1.1) To provide Hands-on materials for our Kindergarten through six grade students using the Montessori Materials to design and build bridges.				
STEM Goal #1:	1.2) To enroll 100% of eligible Middle School students in honors physical science classes.				
Problem-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	1.1. Teachers need to be provided sensorial materials in grades one through six in order to meet the goal.	1.1. Students will participate in utilizing the Montessori Materials to create original designs such as building structures and bridges.	1.1. Teachers, MTSS Team, Administrators	1.1. The Administrative Team will review students' work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor school based assessment and interims to ensure adequate progress and to adjust instruction	1.1. Formative District Baseline data and school based assessments, projects entered at the Regional Science and Engineering fair and Gizmos Assessments. Summative 2013 FCAT Science Test.
2	1.2. Prerequisite courses must be provided in order to prepare the students for honors physical science	1.2. Students will participate in the Science Fair, field trips, such as Kennedy Space Center and the Moab Desert in Utah to have hands on experiences in environmental science, physical science and life science. Students will also participate in the Fairchild Challenge by creating their own gardens.	The teachers, garden coordinator, and the MTSS Team	1.2. Rating from the Fairchild Garden Challenge and The Administrative Team will review students' work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor school based assessment and interims to ensure adequate progress and to adjust instruction.	Formative District Baseline data and school based assessments, projects entered at the Regional Science and Engineering fair and Gizmos Assessments. Summative 2013 FCAT Science Test.

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:			To strengthen career academy structure increasing the use of Career Academy National Standards of Practice		
Problem-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	Curriculum not aligned to career theme across all disciplines	Provide internship opportunities for Middle school students, such as mentoring younger students, as teacher assistants three times a week for one hour.	Teachers, Garden Coordinator, MTSS Team and Administrators	Classroom Walkthroughs, Feedback from mentor teachers and students	Formative Student Portfolio

2	Curriculum not aligned to career theme across all disciplines	Create a Business Plan and Co-op to sell vegetables and herbs grown in the school garden.	Teachers, Garden Coordinator, MTSS Team and Administrators	Classroom Walkthroughs, success of school business	Formative Student Portfolio
---	---	---	--	--	-----------------------------

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	Success Maker	Individualized Reading Program utilizing technology	ESSAC	\$2,090.00
Science	1.1 and 2.1 Provide students opportunities to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze and explain science concepts during hands-on lab activities and classroom discussions to reinforce higher order thinking skills.	JJ Boot Camp Science Materials	General Funds	\$7,107.00
Writing	1.1 Training on how to use figurative language in Narrative Language to increase writing proficiency	Writing hand outs and Writing Consultant	General Funds	\$330.00
Attendance	Provide professional development on how to establish an inclusive classroom.	Facilitator will conduct a whole day workshop with staff using cooperative learning, team building and hands on activities.	General Funds	\$875.00
				Subtotal: \$10,402.00
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: \$10,402.00

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/17/2012)

## 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
The SAC funds will be used to help defray the cost of the Success Maker Reading and Mathematics Program.	\$2,090.00

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

1. To develop and monitor implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
2. To review student performance data.
3. To oversee and manage budget for the school recognition funds.

## 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 CORAL REEF MONTESSORI ACADEMY CHARTER 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	82%	80%	91%	61%	314	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	75%	77%			152	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	63% (YES)	80% (YES)			143	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					609	
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 CORAL REEF MONTESSORI ACADEMY CHARTER 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	82%	82%	81%	48%	293	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	74%	78%			152	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	61% (YES)	82% (YES)			143	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					588	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested