FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MATER ACADEMY LAKES HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Rene Rovirosa/ Robert Blanch

SAC Chair: George Groezinger

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/26/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Mr. Rene Rovirosa	BS-Social Studies, Florida International University; MS-Supervision, Florida International University, Educational Leadership Certificate- State of Florida	7	11	From 2007-2012 Mr. Rovirosa has been at Mater Lakes Academy (7018) '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B B C D High Stds Rdg. 54% 54% 43% 46% 38% 36% High Stds Math n/a n/a 79% 73% 64% Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68% 51% 59% 56% 48% Lrng Gains-Math n/a n/a 75% 83% 74% Gains-Rdg-25% 70% 41% 67% 55% 56% Gains-Math-25% n/a n/a 59% 80% 74%
Assis Principal	Mr. Francisco Jimenez	BS in Biology and MS in Educational Leadership from Barry University	3	12	From 2006-2010 was at Doral Academy (7020) This is Mr. Jimenez third year at Mater Lakes Academy (7018) '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A High Standards Rdg. 54% 43% 61% 45% 51% High Standards Math n/a n/a 91% 88% 83% Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68% 51% 63% 54% 56% Lrng Gains-Math n/a n/a 84% 85% 84 %

					Gains-Rdg-25% 70% 41% 57% 51% 54 % Gains-Math-25% n/a n/a 82% 87% 78%
Assis Principal	Mr. George Groezinger	BS in Chemistry, Wheaton College; MS in Educational Leadership, American College of Education	7	1	Mr. Groezinger has been at Mater Lakes Academy for seven years. This is his first year as an administrator. '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B B C D High Standards Rdg. 54% 43% 46% 38% 36% High Standards Math n/a n/a 79% 73% 64% Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68% 51% 59% 56% 48% Lrng Gains-Math n/a n/a 75% 83% 74% Gains-Rdg-25% 70% 41% 67% 55% 56% Gains-Math-25% n/a n/a 59% 80% 74%

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Mathematics	Matthew Bieule	Mathematics 6-12	5	1	Mr. Bieule has been at Mater Lakes Academy for seven years. '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B B C D High Standards Rdg. 54% 43% 46% 38% 36% High Standards Math n/a n/a 79% 73% 64% Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68% 51% 59% 56% 48% Lrng Gains-Math n/a n/a 75% 83% 74% Gains-Rdg-25% 70% 41% 67% 55% 56% Gains-Math-25% n/a n/a 59% 80% 74%

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Mentoring of new teachers with veteran teachers.	Principal, Vice Principal	ongoing	
2	2. E-recruiting at Teachers-Teachers.com	Principal, Vice Principal	ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
3	1. Teachers are encouraged to take college courses or professional development to satisfy the requirements. 2. Teacher contracts have been modified to reflect the need for appropriate certification. 3. Professional Development will be

	offered at the school site to accomplish certification needs.

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
31	16.1%(5)	35.5%(11)	35.5%(11)	12.9%(4)	9.7%(3)	90.3%(28)	9.7%(3)	0.0%(0)	16.1%(5)

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
Matthew Bieule	Sergio Fernandez	Both are Math teachers	Best Practices in the Classroom
Jessica Falcon	Eduardo Dominguez	Both are Social Studies teachers	Best Practices in the Classroom
Nored Nunez	Brandon Neifeld	Both are Chemistry teachers	Best Practices 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

Not Applicable

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Not Applicable

Title I, Part D

Not Applicable

Title II

Not Applicable

Title III

Not Applicable

Title X- Homeless

Not Applicable

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Not Applicable

Violence Prevention Programs

Not Applicable

Nutrition Programs

Not Applicable

Housing Programs

Not Applicable

Head Start

Not Applicable

Adult Education

Not Applicable

Career and Technical Education

Not Applicable

Job Training

Not Applicable

Other

Not Applicable

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

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

• Administrator(s) who will ensure commitment and allocate resources;
• Teacher(s) and Coaches will extend and report on meeting the goals of the leadership team at grade level, subject area, and intervention group, problem solving
• Team members who will meet to review consensus, infrastructure, and implementation of building level.
With these parameters in mind, out leadership team consists of:
Principal
Vice Principal
Assistant Principal
Test Chair
EESAC Chair
Guidance Counselors
Department Heads
Teachers
Coaches

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

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

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

• What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
• What progress is expected in each core area?
• How will we determine if students have made expected levels of progress towards proficiency? (common assessments)
• How will we respond when grades, subject areas, or class of, or individual students have not learned? (Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
• How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (enrichment opportunities).
2. Gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by group or individual student diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment.
3. Use the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success.
4. Gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM.
5. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
6. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
7. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for meeting Annual Measurable Objectives

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

1. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.
2. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and interventions.
3. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.
4. The Leadership Team provides analysis of data during faculty meetings so departments can then have their monthly data chats.

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.

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

2. Data is analyzed and disaggregated first by the MTSS/RtI leadership team, interventions are planned, responses to interventions that are in place are analyzed and input is sought on future instructional practices by the EESAC committee, faculty, and all other stakeholders.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:
1. training for all administrators in the MTSS/RtI problem solving at Tiers 1, 2, and 3 (SST), using the Tier 1 Problem Solving Worksheet, Tier 2 Problem Solving Worksheet, and Tier 3 Problem Solving Worksheet and Intervention Plan
2. providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures; and
3. providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS Leadership Team is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional wellbeing, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.
1. MTSS leadership is vital, therefore, in building our team we have considered the following:
• Administrators will ensure commitment and allocate resources
• Teachers will extend and report on meeting the goals of the leadership team at grade level, subject area, and intervention group levels.
• Team members will meet to review consensus, infrastructure, and implementation of MTSS
2. The school's Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:
• School reading, math, science, and behavior specialists
• Special education personnel
• School guidance counselor
• School psychologist
• School social worker
• Member of advisory group
Community stakeholders

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

A key factor to an individual school's success is the building leadership. The principal sets the tone as the school's instructional leader, reinforcing the positive and convincing the students, parents and teachers that all children can learn and improve academically. In essence, the school principal has the potential to have a great impact on student learning through his or her support of teachers and coaches. In order for principals to become instructional leaders, it is imperative that they understand the literacy challenges of the populations of students whom they serve.
The principal selects team members for the Reading Leadership Team (RLT) based on a cross section of the faculty and administrative team that represents highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum. The team will meet monthly throughout the school year. The LLT maintains a connection to the school's Response to Intervention process by using the MTSS/RtI problem solving approach to ensure that a multi-tiered system of reading support is present and effective.

The Literacy Leadership Team includes:

Mr. Rene Rovirosa – Principal
Mr. Francisco Jimenez – Vice Principal
Mr. George Groezinger- Assistant Principal and EESAC Chair
Mr. Matthew Bieule – Test Chair
Ms. Jessica Falcon – Social Studies Department Head
Ms. Nored Nunez – Science Department Head
Mr. Roy Franco – Math Department Head
Ms. Zee Aleman – Interim Language Arts Department Head
Ms. Suzanne Reif– Language Arts Teacher
Ms. Alive Martinez – Activities Director
Ms. America Manzano – Language Arts Teacher
Ms. Sherry Lifeset – Language Arts Teacher
Ms. Alexandra Leszczynsky – Language Arts Teacher

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

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

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

• Use data constantly available to LLT and teachers to evaluate ALL students and find ways to constantly improve their

literacy.
• All teachers will promote reading and writing skills in their classrooms.
• All teachers will set up word walls in their classrooms to enhance the print-rich environment for the students for each subject area.
The LLT will coordinate with department chairs to ensure reading and writing strategies are employed in instruction in all classrooms.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Not Applicable

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

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

*High Schools Only

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?

Our Student Services professionals implement lessons which focus on improving personal effectiveness, planning life after high school, and succeeding in post-secondary academic institutions. Mater Lakes Academy High School supports the Secondary School Reform, Articulation, Transition, and Orientation to increase the percentage of graduating students that pursue and are successful in post-secondary areas of enrichment. Students are encouraged to matriculate in Advanced Placement courses and those students that qualify are encouraged to participate in the Dual Enrollment courses. Core area teachers distribute Community Service packets beginning in grade nine stressing the responsibility of the student to strengthen and improve community relations.

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?

Not Applicable

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

Core area teachers distribute Community Service packets beginning in grade nine stressing the responsibility of the student to strengthen and improve community relations.

Beginning as early as September, students are given specific lessons on college applications, scholarship preparation and

interviewing skills. All students are recommended to complete a Silver Knights application, scholarship applications and college applications which encompass the skills necessary for real life situations such as application preparation, writing skills, interviews with active professionals, appropriate dress and networking skills.

This year we are offering 20 AP classes in 14 different subject areas and Honors classes are offered in each subject area. This year the PSAT will be administered to all of our 9th -11th graders here at the school. In addition, we strongly encourage our upperclassmen to participate in SAT and ACT Testing.

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 the2011- 2012 FCAT reading test indicate that 29% of students achieved level three proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 3percentage points to 32 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29 % (196)	32% (219)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT reading test was reporting Category 4- Informational Text and Research Process Students were not able to employ these skills.	Students will be given instruction in Informational Text and Research Process skills and will also be given various opportunities to apply these skills. Instruction will be differentiated to ensure student needs are met and formative assessments will allow teachers to monitor progress. In addition, pull out tutoring will take place for those students who are not mastering the material by the end of the first nine weeks	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	Bi-weekly ongoing classroom formative assessments focusing on students' knowledge of Informational Text and Research Process will be given. In addition, District Interim Assessments will be used and data will be disaggregated by a team of administration and teachers with the goal of identifying areas where students need additional support. . The MTSS team and administrators will analyze assessment data and implement plans for early interventions among targeted students. Instruction will be adjusted as needed based on the results of the assessment data.	Formative: Mini assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessment tests, Springboard Assessments and FAIR assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading

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:	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
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 25% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 26%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (168)	26% (178)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area which showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4: Informational Text and Research Process. These students lack the ability to employ Informational Text and Research Process skills in their work.	Utilizing Springboard curricula, Project Based Learning will move students from guided learning to more independent learning. Use real-world documents such as, how to articles, brochures, fliers and websites use text features to locate, interpret and organize information. Implementation of reading strategies across curriculum to enhance student achievement in all disciplines including AP Classes All students will be taught how to apply the Document Based Problem scenario which addresses both the critical thinking component and technical writing process.	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	Bi-weekly ongoing classroom formative assessments focusing on students' knowledge of Informational Text and Research Process will be given. In addition, District Interim Assessments will be used and data will be disaggregated by a team of administration and teachers with the goal of identifying areas where students need additional support. . The MTSS team and administrators will analyze assessment data and implement plans for early interventions among targeted students. Instruction will be adjusted as needed based on the results of the assessment data.	Formative: Mini assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessment tests and Springboard assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 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:	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
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 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 68% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student achieving learning gains by5 percentage points to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (310)	73% (333)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test, 68% percent of students made learning gains. Category 4: Informational Text and Research Process is the cluster that these students lack the ability to employ Informational Text and Research Process skills in their work.	Students will be given instruction supplemented with Springboard Reading Strategies on a consistent basis. Implementation of Horizontal Teaming to improve collaborations relating to instructional strategies and feedback. All students will be taught how to apply the Document Based Problem scenario which addresses both the critical thinking component and technical writing process. In addition, pull out tutoring will take place for those students who are not mastering the material by the end of the first nine weeks. This tutoring will take place twice a week and employ Reading Plus.	MTSS/RTI Leadership Team	Ongoing classroom formative assessments focusing on students' knowledge of Informational Text and Research Process will be given. In addition, District Interim Assessments will be used and data will be disaggregated by a team of administration and teachers with the goal of identifying areas where students need additional support. . The MTSS team and administrators will analyze assessment data and implement plans for early interventions among targeted students. Instruction will be adjusted as needed based on the results of the assessment data.	Formative: Mini assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessment tests, FAIR assessments and Reading Plus assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading

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:	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
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 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 70% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012- 2013 school year is to increase in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 75%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (87)	75% (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	As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test, the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains was 70%. The area which showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4: Informational Text and Research Process These students lack the ability to employ Informational Text and Research Process skills in their work.	Students will be given instruction supplemented with Springboard Reading Strategies on a consistent basis. Implementation of Horizontal Teaming to improve collaborations relating to instructional strategies and feedback. All students will be taught how to apply the Document Based Problem scenario which addresses both the critical thinking component and technical writing process. In addition, pull out tutoring will take place for those students who are not mastering the	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	Bi-weekly ongoing classroom formative assessments focusing on students' knowledge of Informational Text and Research Process will be given. In addition, District Interim Assessments will be used and data will be disaggregated by a team of administration and teachers with the goal of identifying areas where students need additional support. . The MTSS team and administrators will analyze assessment data and implement plans for early interventions among targeted students. Instruction will be adjusted as needed based on the results of	Formative: Mini assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessment tests, FAIR assessments and Reading Plus assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment

		material by the end of the first nine weeks. This tutoring will take place two times per week and will employ Reading		the assessment data.	

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	54%	58%	63%	67%	71%	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	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
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Results of the 2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 indicate that 13% of our ELL's were proficient. Our goal for the 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0 is to increase this by 25 percentage points to 38%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (5)	38% (16)

Problem-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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
2	Students lack vocabulary skills and reading comprehension skills which enable them to master FCAT 2.0 Reading at grade level.	Students will benefit from a variety of activities working with sets of words that are semantically related. Students also need more practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms. Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word meanings and word relationships from context, as well as provide additional instruction on word meanings. Students should practice using context clues to distinguish the correct meaning of words that have multiple meanings. Teachers should emphasize placing questions in context by rereading to review what preceded and what followed the passage, paragraph, or sentence in question. Students should be able to distinguish literal from figurative interpretations. Useful instructional strategies include: • vocabulary word maps; • word walls; • personal dictionaries; • instruction in different levels of content-specific words (shades of meaning); • reading from a wide variety of texts; • instruction in differences in meaning due to context; and • engaging in affix or root word activities.	MTSS/RtI Team and Administration	Bi weekly ongoing classroom formative assessments given by teachers will target students' abilities to understand vocabulary and reading comprehension within/across texts. In addition Interim Assessments data will be disaggregrated to determine the effectiveness of instruction. . The MTSS team and administrators will analyze assessment data and implement plans for early interventions among targeted students. Instruction will be adjusted as needed based on the results of the assessment data	Formative: Mini assessments, Baseline Assessments, Interim Assessments and Springboard assessments, FAIR assessments and Reading Plus assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading

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:	Not Applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 52% of students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase proficiency of this subgroup by 6 percentage points to 58%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% (253)	58% (282)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the administration of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 52% of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroups did not demonstrate proficiency. There are two major areas that need to be addressed within this subgroup: Reporting Category 1: Vocabulary and Reporting Category 4: Informational Text and Research Process	Identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate interventions within the first two weeks of the 2011-2012 school year, and monitor student progress using data on a monthly basis. Utilizing Springboard curricula, Project Based Learning will move students from guided learning to more independent learning. All students will be taught how to apply the Document Based Problem scenario which addresses both the critical thinking component and technical writing process.	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data. Ongoing classroom assessments/observations focusing on students' ability to complete assignments as teacher assumes the role of facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. Adjustments to instruction will be mmade as indicated by the achievement data.	Formative Assessments: Student work Samples utilizing rubric, mini assessments, Readping Plus, FAIR and Springboard Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Implementation of reading strategies across curriculum to enhance student achievement in all	9-12	Literacy Leadership Team	School-wide	8/14/12, 9/4/12, 10/2/12, 11/6/12, 12/4/12, 1/8/13, 2/5/13, 3/5/13, 4/2/13, 5/7/13	Formative: Mini-assessments, student work folders Summative assessments/FCAT 2013 Reading 2.0	Literacy Leadership Team

disciplines including AP Classes						
Classroom implementation of Document Based Problems within the Classroom	9-12	Literacy Leadership Team	School-wide	8/14/12, 9/4/12, 10/2/12, 11/6/12, 12/4/12, 1/8/13, 2/5/13, 3/5/13, 4/2/13, 5/7/13	Formative: Mini-assessments, student work folders Summative assessments/2013 FCAT Reading 2.0	Literacy Leadership Team
Implementation of Vertical Teaming to improve collaborations relating to instructional strategies and feedback	9-12	Literacy Leadership Team	School-wide	8/14/12, 9/4/12, 10/2/12, 11/6/12, 12/4/12, 1/8/13, 2/5/13, 3/5/13, 4/2/13, 5/7/13	Formative: Mini-assessments, student work folders Summative assessments/2013 FCAT Reading 2.0	Literacy Leadership Team

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Springboard Strategies	Springboard Workbooks	School Based Budget	$5,761.00
Springboard Strategies	Springboard Workbooks	EESAC Funds	$4,650.00
			Subtotal: $10,411.00
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: $10,411.00

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:	During the 2012 administration of the CELLA 56 % of our students displayed proficiency in Listening/Speaking. Our goal is to increase the number of students displaying proficiency in Listening/Speaking to 66% on the 2013 CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
56% (40)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack the vocabulary and the grammar skills that allow them to display proficiency in Listening/Speaking.	Students will be given targeted instruction in the meaning of familiar base words and affixes (prefixes and suffixes) to determine meanings of unfamiliar complex words. In addition Reading Plus will be employed twice a week.	Vice-Principal	Mini-assessments, formative assessments and FAIR assessments will be administered consistently throughout the school year, the results will be analyzed by the MTSS team and the administration to determine the most effective instructional strategies needed to address student weaknesses.	Formative: mini-assessments, FAIR assessments, Interim Assessments, and Reading Plus assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA,

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	During the 2012 administration of the CELLA 32 % of our students displayed proficiency in Reading. Our goal is to increase this proficiency to 8% for the 2013 CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
32% (23)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack Literary analysis skills which will allow them to show proficiency in Reading comprehension.	Students will be given additional opportunities for instruction in determining the main idea or essential message in grade-level text through inferring, paraphrasing, summarizing, and identifying relevant details. (LA 910.1.7.3 The student will determine the main idea or essential message in grade-level or higher texts through inferring, paraphrasing, summarizing, and identifying relevant details). In addition Reading Plus will be employed twice a week.	Vice-Principal	Mini-assessments, formative assessments and FAIR assessments will be administered consistently throughout the school year, the results will be analyzed by the MTSS team and the administration to determine the most effective instructional strategies needed to address student weaknesses.	Formative: mini-assessments, FAIR assessments, Interim Assessments, Reading Plus assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA FCAT 2.0 Reading

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
	During the 2012 administration of the CELLA 16% of our

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	students displayed proficiency in Writing. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percent of students proficient on the 2013 CELLA by 10 percentage points to 26%

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:
31% (22)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack the organizational skills necessary to become effective writers.	Students will be given instruction in using organizational strategies to make a plan for writing such as: telling or sharing personal stories or memories out loud, graphic organizers, linear organizers a timeline, storyboards, drawing simple pictures, KWL chart, logs, and answering essential questions. In addition Reading Plus will be employed twice a week.	Vice-Principal	Mini-assessments, formative assessments and FAIR assessments will be administered consistently throughout the school year, the results will be analyzed by the MTSS team and the administration to determine the most effective instructional strategies needed to address student weaknesses.	Formative: mini-assessments, FAIR assessments, Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA FCAT 2013 Writing

CELLA Budget:

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

Grand Total: $0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

** When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics 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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	
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				

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

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%.	Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	49%	54%	58%	63%	68%	

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

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

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Reslults of the 2012 Algebra I EOC show that 42% of our ELL's demonstrated proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the ELL proficiency on the 2013 Algebra I EOC by 11 percentage points to 53%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (10)	53% (12)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC the area of greatest difficulty for students was reporting category 3 – Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics.	Students will be given additional instruction and enrichment activities in... a. writing, interpreting, and using mathematical expressions and equations and inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities. b. developing students understanding of rationals, raidcals, quadratics and linear equations. c. solving mathematical problems graphically.	Vice Principal, MTSS Leadership team	Using the FCIM DART model the MTSS Leadership Team and Vice-Principal will review the Data, Assess the strengths of the school and opportunities for strengthening learning, Review all available data sources, and Target instruction to ensure that progress is being made and students are making learning gains. In addition we will conduct mathematics course –alike learning teams to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy. We will make adjustments to instruction as needed as indicated by the data.	Formative Biweekly Assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessments and Student generated work in math journals Summative: 2013 Algebra I EOC

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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
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:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	N/A

Mathematics Goal E:	
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
No Data Submitted				

End of High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC indicate that 46 % of students scored at achievement Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 2 percentage points to 48% the percentage of students scoring Level 3 on the 2013 Algebra I EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46% (126)	48% (132)

Problem-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 I EOC the area of greatest difficulty for students was reporting category 3 – Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics.	Students will be given additional instruction in a. writing, interpreting, and using mathematical expressions and equations and inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities. b. developing students understanding of rationals, raidcals, quadratics and linear equations. c. solving mathematical problems graphically. d. opportunities to complete more rigorous mathematical problems	Vice Principal, MTSS Leadership team	Using the FCIM DART model the MTSS Leadership Tam and Vice-Principal will review the Data, Assess the strengths of the school and opportunities for strengthening learning, Review all available data sources, and Target instruction to ensure that progress is being made and students are making learning gains. In addition we will conduct mathematics course-alike learning teams to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy. We will make	Formative Biweekly Assessments; Baseline and Interim Assessments and Student generated work in math journals Summative: 2013Algebra I EOC

				adjustments to instruction as needed as indicated by the data.	

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 I EOC indicate that 13% of students scored at achievement Levels 4 and 5.Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percent proficient by 1 percentage point to 14%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (35)	14% (39)

Problem-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 I EOC the area of greatest difficulty for students was reporting category 3 – Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics.	Students will be given additional instruction and enrichment activities in... a. writing, interpreting, and using mathematical expressions and equations and inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities. b. developing students understanding of rationals, raidcals, quadratics and linear equations. c. solving mathematical problems graphically.	Vice Principal, MTSS Leadership team	Using the FCIM DART model the MTSS Leadership Team and Vice-Principal will review the Data, Assess the strengths of the school and opportunities for strengthening learning, Review all available data sources, and Target instruction to ensure that progress is being made and students are making learning gains. In addition we will conduct mathematics course –alike learning teams to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy. We will make adjustments to instruction as needed as indicated by the data.	Formative Biweekly Assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessments and Student generated work in math journals Summative: 2013 Algebra I EOC

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 Geometry EOC Assessment indicate that 33% of our students scored at Achievement Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 3 percentage points to 36%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

33% (98)	36% (106)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment the area of greatest deficiency was Three-Dimensional Geometry. Students lack the necessary skills to apply geometric concepts in three dimensions.	We will develop school site mathematics course-alike learning teams to build the capacity to research, discuss, design and implement the following research-based instructional strategies that: We will provide students with practice in deriving the formulas for perimeter and/or area of polygons We will develop departmental guidelines for all student learning notebooks designed to increase student achievement. We will provide teachers with training in developing meaning through mathematical problem solving in a real-world context We will provide teachers with training in assisting students as they make sense of problems and persevere in solving them. We will assist teachers with effective strategies for integrating technology in their lesson designs.	Vice Principal, MTSS Leadership team	Using the FCIM DART model we will review the Data, Assess the strengths of the school and opportunities for strengthening learning, Review all available data sources, and Target instruction to ensure that progress is being made and students are making learning gains. In addition we will conduct mathematics course-alike learning teams to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy. We will make adjustments to instruction as needed as indicated by the data.	Formative Biweekly Assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessments and Student generated work in math journals Summative: 2013 Geometry EOC

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Geometry assessment indicate that 27% of students scored at level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase this by 1 percentage point to 28%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (78)	28% (82)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students need time to receive instruction and	We will develop school site mathematics	Vice Principal, MTSS Leadership	Using the FCIM DART model we will review	Formative Biweekly

1	practice in real-world examples and in the use of student learning notebooks.	course-alike learning teams to build the capacity to research, discuss, design and implement the following research-based instructional strategies that: -Provide students with practice in using coordinate geometry to find slopes, parallel lines, perpendicular lines, and equations of lines -Provide inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities -Honor student learning styles through an instructional model that embraces diversity and the brain's natural learning cycle We will develop school site mathematics course-alike learning teams to build the capacity to research, discuss, design and implement organizational strategies: -Develop departmental guidelines for all student learning notebooks designed to increase student achievement. -Provide teachers with training in developing meaning through mathematical problem solving in a real-world context. -Provide teachers with training in assisting students as they make sense of problems and persevere in solving them. -Assist teachers with effective strategies for integrating technology in their lesson designs	team	the Data, Assess the strengths of the school and opportunities for strengthening learning, Review all available data sources, and Target instruction to ensure that progress is being made and students are making learning gains. In addition we will conduct mathematics course-alike learning teams to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy. We will make adjustments to instruction as needed as indicated by the data	Assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessments and Student generated work in math journals Summative: 2013Geometry EOC

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
					Formative: Mini	

DATA Chats	9-12	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Vice Principal	School-wide	8/14/12, 9/4/12, 10/2/12, 11/6/12, 12/4/12, 1/8/13, 2/5/13, 3/5/13, 4/2/13, 5/7/13	assessment, Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Algebra I and Geometry EOC's	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Vice Principal
Implementation of Horizontal and Vertical Teaming to improve collaborations relating to instructional strategies and feedback	9-12	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Vice Principal	School-wide	8/14/12, 9/4/12, 10/2/12, 11/6/12, 12/4/12, 1/8/13, 2/5/13, 3/5/13, 4/2/13, 5/7/13	Formative: Mini assessment, Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Algebra I and Geometry EOC's	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Vice Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core Student Edition Math Workbooks	Common Core Student Edition Math Workbooks	School Based Budget	$1,780.00
			Subtotal: $1,780.00
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: $1,780.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

** When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science 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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science 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				

Biology 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 Biology. Biology Goal #1:	The results of the 2011-2012 Biology EOC Assessment indicate that 34% of our students scored at Achievement Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase this number by 3 percentage points to 37%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (89)	37% (96)

Problem-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 results of the 2012 Biology EOC Assessment indicate that 31% of our students were proficient.	We will provide all students the opportunity to design experiments using the process of science throughout their	MTSS/RtI Team	The MTSS and administrators team and administrators will review formative biweekly assessment data reports to adjust	Formative Biweekly Assessment reports; Baseline and Interim Assessments

1	The area of deficiency was Molecular and Cellular Biology. Students lack the opportunities to participate in inquiry-based laboratory experiences and field experiences.	science courses while teachers incorporate the process of science through more inquiry-based laboratory activities, field experiences, and classroom discussions. We will provide inquiry-based, hands-on, laboratory activities incorporating the nature of science and the process of doing science for students and allow them to make connections to real-life experiences, and explain and write about their results and their experiences. Instruction in all high school courses adheres to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides		instruction to ensure that progress is being made and students are making learning gains using Florida's DART model. Adjustments to instruction will be made based on assessment data.	Summative: 2013 Biology EOC

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	The results of the 2011-2012 Biology EOC Assessment indicate that 25% of our students scored at Achievement Levels 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 2percentage points to27 %
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (67)	27% (70)

Problem-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 Biology EOC Assessment indicate that 25% of our students scored Level 4 and 5. The area of deficiency was Molecular and Cellular Biology. Students lack the opportunities to participate in inquiry-based laboratory experiences, field experiences and enrichment activities such as science competitions.	Students will be given opportunities to participate in enrichment activities such as science competitions and science fairs. In addition we will provide all students the opportunity to design experiments using the process of science throughout their science courses while teachers incorporate the process of science through more inquiry-based laboratory activities, field experiences, and classroom discussions.	MTSS/RtI Team	The MTSS team and administrators will review formative biweekly assessment data reports to adjust instruction to ensure that progress is being made and students are making learning gains using Florida's DART model. Adjustments to instruction will be made based on assessment data. Adjustments to instruction will be made based on assessment data.	Formative Biweekly Assessment reports; Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Biology EOC

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Implementation of Vertical Teaming to improve collaborations relating to instructional strategies and feedback	9-12	MTSS Leadership Team and Vice Principal	School-wide	8/14/12, 9/4/12, 10/2/12, 11/6/12, 12/4/12, 1/8/13, 2/5/13, 3/5/13, 4/2/13, 5/7/13	Formative: Mini assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Biology EOC	MTSS/RtI Team and Vice Principal
Science Dialogues	9-12	MTSS Leadership Team and Vice Principal	School-wide	8/14/12, 9/4/12, 10/2/12, 11/6/12, 12/4/12, 1/8/13, 2/5/13, 3/5/13, 4/2/13, 5/7/13	Formative: Mini assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Biology EOC	MTSS/RtI Team and Vice Principal

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Inquiry Based Laboratory Supplies	Inquiry Based Laboratory Supplies	School Based Budget	$1,100.00
FCAT Coach Workbooks	FCAT Coach Workbooks	School Based Budget	$1,347.30
			Subtotal: $2,447.30
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: $2,447.30

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 2011-2012 FCAT Writing test indicate that 84% of students achieved level 3 or higher proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase our level 3.0 and higher student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 86%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84% (230)	86% (234)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack skills in the analysis of informational text and supporting persuasive essays with relevant and reliable information.	Students will be given supplemental instruction in the analysis of informational text and supporting persuasive essays with relevant and reliable information. During writing instruction students will use a graphic organizer 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, and anecdotes to develop focus and elaboration including real life skills.	LiteracyLeadership Team	Administer and score student prompts that are based on Informational and Non-informational text on real life skills to monitor students' progress and to adjust focus as needed.	Formative students' scores on monthly writing assessments and District Writing Assessments Summative: FCAT 2013 Writing

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Workshop: Incorporating Real Life Skills into academic Writing.	9-12	Literacy Team and Vice Principal	Language Arts Teacher, 9-12	Teacher Pre-Planning August 13-17, 2012	Formative: Mini assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: FCAT 2013 Writing	Literacy Leadership Team and Vice Principal

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

U.S. History End-of-Cource (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 U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	According to the Baseline Assessment in US History 0% of our students scored at Level 3 in US History. Our goal for the 2013 US History EOC is to have at least 25% of our students score Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

0% (0)	25% (38)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students struggled on the Baseline US History exam with reporting category #3: The US and Defense of the International Peace. Students lack the necessary skills to comprehend the US's role in the defense of international peace at this time.	Ensure that the US History curriculum is taught with fidelity and is paced so as to address all State and District Benchmarks and curricular requirements, paying particular attention to the US and Defense of the International Peace.	Administration	Monthly school and teacher generated assessments will be administered and scored in order to monitor student's progress and adjust instructional focus. In addition Baseline and Interim Assessments will be administered and Data will be interpreted according to the FCIM DART model by the MTSS team.	FORMATIVE - Monthly assessments, chapter/ unit assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessment Tests. SUMMATIVE – Spring 2013 US History EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	According to the Baseline Assessment in US History 0% of our students scored at Levels 4 and 5 in US History. Our goal for the 2013 US History EOC is to have at least 25% of our students score Level s 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	25% (38)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need continued opportunities to discuss the values, complexities, and dilemmas involved in social, political, and economic issues in history; assist students in developing well-reasoned positions on issues.	Provide students with opportunities to discuss the values, complexities, and dilemmas involved in social, political, and economic issues in history; assist students in developing well-reasoned positions on issues.	MTSS/ RtI Leadership Team	Monthly school and teacher generated assessments will be administered and scored in order to monitor student's progress and adjust instructional focus. In addition Baseline and Interim Assessments will be administered and Data will be interpreted according to the FCIM DART model by the MTSS team.	FORMATIVE - Monthly assessments, chapter/ unit assessments, Baseline and Interim Assessment Tests. SUMMATIVE – Spring 2013 US History EOC

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						

U.S. History 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 U.S. History EOC 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 our attendance from 95.3% (2011-2012 value) to 95.8% by decreasing absences due to illnesses and truancy and to create a climate in our school in which parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and accepted. Our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excess absences from 297 (2011-2012 value) to 282 by decreasing absences due to illnesses and truancy and to create a climate in our school in which parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and accepted. Our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive tardies 365 in 2011-2012 to 347 in 2012-2013 by educating students and parents on the importance of being to school on time.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:

95.3% (970)	95.8% (975)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
297	282
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
365	347

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance is of the utmost importance and there is a need to communicate the amount of excessive absences. The number of students with excessive absences was 297. The number of students with excessive tardies was 365. Student attendance is of the utmost importance and there is a need to communicate the amount of excessive tardies so that both students and parents understand the need for punctuality	Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non-attendance and/or tardiness to the administration for intervention services. Teach healthy choices and prevention strategies in order to maintain a healthy environment at the school.	Vice Principal and/or designee	Monthly updates to the Administration and to the entire faculty during faculty meetings. According to FCIM effective schools operate under safe/orderly climates. The Vice-Principal and/or designees will constantly monitor absences, tardies.	Logs and attendance rosters

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Truancy Prevention	9-12	Administration	School-wide	Teacher Pre-Planning August 13, 2012	Attendance Data Reports	Vice Principal

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	In the2011- 2012 school year there were 119students suspended out of school. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the number of students suspended out of school to 107. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of out-of-school suspensions by 3 from 33 to 30.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
33	30
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
23	21
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
119	107
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
90	81

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	In the 2011-2012 school year 90 students were suspended out-of-school. We need more opportunities to recognize students for positive behavior	Utilize the Student Code of Conduct by providing incentives for compliance through the use of a positive behavior system.	Administrative Team	We will monitor reports on student outdoor suspension rate. According to FCIM we will Plan, Do, Check and Act on student suspensions. We will Plan to study the data on suspended students twice per month, Do get together with Administration to assess the data, Check to be sure the process is maintained with fidelity, and Act to work with parents and students to ensure the school provides and safe and orderly environment where school rules are clearly communicated and understood.	Participation Log for students who are recognized for complying with the Student Code of Conduct.

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The Student Code of Conduct	9-12	Administration/ EESAC Chair	School-wide	Preplanning August 13-17, 2012	Utilize classroom walk-throughs to monitor the enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct. Review communication logs to determine the number of contacts made with parents of students who have been placed on suspension.	Administration/ EESAC Chair

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)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School - F.S., Sec. 1003.53

** 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. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	Our drop-out rate for the 2011-2012 year was 0.29%. Our goal for the coming 2012-2013 school year is to decrease this rate to 0.28%. Our graduation rate for the 2011-2012 year was 88.1%. Our goal for the coming 2012-2013 school year is to maintain this rate at 88.1%.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
0.29% (3)	0.28% (3)
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
88.1%(89)	88.1%(177)

Problem-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 face financial or societal pressures to drop out. Students have difficulty completing graduation requirements.	Advise students on the importance of completing a high school education. Early interventions with select students along with free tutoring services for students in need of educational assistance.	Administration and counselors.	Enrollment Statistics	Enrollment Statistics

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						

Dropout Prevention 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 Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	During 2011-2012 school year, parent participation in school wide activities was 79.3%. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase parent participation by 4 percentage points to 83.3 %.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
79.3%	83.3%

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	Lack of participation in school wide activities by parents of English Language Learners (ELL) who struggle to understand the English Language.	Mentors fluent in parents' home language meet parents at the entrance of the school and call to invite them to attend PTA/parent group programs.	School Administration and ESSAC Chair	Review sign in sheets/logs to determine the number of limited English proficient parents attending school events.	Sign in Sheets

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	During the 2011-2012 school year 7% of our students were involved in AP courses in STEM related subjects. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase this by 4 percentage points to 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	Students are not participating in higher level AP courses in STEM related subjects because they fail to recognize the advantages of the AP Program.	Our administration and counselors will educate students and parents on a monthly basis at the EESAC meeting concerning the importance of AP coursework in STEM related subjects.	EESAC Chair, Counselors and Administration	The Administration and school counselors will analyze PSAT scores, FCAT scores, prior AP scores and course grades to determine which students have a chance of success in AP courses and guide these students to a consideration of AP coursework.	Formative: District and teacher formative assessments such as Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: FCAT and EOC exams in STEM related subjects... 2013 FCAT Science 2.0 2013 FCAT Math 2.0 2013 Biology EOC 2013 Algebra I EOC

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student enrollment in high school CTE courses by 5%.

Problem-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 and parents are uninformed concerning CTE choices.	Promote CTE courses and activities including disseminating information concerning CTE courses and FACTS.org at various school meetings.	Counselors monitor and review student schedules with CTE teachers and guidance, to ensure enrollment of intermediate and advanced level courses, building strong academies.	Counselors monitor and review student schedules with CTE teachers and guidance, to ensure enrollment of intermediate and advanced level courses, building strong academies.	Administrators monitor the effective implementation of lessons and timely instruction in the CTE classrooms through common planning, review of test data including baseline, practice or readiness tests.

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Not Applicable Goal:

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						

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 Not Applicable Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Springboard Strategies	Springboard Workbooks	School Based Budget	$5,761.00
Reading	Springboard Strategies	Springboard Workbooks	EESAC Funds	$4,650.00
Mathematics	Common Core Student Edition Math Workbooks	Common Core Student Edition Math Workbooks	School Based Budget	$1,780.00
Science	Inquiry Based Laboratory Supplies	Inquiry Based Laboratory Supplies	School Based Budget	$1,100.00
Science	FCAT Coach Workbooks	FCAT Coach Workbooks	School Based Budget	$1,347.30
				Subtotal: $14,638.30
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: $14,638.30

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	○ Prevent	● NA

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ○ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/10/2012)

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

Springboard Resources	$4,650.00

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

Our EESAC Committee will ensure the design and the implementation of the SIP with the goal of improving the academic success of each and every one of our students including the lowest 25% subgroup and the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup. In addition, the EESAC Committee will ensure that funds allocated for instructional supplies that foster student success are spent appropriately.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District
MATER ACADEMY LAKES HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	44%	77%	84%	28%	233	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	51%	84%			135	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	41% (NO)	80% (YES)			121	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					499	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
MATER ACADEMY LAKES HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	46%	79%	87%	30%	242	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	59%	75%			134	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	59% (YES)			126	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					502	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested