FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: KEY BISCAYNE K-8 CENTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: Silvia P. Tarafa

SAC Chair: Sandra Manzieri

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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	Silvia P. Tarafa	Bachelors of Science in Political Science, Master of Science Elementary Education, Specialist in Administration, Elementary Education, Leadership and ESOL endorsement	6	11	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A AMO High Standards Reading 84 93% 92% 92% 90% High Standards Mathematics 87 87% 88% 89% 89% Learning Gains-Reading 83 75% 75% 77% 71% Learning Gains-Mathematics 87 74% 78% 79% 78% Gains-Reading-25% 86 80% 77% 78% 70% Gains-Mathematics-25% 84 73% 71% 74% 71%
Assis Principal	Blanca Herrera-	Bachelors of Science in Education, Masters of Science in Education, Specialist in Education, Doctorate in	14	16	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A AMO High Standards Reading 84 93% 92% 92% 90% High Standards Mathematics 87 87% 88% 89% 89% Learning Gains-Reading 83 75% 75% 77%

	Torres	Education, Certification in Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Educational Leadership, and ESOL endorsed			71% Learning Gains-Mathematics 87 74% 78% 79% 78% Gains-Reading-25% 86 80% 77% 78% 70% Gains-Mathematics-25% 84 73% 71% 74% 71%
Assis Principal	Sharlesque Hill	Bachelors of Arts English Education, Masters of Science Educational Leadership, English Grades 6-12, and Educational Leadership	6	6	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A AMO High Standards Reading 84 93% 92% 92% 90% High Standards Mathematics 87 87% 88% 89% 89% Learning Gains-Reading 83 75% 75% 77% 71% Learning Gains-Mathematics 87 74% 78% 79% 78% Gains-Reading-25% 86 80% 77% 78% 70% Gains-Mathematics-25% 84 73% 71% 74% 71%

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification (s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
No data submitted					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Newly hired teachers are provided a mentor teacher within their subject area and/or grade level to assist with understanding school policies and procedures.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Grade Level Chairs, Department Chairs	August 2012 - May 2013	
2	2. New teachers are paired with veteran teachers who have been trained through the MINT program with Miami-Dade County Public Schools.	Principal	August 2012 - May 2013	
3	3. New teachers will be provided common planning time with their corresponding grade level and will participate in grade level meetings, data chats, and professional development.	Principal, Assistant Principals	August 2012- May 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
2	Teachers are provided with professional development opportunities through

	weekly briefings and other educational opportunities.

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
86	0.0%(0)	23.3%(20)	44.2%(38)	32.6%(28)	44.2%(38)	97.7%(84)	4.7%(4)	3.5%(3)	66.3%(57)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

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

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Administrative Team:Principal and Assistant Principals
Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers
Instructional Coach(es) Reading
Speech Language Pathologist
Placement Specialist
Social Worker
Guidance Counselors
Trust Specialist
School Psychologist
Media Specialist
Technology Specialist

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

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will determine how to develop and maintain a data-analysis system to bring out the best in our school, teachers, and in our students. The team meets monthly to provide teachers with the ability to collaborate on strategies for dealing with students in need of enhanced instruction, review previous assessment data, modify instructional focus, and review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development opportunities and resources that should be made available to staff members.

Administrative Team: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures the implementation of MTSS/RtI through team building, needs assessment of MTSS/RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS/RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities.

General Education Teachers (Primary, Intermediate, and Middle School): Provide information regarding core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, and collaborate with other staff members to implement Tier 2 interventions.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participate in student data collection and observations. Integrate core instructional activities/materials into Tier 1 instruction, and collaborate with general education teachers through inclusionary activities, such as co-teaching and collaboration.

Instructional Coach Reading: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities;

assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1 intervention plans. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Computer Technician: Assists with the technology necessary to manage and display data; provides technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Student Services Personnel: Provides quality services and expertise on intervention with at-risk students. In addition, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the school and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans and provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation. Provides counseling for students that are in jeopardy of being retained.

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

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team meets with the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provides data pertaining to: Tier 1 students; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helps set clear expectations for instruction; facilitates the development of a systemic approach to teaching; and aligns processes and procedures.

Using data collected from the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 and EOC Assessments, the MTSS/RtI team determines the school-wide needs for the 2012-2013 school year. Needs-based instructional strategies are developed for Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2 intervention focus for the SIP. After the Fall Interim assessments the SIP is revisited and modified as warranted from the data collected; strategies and/or focus is adjusted based on needs and discussed before the ESSAC. New strategies and/or focus become part of school-wide instruction and intervention program. During each assessment cycle, the SIP is reviewed and any warranted adjustments are made and brought before the ESSAC.

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 in the areas of reading, mathematics, science, and writing will include:
Tier 1: District Baseline Assessments, Interim Assessments, FAIR, FCAT 2.0
Tier 2: District Baseline Assessments, Interim Assessments, FAIR, Voyager Assessments, Diagnostic Assessment in Reading (DAR), State Released Assessments, FCAT 2.0
Tier 3: District Baseline Assessments, Interim Assessments, FAIR, Voyager Assessments, Research-based Computer-Based programs, PMRN, Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), State Released Assessments, FCAT 2.0

Behavioral issues will be addressed through student services personnel:
Tier 1: Accurate documentation of counseling will be maintained on the student case management system.
Tier 2: Consequences will be appropriately determined based on the severity of each incident and repetition of behavior.
Tier 3: Teachers will collaborate to make recommendations regarding referrals to special education programs based on behavioral needs.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The administrative team and reading coach will be trained on the MTSS/RtI process; teachers will receive professional development during common planning time and during mandatory professional development workdays.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet periodically to discuss the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. They will

align instruction to assist teachers with identifying remediation strategies and monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and interventions.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal: Silvia P. Tarafa
Assistant Principals: Blanca Herrera-Torres and Sharlesque Hill
Grade Level/Department Chairpersons: Angela Patlan, Teresita Barcelo, Darlene Durant, Paloma Ferreyros, Lourdes Fantes, Lynda Anderson, Kim Scales, Preston Pratt , Leah Moore, Aliette Arner, Laura Lopez, Gloria Plaza
Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Aliette Arner, Linda Leung, Jessica Lopez-Miro, Lourdes Lorido, Elena Romanach
Media Specialist: Gloria Plaza

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to provide teachers with the ability to share best-practices for enhanced reading instruction; review previous assessment data and modify instructional focus; and review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development opportunities and resources that should be made available to staff members.

Administrative Team: Ensures the implementation of LLT through collaboration and team building; assesses the needs of school staff; and ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional development in the area of literacy.

Media Specialist: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection and analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding instructional planning; assists with procedural mandates of the district to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Assists with reading materials and technological resources necessary to operate the reading program; provides support to teachers and staff regarding supplementary materials for instruction.

Grade Level/ Department Chairpersons: Provides information about core instructional needs; participates in student data collection; delivers instruction and collaborates with team members to implement interventions.

Exceptional Student Education Teachers: Participates in student data collection and observations; integrates core instructional activities/materials with specialized instruction; and collaborates with general education teachers through inclusion activities, such as co-teaching and collaboration.

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

The LLT will target student participation in Accelerated Reader, Reading Plus, SuccessMaker, and other technological programs which will enhance fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Students with reading deficiencies will receive rigorous instruction utilizing the Journeys and Voyager instructional materials during pull-out (primary and intermediate) and classroom instruction (secondary). The team will also provide additional attention to students who fall in the lowest quartile, but meet proficiency on FCAT.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

applicable.

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Reading strategies are implemented in all content areas. All staff is afforded the opportunity to participate in Reading PD. The Literacy Leadership monitors the implementation of school-wide literacy strategies across the curriculum. The reading coach or other trained faculty will facilitate professional development opportunities in the area of reading to expand the knowledge base of all content area teachers. Teachers will infuse these strategies in lesson plans and instruction throughout the school year.

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

N/A

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 34% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2011 – 2012 school year is to maintain level 3 student proficiency at 34%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (279)	34% (279)

Problem-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	1a.1. The area of greatest deficiency as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading administration was Category 1: Vocabulary, in 4th, 6th and 8th Grade. An area of deficiency as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading in 3rd Grade was Category 2: Reading Application. An area of deficiency as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading in 5th Grade was Category 3: Literary Analysis. An area of deficiency as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading in 7th Grade was Category 4:Informational Text/ Research Process.	1a.1. Use passages with different levels of content-specific words, differences in meaning due to context, and engage in affix or root word activities. Use how-to articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to analyze text structure such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Use biographies, diary entries, poetry and drama to teach students to identify and interpret elements of story structure within and across texts Use Time for Kids and other instructional periodicals to identify essential themes and messages in Informational Texts.	1a.1. MTSS/RtI and LLT	1a.1. Following the FCIM, on a quarterly basis, review and analyze results of selection tests and Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on vocabulary activities.	1a.1. Formative: Selection Tests and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013FCAT Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment Reading Test indicate that 2 students performed at levels 4 – 6. For

Reading Goal #1b:	the 2012-2013 school year, the goal is to maintain or improve achievement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1. Students require opportunities for multiple reads of a selection prior to responding to comprehension questions.	1b.1. The use of picture walks should be used to assist students in making predictions of a reading selection. Students must have continuous review/practice when learning reading concepts.	1b.1. Leadership Team	1b.1. Monitor IEP reading goal (s) and related benchmarks through a quarterly status report update on SPED EMS.	1b.1. Formative: Teacher-made assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 55% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2011 – 2012 school year is to maintain Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency at 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (454)	55% (454)

Problem-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	2a.1. The area of greatest deficiency as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading administration was Category 1: Vocabulary, in Grades 4,6,and 8. An area of deficiency as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading in 3rd Grade was Category 2: Reading Application. An area of deficiency as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading in 5th Grade was Category 3: Literary Analysis.	2a.1. Enrich instruction utilizing high-complexity text with rich vocabulary. Incorporate higher levels of content-specific words through shades of meaning. Enrichment activities will include real-world documents and graphic organizers to analyze text structure such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Use poetry as enrichment to practice identifying descriptive language that	2a.1. LLT	2a.1. Through the FCIM, review results of selection tests on a bi-weekly basis and quarterly interim assessments to evaluate students' performance on text structure test items.	2a.1. Formative: Selection Tests and Interim Assessments; Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

	An area of deficiency as indicated on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading in 7th Grade was Category 4: Informational Text/ Research Process.	defines moods and provides imagery. Use Time for Kids and other instructional periodicals to enrich instruction by identifying essential themes and messages in Informational Texts.			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment Reading Test indicate that the student scored above a level 7. For the 2012-2013 school year, the student will maintain or increase the performance level of 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1. Students demonstrate difficulties in understanding how different types of text must be read in order to aid comprehension. Students should be guided to read fiction, nonfiction text in order to identify the differences and select the appropriate method to collect information.	2b.1. To improve comprehension, reading selections should be taught at a level that does not frustrate the student (high interest low readability). Students must have continuous review/practice when learning reading concepts.	2b.1. Leadership Team	2b.1. Monitor IEP reading goal (s) and related benchmarks through a quarterly status report update on SPED EMS.	2b.1. Formative: Teacher-made assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 75% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011 – 2012 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by five percentage points to 80%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (443)	85% (502)

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	3a.1. An area of difficulty as indicated on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test is Category 3: Literary Analysis: Fiction/Non-Fiction in Grades 3-8. Students need to locate and analyze the use of descriptive, idiomatic, and figurative language in a variety of literary texts.	3a.1. Utilize complex texts, including poetry, to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery; note how authors use figurative language.	3a.1. MTSS/RtI and LLT	3a.1. Through FCIM, review results of select tests and interim assessments on a tri-weekly basis.	3a.1. Formative: Selection Tests and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment Reading Test indicate that 2 students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3b.1. Students demonstrate difficulty using information from read-aloud nonfiction text to answer questions about the main idea and supporting details (e.g., who, what, where, when).	3b.1. To improve comprehension, reading selections should be taught at a level that does not frustrate the student (high interest low readability). Students must have continuous review/practice when learning reading concepts.	3b.1. Leadership Team	3b.1. Through FCIM, monitor IEP reading goal(s) and related benchmarks through a quarterly status report update on SPED EMS.	3b.1. Formative: Teacher made assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 80% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011 – 2012 school year is to increase in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by five percentage points to 85%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (126)	85% (134)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4a.1. An area of difficulty as indicated on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test is Category 3: Literary Analysis: Fiction/Non-Fiction in Grades 3-8.	4a.1. Encourage students to read from a wide variety of texts by tracking their independent reading through the Accelerated Reader program.	4a.1. MTSS/RtI and LLT	4a.1. Monthly review results of tests and interim assessments toevaluate students' performance on compare/contrast test items, using the FCIM. Monitor the results of the Accelerated Reader reports.	4a.1. Formative: Selection Tests and Interim Assessments; Accelerated Reader reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
2	4b.1. Students demonstrate difficulty using information from read-aloud nonfiction text to answer questions about the main idea and supporting details (e.g., who, what, where, when).	4b.1. To improve comprehension, reading selections should be taught at a level that does not frustrate the student (high interest low readability). Students must have continuous review/practice when learning reading concepts.	4b.1. Leadership Team	4b.1. Through FCIM, monitor IEP reading goal(s) and related benchmarks through a quarterly status report update on SPED EMS.	4b.1. Formative: Teacher made assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : Our goal is to decrease by 50% non-proficient students from the baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0.

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

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate Black students reached proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain proficiency.
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
	5B.1 As noted by the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading	5B.1 Use vocabulary word maps and personal dictionaries to identify	5B.1 MTSS/Rti Leadership team	5B.1 Through FCIM, review results of interim assessments to evaluate	5B.1 Formative: Teacher made assessments,

1	test, Black students demonstrate difficulty in Category 1: Reading Application. Students need to focus on identifying context clues and understanding multiple meanings.	meaning. Encourage students to read from a wide variety of texts and use the Reading Plus program.		students' performance on vocabulary test items. Monitor Reading Plus program reports.	Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate ELL students reached proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C.1. As noted by the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading test, ELL students demonstrate difficulty in Category 1: Reading Application. Students need to focus on identifying context clues and understanding multiple meanings.	5C.1. Use vocabulary word maps and personal dictionaries to identify meaning. Encourage students to read from a wide variety of texts and use the Imagine Learning program.	5C.1. MTSS/RtI	5C.1. Through FCIM, review results of interim assessments to evaluate students' performance on vocabulary test items. Monitor Imagine Learning program reports.	5C.1. Formative: Teacher made assessments, Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core District Training	K-8 /Language Arts, Reading & Social Studies	MDCPS	K-8 Teachers:Language Arts, Reading, Social Studies	July 2012	Attendance Sheets from faculty presentation	Administration
Common Core Teacher Training	K-8 /Language Arts, Reading & Social Studies	Select Teacher Facilitators	K-8 Teachers:Language Arts, Reading, Social Studies	August 2012-June 2013	Attendance Sheets Lesson Plans	Administration
Text Complexity	K-8 /Language Arts, Reading & Social Studies	Select Teacher Facilitators	K-8 Teachers:Language Arts, Reading, Social Studies	August 2012-June 2013	Attendance Sheets Lesson Plans	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goals 1-5 Use how-to-articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to identify text features and to locate, interpret, organize information, and recognize the characteristics of reliable and valid information.	Classroom Subscription to Grade-Appropriate Non-Fiction Text	Discretionary Funds	$2,672.00
			Subtotal: $2,672.00

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goals 4-5 Utilize the Accelerated Reader program to personalize reading practice to each student's leveland to assess student's reading, vocabulary, literacy skills, and reading comprehension	Subscription to Accelerated Reader	EESAC	$5,200.00
			Subtotal: $5,200.00
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: $7,872.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment indicate that 67% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
67% (211)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. A barrier in the area of Listening is the lack of opportunities for students to gain exposure to correct English dialect. A barrier in the area of Speaking is the lack of opportunities for students to communicate in English outside of school, due to Spanish-speaking households.	1.1. Provide students with opportunities to communicate with peers in English. Recorded Readings will help students master words and sounds. Incorporate the Language Experience Approach (LEA) in daily instruction to provide students opportunities to respond to first-hand, multi-sensorial experiences.	1.1. MTSS/ RtI	1.1. Focused Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan review using FCIM.	1.1. Formative: Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment indicate that 47% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
47% (150)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. An area of concern is Vocabulary. ELL students demonstrate this deficiency as they learn to manipulate the English language. Students need to determine meanings of words by using context clues and multiple meanings of words.	2.1. Instruct students in the use of concept maps, QAR and cooperative learning to build their general knowledge of word meanings and relationships, the study of synonyms, antonyms, and practice recognizing examples and non-examples of word relationships.	2.1. MTSS/RtI	2.1. Focused Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plan review using FCIM	2.1. Formative: Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2012 Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment indicate that 48% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
48% (152)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. An area in which ELL students demonstrate a deficiency is providing supporting ideas. Students need to have a command of the English language to develop supporting ideas, and precise word choice.	2.1. Use mentor text and exemplars for creative, effective writing. Incorporate story maps/webs as a means to demonstrate how good writers provide supporting details (elaboration) in their writing.	2.1. MTSS/RtI	2.1. Classroom Walkthrough, lesson plan review using FCIM	2.1. Formative: Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 29% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2011 – 2012 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (253)	30% (261)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. An area which shows minimal growth and requires improved performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test in 3rd Grade is Category 2: Number: Fractions An area of minimal growth and requires improved performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test in 4th Grade is Category 3: Geometry and Measurement. An area which shows minimal growth and requires improved performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test in 5th Grade is Category 1: Expressions, Equations & Statistics	1a.1. Provide opportunities for students to incorporate practical application of portions through exploration in order to develop problem solving strategies during daily instruction in order to solve real world application based problems. Use the instructional support needed for students to engage in mathematical exploration to develop problem solving strategies during daily instruction in order to solve real world application based problems. Teachers will provide the instructional support needed for students to identify values in expressions using GO-Math and Riverdeep programs.	1a.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1a.1. Following FCIM, on a monthly basis, review of GO-Math! Florida benchmark, chapter, mini assessments and District baseline and interim assessment results	1a.1. Formative: Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 2 students achieved Level 4, 5, or 6 in mathematics. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to ensure students progress through the performance levels of 4 through 6.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1. An area which shows minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment is Number and Operations.	1b.1. Teachers will provide the instructional support needed for students to explore and develop an understanding of number and operations through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice as it relates to real-world applications.	1b.1. Leadership Team	1b.1. Using FCIM, monitor IEP mathematics goal(s) and related benchmarks through quarterly status report update on SPED EMS.	1b.1. Formative: Teacher-made assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 55% of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency to 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (478)	55% (479)

Problem-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	2a.1. An area which shows minimal growth and requires improved performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test in 3rd Grade is Category 2: Number: Fractions An area of minimal growth and requires improved performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test in 4th Grade is Category 3: Geometry and Measurement.	2a.1. Provide enrichment in targeted categories through technology-based programs; such as, Riverdeep and Gizmos, to facilitate mathematics instruction and stimulate critical thinking skills in Number: Fractions. Provide enrichment in targeted categories through technology-based programs; such as, Riverdeep and Gizmos, to facilitate mathematics instruction and stimulate critical thinking skills in Geometry and Measurement.	2a.1. MTSS/RtI	2a.1. Review of reports generated by computer programs using FCIM.	2a.1. Formative: Reports from computer-based activities and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

	An area which shows minimal growth and requires improved performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test in 5th Grade is Category 1: Expressions, Equations & Statistics.	Provide enrichment in targeted categories through technology-based programs; such as, Riverdeep and Gizmos, to facilitate mathematics instruction and stimulate critical thinking skills in Expressions, Equations, & Statistics.			

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 88% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase students making learning gains to 93%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% (533)	93% (563)

Problem-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	3a.1. As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Administration the area with the minimal growth in Grades 3-5 is Category 3: Geometry and	3a.1. Provide context for mathematical exploration through the use of manipulatives to enable students to determine the reasonableness of number operation results,	3a.1. MTSS/RtI	3a.1. Weekly Focused walkthroughs; review of student work folders using FCIM.	3a.1. Formative: Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments

	Measurement.	including in real life problem situations.			Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 1 student made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain current proficiency level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3b.1. An area which shows minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment is Number and Operations.	3b.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to have continuous review/practice when learning math concepts.	3b.1. Leadership Team	3b.1. Following FCIM, monitor IEP math goal and related benchmarks through a quarterly status report update on SPED EMS.	3b.1. Formative: Teacher-made assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 89% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student achievement learning gains to 94%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89% (111)	94% (118)

Problem-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	4a.1. As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Administration the area with the minimal growth in Grades 3-5 is Category 3: Geometry and Measurement.	4a.1. Use an infusion of literature in mathematics to provide tangible meaningfor children to successfully grasp mathematical concepts and allow students to make connections with	4a.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	4a.1. Weekly Focused walkthroughs; review of lesson plans using FCIM.	4a.1. Formative:Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013

		real-world situations. Use technological programs, such as: BrainPop and FCAT Explorer for remediation.			FCAT 2.0 Assessment
2	4b.1. An area which shows minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment is number and operations.	4b.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to have continuous review/practice when learning math concepts.	4b.1. Leadership Team	4b.1. Monitor IEP math goal and related benchmarks through a quarterly status report update on SPED EMS using FCIM.	4b.1. Formative: Teacher-made assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our goal is to decrease by 50% non-proficient students from the baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that ELL students reached proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted by the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test, ELL students need instructional support to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts.	Use technological programs like FCAT Explorer and Gizmos to increase recall abilities.	MTSS/Rti	Following FCIM, review results of Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on test items. Monitor reports from online programs.	Formative: Teacher made assessments, Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that SWD students reached proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. As noted by the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test, SWD students need instructional support to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts.	5D.1. Use technological programs like FCAT Explorer and Gizmos to increase recall abilities.	5D.1. MTSS/RtI	5D.1. Following FCIM, review results of interim assessments toevaluate students'performance on test items. Monitor reports from online programs.	5D.1. Formative: Teacher made assessments, Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that ED students reached proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. As noted by the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test, ED students need instructional support to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts.	5E.1. Use technological programs like FCAT Explorer and Gizmos to increase recall abilities.	5E.1. MTSS/RtI	5E.1. Following FCIM, review results of interim assessments toevaluate students'performance on test items. Monitor reports from online programs.	5E.1. Formative: Teacher made assessments, Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 29% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (253)	30% (261)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. An area which shows minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test in grades 6-8 is Category: Geometry and Measurement.	1a.1. Teachers will provide the instructional support needed for students to incorporate STEP-IT-UP problem solving protocol strategies during weekly instruction in order to solve real world application based problems.	1a.1. MTSS/RtI	1a.1. Weekly focused Walkthroughs; review of lesson plans and review department meeting minutes using FCIM.	1a.1. Formative: Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 2 students achieved Level 4, 5, or 6 in mathematics. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to ensure students progress in levels of 4 through 6.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1. An area which shows minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment is Geometry and Measurement.	1b.1. Teachers will provide the instructional support needed for students to have repetitive practice for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	1b.1. Leadership Team	1b.1. Monitor IEP math goal(s) and related benchmarks through a quarterly status report update on SPED EMS following FCIM.	1b.1. Formative: Teacher-made assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 55% of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency at 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (478)	55% (479)

Problem-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	2a.1. An area which shows minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test in grades 6-8 is Category: Geometry and Measurement. Students need critical thinking skills to generate and apply formulas to solve real-world problems.	2a.1. Use hands-on experiences; manipulative and technology based, to facilitate the conceptual learning and understanding of algebraic concepts and their application to solve real world problems. Incorporate the use of Gizmos in advanced Math classes.	2a.1. Leadership Team	2a.1. Using FCIM, conduct weekly focused Walkthroughs; review of lesson plans, Gizmos reports and review department meeting minutes.	2a.1. Formative: Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment Math Test indicate that 1 student scored above a level 7. For the 2013 school year, the student will maintain or increase the

Mathematics Goal #2b:	performance level of 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1. An area which shows minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment is geometry and measurement.	2b.1. Teachers will provide the instructional support needed for students to have continuous repetition/practice with learning math concepts.	2b.1. Leadership Team	2b.1. Following FCIM, monitor IEP math goal(s) and related benchmarks through a quarterly status report update on SPED EMS.	2b.1. Formative: Teacher-made assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 88% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase students to 93%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% (533)	93% (563)

Problem-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	3a.1. The areas which show minimal growth and requires students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Administration is: Grade 6: Fractions, Ratios/Proportional Relationships & Statistics; Grade 7: Statistics and Probability; Grade 8: Expressions, Equations & Functions.	3a.1. Provide context for mathematical exploration through the use of manipulatives to enable students to move from concrete to the abstract through the implementation of intensive courses, pull-outs and push-ins.	3a.1. MTSS/Rti Leadership Team	3a.1. Weekly focused walkthroughs and review of student work folders using FCIM.	3a.1. Formative:Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:	

Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment indicate that 1 student made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3b.1 An area which shows minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment is Geometry and Measurement.	3b.1. Teachers will provide the instructional support needed for students to have repetitive practice for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	3b.1. Leadership Team	3b.1. Monitor IEP math goal(s) and related benchmarks through a quarterly status report update on SPED EMS, using FCIM	3b.1. Formative: Teacher-made assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 89% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student achieving learning gains to 94%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89% (111)	94% (118)

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our goal is to decrease by 50% non-proficient students from the baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that ELL students reached proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C.1. An area which shows minimal growth and would require ELL students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Administration is Category: Number and Operations. Students need to develop an understanding of and fluency with multiplication and division of fractions and decimals.	5C.1. Use technological programs like FCAT Explorer and Gizmos to develop quick recall ability.	5C.1. MTSS/Rti Leadership Team	5C.1. Review results of interim assessments toevaluate students'performance on test items using FCIM. Monitor reports generated from online programs.	5C.1. Formative: Teacher made assessments, Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that SWD students reached proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. An area which shows minimal growth and would require SWD students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Administration is Category: Number and Operations. Students need to develop an understanding of and fluency with multiplication and division of fractions and decimals.	5D.1. Use technological programs like FCAT Explorer and Gizmos to develop quick recall ability.	5D.1. MTSS/Rti Leadership Team	5D.1. Review results of interim assessments to evaluate students' performance on test items using FCIM. Monitor reports from online programs.	5D.1. Formative: Teacher made assessments, Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that ED students reached proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. An area which shows minimal growth and would require ED students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Administration is Category: Number and Operations. Students need to develop an	5E.1. Use technological programs like FCAT Explorer and Gizmos to develop quick recall ability.	5E.1. MTSS/Rti Leadership Team	5E.1. Following FCIM, review results of interim assessments toevaluate students'performance on test items. Monitor reports from online programs.	5E.1. Formative: Teacher made assessments, Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

	understanding of and fluency with multiplication and division of fractions and decimals.				

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC Test indicate that 33% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain Level 3 student proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (19)	33% (19)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 An area whichshows minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the Algebra EOC test is calculating polynomials.	1.1 Teachers will provide the instructional support needed for students to utilize Florida Focus to increase student exposure to the concept of calculating multi-step equations.	1.1 Leadership Team	1.1 Focused Walkthroughs and review of lesson plans, bi-weekly, using FCIM	1.1 Formative: Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Algebra EOC Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC Test indicate that 64% of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain Level 4 and 5 student proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (37)	64% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	2.1. An area whichshows	2.1. Teachers will provide the	2.1. Leadership Team	2.1. Focused Walkthroughs	2.1. Formative:

1	minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the Algebra EOC test is calculating polynomials.	instructional support needed for students to utilize Florida Focus to increase student exposure to the concept of calculating multi-step equations.		and review of lesson plans, bi-weekly, using FCIM.	Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013Algebra EOC Assessment

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A : Our goal is to decrease by 50% non-proficient students from the baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 Algebra EOC.

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC Test indicate that 10% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain Level 3 student proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10% (4)	10% (4)

Problem-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	2a.1. An area which indicates minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the Geometry EOC test is Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics. Students need to develop an enhanced use of graphing calculators to solve problems.	2a.1. Use hands-on experiences; manipulative and technology based, to facilitate the conceptual learning and understanding of geometric concepts and their application to solve real world problems.	2a.1. Leadership Team	2a.1. Weekly focused Walkthroughs; review of lesson plans and review department meeting minutes, using FCIM.	2a.1. Formative: Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Geometry EOC Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC Test indicate that 90% of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain Level 4 and 5 proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90% (4)	90% (4)

Problem-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	2a.1. An area which Indicates minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the Geometry EOC test is Trigonometry and	2a.1. Use hands-on experiences; manipulative and technology based, to facilitate the conceptual learning and understanding of geometric concepts and enrich their application	2a.1. Leadership Team	2a.1. Focused Walkthroughs; review of lesson plans and review department meeting minutes, weekly, using FCIM.	2a.1. Formative: Benchmark Mini Assessments, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Geometry EOC

	Discrete Mathematics. Students need to develop an enhanced use of graphing calculators to solve problems.	to solve real world problems.			Assessment

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A : Our goal is to decrease by 50% non-proficient students from the baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 Geometry EOC.

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Goals 1-5 Research, collaborate,desigr and implement instructional strategies to enhance the use of manipulatives.	K-8 / Math	Administrator	Math (K-8)	Wednesday early release August 2012-June 2013	Attendance sheets	Administrator
Goals 1-5 Training on the Implementation of the NGSSS.	K-8 / Math	Administrator	Math (K-8)	Wednesday early release August 2012-June 2013	Attendance Sheets	Administrator

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal 1-5 Provide contexts for mathematical exploration through the use of manipulatives.	Manipulatives and mathematical supplies	Supplies	$1,000.00
Goals 1-5 Use literature in mathematics toprovide the necessary meaning for children to successfully grasp mathematical concepts and allow students to makeconnections with real-world situations.	Mathematically infused literature, grade-level appropriate	Supplies, PTA	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goals 1-5 Utilize technology-based programs in the classroom to facilitate mathematical instruction and stimulate critical thinking.	BrainPop, LCD, Promethean Board	General Fund, PTA	$3,200.00
			Subtotal: $3,200.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Promethean training for Math teachers	Attend district workshop	General Fund	$170.00
			Subtotal: $170.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $5,370.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define

areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 47% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency to 49%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47% (143)	49% (148)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. The area of deficiency for elementary as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science test was Physical Science. Students need time for in-depth exposure to inquiry based activities that is necessary to understand concepts and increase proficiency.	1a.1. Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Physical Science.	1a.1. MTSS /Rti	1a.1. Review of assessment results, FCAT Explorer progress and students' science lab journals, sheets, and logs on a bi-weekly basis, using FCIM.	1a.1. Formative: Results of weekly/ unit assessments, lab logs, and quarterly Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment
2	1a.2. An area of deficiency for middle school as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science test was Physical Science. Students need time for in-depth exposure to inquiry-based activities that is necessary to understand concepts and increase proficiency.	1a.2. Provide classroom and after-school opportunities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and discussion of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, models, and various investigative methods scientists use (ie. Science Fair, SECME, Fairchild Challenge).	1a.2. MTSS/Rti	1a.2. Review of assessment results, FCAT Explorer progress and students' science lab journals, sheets, and logs, bi-weekly using FCIM.	1a.2. Formative: Results of weekly/ unit assessments, lab logs, and quarterly Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 30% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase proficiency to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (91)	31% (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	2a.1. The area which showed minimal growth and would require students to improve performance as notedon the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science administrationwas Life Science. Students need a foundation to connect science to the realworld around them. Financial restraints to provide life and environmental programs necessary to support and enrich the Big Ideas.	2a.1. Develop enrichment experiences and activities to support science through Fairchild Challenge, Science Fair, and fieldtrips that provide opportunities for students to model, explain, and label diagrams showing the cause-and-effect relationships of changes in populations in food webs and food chains in different ecosystems.	2a.1. Leadership Team	2a.1. Review of surveys, student reflections of field experiences, and assessment results	Formative: Student reflections, results of weekly/unit assessments and quarterly Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Goals 1-2 Research, collaborate, design, and implement instructional strategies to increase rigor through inquiry based learning in Physical Science and The Nature of Science.	K-8 / Science	Administrators	Science (K-8)	Wednesday early release August 2012-June 2013	Review attendance sheets and completion of presentation	Administration
Goals 1-2 Vertical training on the implementation of the NGSSS to ensure fidelity and depth of the content presented to students.	K-8/ Science	Administrators	Science (K-8)	Faculty Meetings August 2012-June 2013	Review attendance sheets	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goals 1-2 Solicit partnerships with local colleges, universities, and/orindustries within the localcommunity to provide expert support to Life and Environmental science concepts.	Personnel from and visits to: Biscayne Nature Center, RSMAS, NOAA, Cape Florida State Park, MAST Academy, and Miami Seaquarium	PTA, Key Biscayne Community Foundation, and General Fund	$1,000.00
Goals 1-2 Develop and implement inquiry based activities.	Replenishing Lab Materials and purchasing Physical Science kits	PTA, General Fund	$4,500.00
			Subtotal: $5,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goals 1-2 Develop and			

implement inquiry based activities.	Red probes and kits	PTA	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goals 1-2 Develop and implement inquiry based activities.	Temporary coverage to provide training to teachers	Substitute Account	$360.00
			Subtotal: $360.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $7,860.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The results of the 2013 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 92% of students achieved Level 3.0 and above proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase proficiency to 93%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92% (264)	93% (266)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1a.1. An area students scoring at 3.0 demonstrate a deficiency with is Word Choice. Students need to have a command of the English language to develop proper use of words and precise word choice.	1a.1. Use CRISS strategies for vocabulary enhancement, and as a means to understand and apply word choice. Review writing samples to identify common mechanical errors.	1a.1. Leadership Team	1a.1. Review of baselines, on-going assessments, and students' monthly writing samples in portfolios, using FCIM.	1a.1. Formative: Writing Baseline/ Mid- Year/ Post Test Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment
1	Administration of Baseline Assessment in Writing clearly demonstrates that students at level 4.0 have a deficiency is in the area of supporting ideas and conventions. Students need a mature	Use mentor text and exemplars as springboards for effective writing, and as a means to understand and apply word choice, support and voice. Review writing samples to have students identify sentence structures, punctuation,			

	command of language, and proper utilization of writing mechanics.	subject/verb agreement, and pronoun referent errors.			

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Workshop on Effective Writing Strategies	K-8/Writing	Media Specialist	Language Arts and Social Studies Teachers (K-8)	Early Release Days August 2012-June 2013	Attendance Sheets	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use mentor text and anchor papers as springboards for creative, effective writing and as a means to understand and apply voice and word choice.	Scanners, Document Cameras	Principal's discretionary account	$1,260.00
			Subtotal: $1,260.00
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: $1,260.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Civics Baseline Assessment indicate that X% of students achieved Level 3.0 and above proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(2)	70%(90)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students need to learn how to analyze primary and secondary sources of information.	1.1. Provide opportunities to interpret primary and secondary sources of information and write to inform and to persuade based on given topic.	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1. Review results of selection tests and student portfolios, quarterly, following FCIM.	1.1. Formative: Selection Tests Summative: 2013 District Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Civics Baseline Assessment indicate that X% of students achieved Level 3.0 and above proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(0)	10%(13)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	2.1. Students need to need to understand the research process on specific issues.	2.1. Provide enrichment opportunities for students to utilize print and non-print resources to research specific issues related to government/ civics; help students provide alternate solutions to the problems researched (i.e. Project Citizen).	2.1. Leadership Team	2.1. Review results of selection tests and students' portfolios, quarterly, using FCIM.	2.1. Formative: Selection Tests Summative: 2013 District Assessment

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Workshop on Effective Writing Strategies	K-8 Writing/Social/ Science	Media Specialist	Social Studies Teachers (K-8)	Early Release Days August 2012 - June 2013	Attendance Sheets	Administration
Common Core Standards	K-8 /Language Arts, Reading & Social Studies	Media Specialist and Teacher Facilitators	Social Studies Teachers (K-8)	Early Release Days August 2012 - June 2013	Attendance Sheets	Administration

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The 2012 attendance average indicates 96.53% attendance rate. Our goal is to increase attendance to 97.03% and absences and tardiness will decrease by .5% during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.53% (1353)	97.03% (1360)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
287	273
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
250	238

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. An area which presents a barrier would be parents and students complying with district attendance and truancy procedures. A barrier regarding tardies is parents bringing K-1 students to school late, along with older siblings who have a later arrival time.	1.1. Provide parents and students with information relative to the district and school's attendance policy. Establish and implement a procedure for early morning detentions for students and provide incentives for students who attend school regularly. Provide K-1 parents with a workshop to review the district and school's attendance policy. Establish and implement a procedure for early morning detentions for students who don't comply.	1.1. Attendance Review Committee	1.1. Review daily attendance bulletin and discuss student attendance at Student Service/Attendance Review Committee meetings weekly using FCIM.	1.1. Daily attendance bulletin, COGNOS Attendance Reports

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attendance Incentives	Pencils, stickers, medallions, etc.	PTA	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
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: $500.00

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:	The 2012 suspension report indicates 11 students were suspended in-school 11 times and 22 students were suspended out-of school 21 times. Given the school-widecommitment to decrease suspension rates, we will decrease student suspensions by 1%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
11	10
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
11	10

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
22	20
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
21	19

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. An anticipated barrier regarding indoor suspensions is student compliance with the District's Code of Student Conduct. An anticipated barrier regarding outdoor suspensions is student compliance with the District's Code of Student Conduct.	1.1. During Grade-level Orientation, the school counselors and administrators will discuss the Code of Student Conduct in order for students to understand the different levels of unacceptable behaviors and the range of corrective strategies. In addition to grade-level orientations, parents are provided with an electronic version of the Parent Handbook, which outlines policies and behaviors for discipline.	1.1. Administrators, Counselors, Anti-Bullying Committee (ABC)	1.1. Monthly disciplinary Committee meetings following FCIM	1.1. Monthly suspension reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Code of Student Conduct	K-8	Counselors/ Anti-Bullying Committee	School-wide	August 2012- June 2013	Student Referrals	Administration

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	In 2012-2013, attendance at parent workshops represented 8% of our enrollment. Given the school wide commitment to engage parents in the educational process, emphasis on parental involvement will beto increase parental attendance at workshops by 2% during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
8%(104)	10%(130)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. A barrier with conducting workshops would include scheduling of workshops to best suit stay-at-home parents as well as those who work. Also, providing workshops on areas of interest for both elementary and middle school parents.	1.1. Conduct two sessions, early morning and afternoon, parent workshops regarding students' behavioral/social issues and various academic strategies throughout the year.	1.1. Administration and Counselors	1.1. Percentage of participation as evidenced through attendance sheets, using FCIM	1.1. Attendance logs/ bulletins
2	1.2. An area of concern is the lack of technology parents may have, which is required to access online	1.2. Utilize the monthly calendar, Wednesday Communicator, and Connect Ed to disseminate information	1.2. Administration and Counselors	1.2. Distribution of monthly calendars, monitor Connect Ed, and monitor attendance at school functions,	1.2. Attendance logs/ bulletins

	information and receive email messages.	regarding school issues and workshops		using FCIM.	

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
Academic Strategies	Elementary (3 -5); Middle School (6-8)/ Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science	Media Specialist	Parents	November 2012-June 2013	Review of attendance logs	Administrators and Leadership Team
Behavioral and Social Issues	Elementary (3 -5); Middle School (6-8)	Counselors	Parents	November 2012-June 2013	Review of attendance logs	Administrators and Leadership Team

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	Based on the need for increased participation in the areas of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, students will receive greater exposure to

STEM Goal #1:	inquiry based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, models, and various investigative methods.

Problem-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	1a.2. Students must increase exposure in all branches of Science. Students need the time for in-depth exposure to inquiry-based activities that is necessary to understanding concepts.	1a.2. Provide classroom and after-school opportunities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking through participation in the District Science Fair and Bridge Competition, SECME challenge participation, Robotics Club, and 6th Grade Garden Enrichment Project.	1a.2. Administrators	1a.2. Review of lab journals and logs and participation in district Science competitions using FCIM.	1a.2. Formative: Results of weekly/unit assessments, and labs Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SECME workshops	Science (2-8)	District/ Science Chairperson	Science Teachers (2nd-8th Grade)	Wednesday early release August 2012-June 2013	Attendance sheets and completion of presentation.	Administrator
Science Fair workshops	Science (3-8)	District/ Science Chairperson	Science Teachers (3rd-8th Grade)	Wednesday early release August 2012-June 2013	Attendance sheets and completion of projects.	Administrator

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Robotics Club Supplies	Lego kit and resources	Principal's discretionary	$600.00
Robotics Competition	Entry fees and transportation	PTA	$200.00
			Subtotal: $800.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Robotics Club	Software for program	Principal's discretionary	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
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: $1,800.00

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:	Based on the need for technology proficiency to complete supplementary educational activities, we will increase student enrollment in the middle school Technology course 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	1.1. Lack faculty with certification in CTE area.	1.1. Faculty will attend Professional Development Institute (PDI) sessions provided by the district and use strategies to effectively implement the program and have students pass the OCP. Students will participate in Introduction to Technology program with the option of articulating to a CTE academy at Coral Gables Senior High.	1.1. Administration	1.1. Pass OCP certification in May at a rate of 80%, using FCIM.	1.1. OCP Certification

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
PDI	7-8/ Technology	District	7-8/ Technology	October 2012- May 2013	PD attendance log	Administrators

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Goals 1-5 Use how-to-articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to identify text features and to locate, interpret, organize information, and recognize the characteristics of reliable and valid information.	Classroom Subscription to Grade-Appropriate Non-Fiction Text	Discretionary Funds	$2,672.00
Mathematics	Goal 1-5 Provide contexts for mathematical exploration through the use of manipulatives.	Manipulatives and mathematical supplies	Supplies	$1,000.00
Mathematics	Goals 1-5 Use literature in mathematics toprovide the necessary meaning for children to successfully grasp mathematical concepts and allow students to makeconnections with real-world situations.	Mathematically infused literature, grade-level appropriate	Supplies, PTA	$1,000.00
Science	Goals 1-2 Solicit partnerships with local colleges, universities, and/orindustries within the localcommunity to provide expert support to Life and Environmental science concepts.	Personnel from and visits to: Biscayne Nature Center, RSMAS, NOAA, Cape Florida State Park, MAST Academy, and Miami Seaquarium	PTA, Key Biscayne Community Foundation, and General Fund	$1,000.00
Science	Goals 1-2 Develop and implement inquiry based activities.	Replenishing Lab Materials and purchasing Physical Science kits	PTA, General Fund	$4,500.00
Writing	Use mentor text and anchor papers as springboards for creative, effective writing and as a means to understand and apply voice and word choice.	Scanners, Document Cameras	Principal's discretionary account	$1,260.00
Attendance	Attendance Incentives	Pencils, stickers, medallions, etc.	PTA	$500.00
STEM	Robotics Club Supplies	Lego kit and resources	Principal's discretionary	$600.00
STEM	Robotics Competition	Entry fees and transportation	PTA	$200.00
				Subtotal: $12,732.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Goals 4-5 Utilize the Accelerated Reader program to personalize reading practice to each student's leveland to assess student's reading, vocabulary, literacy skills, and reading comprehension	Subscription to Accelerated Reader	EESAC	$5,200.00
Mathematics	Goals 1-5 Utilize technology-based programs in the classroom to facilitate mathematical	BrainPop, LCD, Promethean Board	General Fund, PTA	$3,200.00

	instruction and stimulate critical thinking.			
Science	Goals 1-2 Develop and implement inquiry based activities.	Red probes and kits	PTA	$2,000.00
STEM	Robotics Club	Software for program	Principal's discretionary	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $11,400.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Promethean training for Math teachers	Attend district workshop	General Fund	$170.00
Science	Goals 1-2 Develop and implement inquiry based activities.	Temporary coverage to provide training to teachers	Substitute Account	$360.00
				Subtotal: $530.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $24,662.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority | Focus | Prevent | NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Accelerated Reader Program	$5,200.00

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

The School Advisory Council will:
-Monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP),
-Work in conjunction with the Parent/Teacher Association (PTA) to support the school's technology needs and
-Work with the Village of Key Biscayne to establish a Compact with Miami-Dade County Public Schools.

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 KEY BISCAYNE K-8 CENTER 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	87%	95%	88%	363	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	75%	74%			149	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?	80% (YES)	73% (YES)			153	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					665	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District KEY BISCAYNE K-8 CENTER 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	88%	98%	74%	352	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	75%	78%			153	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	77% (YES)	71% (YES)			148	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					653	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested