

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: AVENTURA CITY OF EXCELLENCE SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Julie Alm/Aventura City Commission

SAC Chair: Ms. Julie Shapiro

Superintendent: Mr. Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012

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)
					2011 – 2012 Grade A 88% High Standards Reading 88% High Standards Math 82% Learning Gains Reading 88% Learning Gains Math 80% Gains Reading -25 74% Gains Math-25 2010 – 2011 Grade A 100% AYP 91% High Standards Reading 91% High Standards Math

Principal	Julie Alm	Certified Educational Leadership all levels, Elementary Education grades 1- 6, Specific Learning Disabilities Grades K – 12	10	10	73% Learning Gains Reading 83% Learning Gains Math 73% Gains Reading -25 82% Gains Math-25 2009 – 2010 Grade A 100% AYP 92% High Standards Reading 85% High Standards Math 75% Learning Gains Reading 69% Learning Gains Math 75% Gains Reading -25 70% Gains Math-25 2008 – 2009 Grade A 93% High Standards Reading 87% High Standards Math 100% AYP 2007 – 2008 Grade A 88% Reading Mastery 89% Writing Mastery 88% Math Mastery 69% Science Mastery 100% AYP
Assis Principal	Leslie Lee	Certified in Educational Leadership and Secondary Social Studies Education	3	3	2011 – 2012 Grade A 88% High Standards Reading 88% High Standards Math 82% Learning Gains Reading 88% Learning Gains Math 80% Gains Reading -25 74% Gains Math-25 2010 – 2011 Grade A 100% AYP 91% High Standards Reading 91% High Standards Math 73% Learning Gains Reading 83% Learning Gains Math 73% Gains Reading -25 82% Gains Math-25 2009 – 2010 Grade A 100% AYP 92% High Standards Reading 85% High Standards Math 75% Learning Gains Reading 69% Learning Gains Math 75% Gains Reading -25 70% Gains Math-25 2008 – 2009 Adminstrator at University of South Florida
Assis Principal	Jorge Paz	Certified Educational Leadership, Elementary Education and Mathematics 5-9	8	2	2011 – 2012 Grade A 88% High Standards Reading 88% High Standards Math 82% Learning Gains Reading 88% Learning Gains Math 80% Gains Reading -25 74% Gains Math-25 2010 – 2011 Grade A 100% AYP 91% High Standards Reading 91% High Standards Math 73% Learning Gains Reading 83% Learning Gains Math 73% Gains Reading -25 82% Gains Math-25 2009 – 2010 Grade A 100% AYP 92% High Standards Reading 85% High Standards Math 75% Learning Gains Reading 69% Learning Gains Math 75% Gains Reading -25 70% Gains Math-25 2008 – 2009 Grade A 93% High Standards Reading 87% High Standards Math 100% AYP 2007 – 2008 Grade A 88% Reading Mastery 89% Writing Mastery 88% Math Mastery 69% Science Mastery 100% AYP

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

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

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Implement "Professional Advancement of New Educators" Program to provide support to teachers new to school	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
2	2. Design individualized professional growth plans for staff demonstrating deficiencies	Curriculum Specialist	Ongoing	
3	3. Provide stipends to lead teachers at each grade/ department/ supplement for Masters and Specialist degreeed staff/ Competitive salaries/ Monetary awards for service years to ACES	Principal	Ongoing	
4	4. Provide leadership opportunities and opportunities for advancement to staff	Principal	Ongoing	
5	5. Advertise positions on Teachers-Teachers.com	Assistant Principal	As Needed	

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
0	

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
75	2.7%(2)	64.0%(48)	33.3%(25)	0.0%(0)	41.3%(31)	100.0%(75)	5.3%(4)	0.0%(0)	33.3%(25)

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
Jorge Paz	Alyssa Prats	Mr. Paz is certified in Clinical Educator and a certified Clinical education trainer	<p>September – Parent Conferencing: “Giving A Heads Up”</p> <p>October – SST (Student Support Team) procedures: How do I know who I should or should not refer?</p> <p>November – Classroom Management Plans – Sharing Best Practices “What works for you?”</p> <p>December – Professional Development – ESOL Endorsements, Gifted Endorsements, General Knowledge Exams, Subject Area Exams, Professional Educator’s Exams.</p> <p>Where are you in the process? What could we do to help?</p> <p>Daniel Sandberg January - Test Preparation – An Overview.</p> <p>February – Thinking Outside the Box – Ensuring Higher Order Teaching.</p> <p>March – “March to March” – Keeping our momentum!</p> <p>April - Promotion/Retention Policies</p> <p>May - P.A.N.E. “Graduation”</p> <p>Reflecting on your year at ACES</p>
Jorge Paz	Alyson Weiner	Mr. Paz is certified in Clinical Educator and a certified Clinical education trainer	<p>September – Parent Conferencing: “Giving A Heads Up”</p> <p>October – SST (Student Support Team) procedures: How do I know who I should or should not refer?</p> <p>November – Classroom Management Plans – Sharing Best Practices “What works for you?”</p> <p>December – Professional Development – ESOL Endorsements, Gifted Endorsements, General Knowledge Exams, Subject Area Exams, Professional Educator’s Exams.</p> <p>Where are you in the process? What could we do to help?</p> <p>Daniel Sandberg January - Test Preparation – An Overview.</p> <p>February – Thinking Outside the Box – Ensuring Higher Order</p>

		Teaching. March – “March to March” – Keeping our momentum! April - Promotion/Retention Policies May - P.A.N.E. “Graduation” Reflecting on your year at ACES
--	--	--

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.

Provides common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, insures school-based team is implementing RTI, conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensure adequate support through professional development. Ensure communication with parents is timely and accurate.

Dean of Curriculum: Ensures administration of quarterly Edusoft baseline, interim and post assessments and disaggregates data to analyze growth of individual students and identify data trends.

Lead K – 8 Math Specialist/Science Teacher/Mentor and Dean of Curriculum: Develops leads and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum and intervention programs.

Dean of Students/ESE Specialist: Participates in student data collection

Lead teacher representing K -2, and lead teacher representing 3-5: Provides information related to core instructional programs and identifies areas for growth within grade level team.

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 team will focus on the schools mission to achieve academic excellence along with the promotion of social responsibility grounded in an atmosphere of human dignity. The team will meet monthly to review progress towards established goals. They will identify areas of strength and areas in need of additional support related to instruction, planning, implementation of new and existing programs, staff development needs, school culture, student achievement and character education initiatives. Progress monitoring data will be used to assess grade levels, groups of students and individual student progress toward meeting high standards. Programs to meet needs of at risk students will be refined based on data. The team will share best practices, plan implementation strategies for new programs, review efficacy of existing programs, latest research and work toward refining processes that maximize student learning and teacher effectiveness.

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 team met with the EESAC committee and principal to develop the SIP. The RtI team provided data related to each of goal areas in the school improvement plan. They discussed areas in need of improvement and set clear expectations for instruction that would utilize data to drive decision making. Professional development needs and curriculum resources were determined based on data analysis.

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.

SAT – 10

Midyear: Two administrations of benchmarks to assess progress toward proficiency, common grade level assessments, cold reads, STAR, bi-monthly math formative mini assessments.

End of year: Edusoft post assessment aligned to FCAT/SAT-10 tested clusters, FAIR, running reading records, CELLA, FCAT and SAT – 10

Frequency of review: bi-weekly meeting with instructional teams and MTSS/RtI team member(s)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

During pre-opening planning in August teachers will receive training related to continuous use of data to target interventions. Data from the previous school year will be reviewed with all staff as a group. This will include school and grade level performance as well as results of previous years' intervention programs. Individual teacher's student performance results will be reviewed to aid teachers in refining their personal growth plans. Common planning time and small targeted review sessions will be schedule throughout the year. Mid-year staff training will focus on the using data to determine the performance related to current interventions.

The RtI team will continue to monitor need for additional professional development during monthly meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS will be supported through the efforts of MTSS leadership team. They will meet on a monthly basis to discuss student needs and support teachers with professional development and resources necessary to ensure complete implementation of the MTSS process. The administration will provide all necessary diagnostic, assessment and remedial resources needed by the MTSS leadership team and teachers to provide accurate student achievement data and success.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school based literacy team includes Lisa Brill-Reading Coach, Angelo Darby-ESOL Coordinator, Natasha Quintana-ESE Specialist, Alexandra Peralta-teacher, Zita De Vita-teacher and Aida Darby-teacher.

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

This team meets weekly to discuss target instructional goals and plan for specialized small group instruction for at risk readers. This team administers the FAIR assessment as required and administers the Fountas and Pinnell running reading record to all students' grades kindergarten through second grade three times per year. The reading coach meets with grade level teams as data becomes available to discuss results and intervention strategies.

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

The major initiatives this year will be to document the use of FAIR results in differentiating reading instruction in the classroom and to use the prescribed intervention resources and strategies aligned to the FAIR assessment in instruction.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Implement school wide instructional focus calendar
Implement grade level specific instructional focus calendar

Implement a word of the day program that posts the word of the day and definition in all middle school classrooms and the

lunch room

All content area teachers will include short and essay response questions in class work and on quizzes and tests.

Administrators will check for implementation when doing walk-through observations of staff and indicate on Classroom Walk-through form if implementation is occurring.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 32 % of students achieved a level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain level 3 student proficiency at the current level of 32%.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32%(203)	32%(204)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was Literary Analysis.	1.1. Students will experience small group instruction focused on shades of meaning and author's purpose. Students will read authentic literature including fiction and non-fiction to strengthen their ability to effectively analyze literature.	1.1. Rtl Leadership team	1.1. Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's knowledge of word meanings and relationships Technology usage reports	1.1. Formative: Common grade level assessments in reading weekly. Running reading records, Quarterly benchmark . Pre and post Saturday school student assessment. Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 56% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain levels 4 and 5 student proficiency student proficiency at the current level of 56%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%(357)	56%(358)

Problem-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. Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was Informational text and research process.	2.1. Students will glean information from a variety of resources including primary sources, brochures, web pages, how to manuals, and articles.	2.1 Administration	2.1 Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on ability to effectively utilize informational text.	2.1. Formative: Common grade level assessments in reading weekly. Running reading records, Quarterly benchmark . Pre and post Saturday school student assessment. Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that
--	--

gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	82% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by percentage points to 87%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82%(420)	87%(445)

Problem-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	3.1. Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was vocabulary.	3.1. All students will participate in a school wide grade appropriate word of the day program. Students will rotate to a teacher led center for specific vocabulary a minimum of once per week	3.1. Administration	3.1. Results of weekly vocabulary quizzes will be reviewed to ensure progress is being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed.	3.1. Formative: Common grade level assessments in reading weekly. Running reading records, Quarterly benchmark . Pre and post Saturday school student assessment. Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 84% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by percentage points to 89%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

84% (56)	89%(60)
----------	---------

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was reading application.	4.1. Continue implementation of small group 2 hour reading block, 5 days per week for all elementary students utilizing the Harcourt Storytown intervention resources focusing on reading comprehension skills.	4.1. Administration	4.1. Results of weekly cold reads will be reviewed to ensure progress is being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed.	4.1. Formative: Assessments related to the instructional focus calendar. Quarterly benchmark assessment reports and Summative: 2013 FCAT 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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	86	88	89	90	91	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	N/A
--	-----

Reading Goal #5C:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:		N/A		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:		N/A		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Using formative data to differentiate instruction	K – 8th grade reading/ language arts teachers	Assistant Principal of Curriculum and Literacy Team	K – 8th grade reading/ language arts teachers	Pre-school training on August, 2012 with monthly follow up during team meetings on the second Thursday of the month. October 17, 2012	Monthly team meetings with administration to discuss student progress, monthly review of lesson plans and periodic classroom walk-through	Administration including Principal, Vice Principal and Assistant Principal of Curriculum.
Reference and research across the curriculum		Assistant Principal of Curriculum	School-wide Math, reading, language arts and science teachers			
Using technology to differentiate instruction	All staff	Instructional Technology Coordinator	School-wide	August 16, 2012 August 15, 2012	Monthly plans will document use of strategies	Administration including Principal, Vice Principal and Assistant Principal of Curriculum
Meeting the needs of ESOL Students	K -8 K -8					

Reading 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
1.1 and 2.1	I-Ready, Accelerated Reader, and Reading Plus	General	\$23,478.00
1.1 and 2.1	I-Ready, Accelerated Reader, and Reading Plus	General	\$4,860.00
			Subtotal: \$28,338.00
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: \$28,338.00

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:		In 2011-2012 54% of students scored proficient on the Listening/Speaking section of CELLA. In 2012-2013 59% of students will score proficient on the Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
54% (45)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student exposure to the Learning Experience Approach	Use of more teacher modeled listening/speaking activities, use of simple direct language and increased use of diagrams for classroom instruction and assessment	Administration	Results of weekly listening /speaking assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress is being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative: Computer and teacher directed listening and speaking diagnostic assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:		In 2011-2012 42% of students scored proficient on the Reading section of CELLA. In 2012-2013 45% of students will score proficient on the Reading section of the CELLA.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
42% (35)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data from 2012 CELLA administration indicated that students weakest area was vocabulary.	Continue implementation of small group 2 hour reading block, 5 days per week for all elementary students utilizing the Harcourt Storytown intervention resources focusing on vocabulary	Administration	Results of weekly cold reads will be reviewed to ensure progress is being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Formative: Common grade level assessments in reading weekly. Running reading records, Quarterly bench mark. Pre and post Saturday school

	skills.		student assessment. 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:	In 2011-2012 43% of students scored proficient on the Writing section of CELLA. In 2012-2013 48% of students will score proficient on the Writing section of the CELLA.
--	--

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

43% (36)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As evidenced by the 2012 CELLA Writing Assessment ELL struggled the most with adding details to their writing and conventions.	Continue to implement Write Source K – 8 program with efficacy including a writing focus calendar that aligns to the reading program.	Administration	Review of student work samples	Formative: Weekly writing assessments and quarterly school wide writing prompts. Summative: CELLA Assessment 2013

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

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 Math Test indicated that 29% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%(185)	30%(192)

Problem-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. Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 4th-Fractions 5th-Geometry Equations	1.1. Students will engage in small group instruction targeting specific of weakness. Students will utilize manipulatives for better understanding of concepts.	1.1. Administration	1.1. During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	1.1. Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicated that 59% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain levels 4 and 5 student proficiency at 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%(377)	59%(377)

Problem-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. Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 4th-Fractions 5th-Geometry Equations	2.1. Students will engage in enrichment activities such as project based learning and computer directed advanced curriculum.	2.1. Administration	2.1. During team meetings projects and computer generated data will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	2.1. Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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 Math Test indicated that 89% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 94%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

89%(456)		94%(481)			
Problem-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	3.1. Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 4th-Fractions 5th-Geometry Equations	3.1. On a weekly basis teachers will meet with differentiated groups to provide standard based instruction in areas of specific weakness.	3.1. Administration	3.1. During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	3.1. Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicated that 79% of students in the lowest 25 % made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students in the lowest25 % achieving learning gains by percentage points to 84%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79%(64)	84%(68)

Problem-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	4.1. Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 4th- Fractions 5th- Geometry Equations	4.1. Students will engage in small group instruction targeting specific of weakness. Students will participate in before school tutoring offered by National Junior Honor Society students.	4.1. Administration	4.1. During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	4.1. Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	86	88	89	90	91	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicated that 73% of Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73%(74)	78%(79)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 6th -7th Geometry Equations 8th- Expressions, Equations and Functions	Students will engage in small group instruction targeting specific of weakness. Students will utilize National Junior Honor Society tutoring to improve basic math skills.	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will	Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicated that 29 % of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%(185)	30%(192)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 6th - 7th Geometry Equations 8th- Expressions, Equations and Functions	Students will engage in small group instruction targeting specific of weakness. Students will utilize manipulatives for better understanding of concepts	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicated that 59% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain levels 4 and 5 student proficiency at 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (377)	59% (377)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 6th - 7th Geometry Equations 8th- Expressions, Equations and Functions	Students will engage in project based lessons and advanced math courses to enrich content knowledge beyond basic skills.	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed	Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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 Math Test indicated that 89% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 94%.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89%(456)	94%(481)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 6th -7th Geometry Equations 8th- Expressions, Equations and Functions	Students will engage in small group instruction targeting specific of weakness. Students will utilize multiple problem solving methods and math journaling to increase understanding of basic math concepts.	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 3b:	N/A
---	-----

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Math Test indicated that 79% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 84%
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79%(64)	84%(68)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 6th -7th Geometry Equations 8th- Expressions, Equations and Functions	Students will engage in small group instruction targeting specific of weakness. Students will increase use of remedial computer tutoring offered as a part of the Math Connects series to strengthen and reteach basic math skills.	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	86	88	89	90	91	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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 Math Test indicated that 83% of English Language Learners made satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of ELLs making satisfactory progress by 2 percentage points to 85 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

83%(16)			85%(16)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 6th -7th Geometry Equations 8th- Expressions, Equations and Functions	Students will engage in small group instruction targeting specific of weakness. Students will utilize manipulatives for better understanding of concepts	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

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 Math Test indicated that 68% of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of SWDs making satisfactory progress by by 2 percentage points to 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%(22)	70%(22)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 6th -7th Geometry Equations 8th- Expressions, Equations and Functions	Students will engage in grade-level appropriate activities that promote the composing and decomposing of; describing, analyzing, comparing, and classifying; and building, drawing, and analyzing models that develop measurement concepts and skills through experiences in analyzing attributes and properties of two-and three-dimensional shapes/objects.	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

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 Math Test indicated that 73% of Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of Economically Disadvantaged students making
---	--

	satisfactory progress by 5 percentage points to 78%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73%(74)	78%(79)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was: 6th - 7th Geometry Equations 8th- Expressions, Equations and Functions	Students will engage in small group instruction targeting specific of weakness. Students will utilize National Junior Honor Society tutoring to improve basic math skills.	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	Formative: Weekly common grade level assessments Summative: FCAT Math results 2013.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 3-Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics.	Provide additional practice in solving and graphing quadratic equations, both with and without technology that involves real world applications	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	Formative: Weekly and interim benchmarking assessments Summative: Algebra EOC results 2013.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicate that 97% of students scored at Levels 4-5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Levels 4-5 by percentage points to 97%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
97%35)	97%35)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 3-Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics.	Develop guidelines for students to use writing and journaling to identify learned concepts and to eliminate misconceptions. Provide real life problems related to algebra for enrichment opportunities.	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	Formative: Weekly and interim benchmarking assessments Summative: Algebra EOC results 2013.

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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. 3A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	100	100	100	100	100	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicate that 100% of students scored a 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring a 3 at 100%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0	0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 1-Two-Dimensional Geometry.	Develop guidelines for students to use writing and journaling to identify learned concepts and to eliminate misconceptions.	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	Formative: Weekly and interim benchmarking assessments Summative: Geometry EOC results 2013.

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 assessment indicate that 100% of students scored a 4-5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring a 4-5 at 100%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%(11)	100%(11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 1-Two-Dimensional Geometry.	Develop guidelines for students to use writing and journaling to identify learned concepts and to eliminate misconceptions.	Administration	During team meetings bi-weekly assessments will be reviewed by teachers and math coach to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus. District Interim data will be reviewed to provide feedback for strategy adjustments as needed.	Formative: Weekly and interim benchmarking assessments Summative: Geometry EOC results 2013.

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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. 3A :			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A	N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicated that 45% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by percentage points to 46%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45%(91)	46%(94)

Problem-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. Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area was Earth/Space.	1.1. Students will have opportunity to participate in hands on labs, utilize interactive online tools such as Gizmos which can be accessed at home and school.	1.1. Administration	1.1. Disaggregate unit assessments to determine areas of weakness and analyze lab reports to adjust instruction.	1.1. Formative: Unit Assessment, quarterly benchmarks and lab reports. Summative: FCAT Science 2013

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicated that 36% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 37%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36%(73)	37%(74)

Problem-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. Data from 2012 FCAT administration indicated that students weakest area	2.1. Students will have opportunity to participate in hands on labs, projects and	2.1. Administration	2.1. Disaggregate unit assessments to determine areas of weakness and analyze	2.1. Formative: Unit Assessment, quarterly benchmarks and

was Earth/Space.	inquiry based learning.	lab reports to adjust instruction.	lab reports. Summative: FCAT Science 2013
------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	---

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:		N/A	
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
N/A		N/A	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	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
Incorporating Labs as an Instructional Strategy	3-5	Science Lab Facilitator	Upper Elementary Teachers	August 16, 2012	Weekly meeting with Science Lab Facilitator	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
2.1	Gizmos interactive online simulations for math and science education in grades 3-12	EESAC	\$1,900.00
			Subtotal: \$1,900.00

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: \$1,900.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicated that 94% of students achieved a level 3 or above. Our goal for the 2012 -2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring level 3 or above at 94%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
94%(191)	94%(192)

Problem-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. Creating student emphasis on conventions and specific details in their narrative/expository and persuasive writing.	1a.1. Teachers will implement lessons that focus on creating interest through supporting details for expository writing, applying features to consider tone, mood and word choice in narrative writing and review persuasive writing techniques with students. Including poetry, print and media advertisements, editorials, and speeches can be used as examples for students to evaluate persuasive techniques.	1a.1. Administration	1a.1. Rubric based writing prompts and blind scoring.	1a.1. Formative: Weekly writing assessments and quarterly school wide writing prompts. Summative: FCAT Writing Assessment 2013

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
6 Traits of Writing	K-8	Administration	New Staff to ACES	August 14, 2012	Evidence of implementation of methods in lesson plan book and also during non-evaluative observations	Administration
Using Scoring Rubrics to Assess Writing	K-8	Administration	All Staff	Quarterly	Score quarterly prompts	Administration

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:		On the 2012 baseline Civics benchmark assessment 0% of students scored proficient. On the 2013 Spring Civics benchmark assessment 16% of students will score proficient			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0 (6)		16% (16)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student preparation in Civics content as they enter from previous grades	Create a school wide K-8 Civics Instructional Focus Calendar to provide adequate background knowledge to all students.	Administration	Monthly assessments will be administered and scored to monitor student progress and adjust the instructional focus.	Monthly assessments Chapter/Unit assessments District Spring Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:		On the 2012 baseline Civics benchmark assessment 0% of students scored proficient. On the 2013 Spring Civics benchmark assessment 16% of students will score proficient.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0% (6)		16% (6)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Engaging learners in active participation to acquire an interest in civics.	Implement hands on, researched based, technology focused projects.	Administration	Monthly assessments will be administered and scored to monitor student progress and adjust the instructional focus.	Monthly assessments Chapter/Unit assessments District Spring 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
Training for implementation of new textbook program	K-8	Assistant Principal of Curriculum	K-5 Elementary Teachers and Middle School Social Studies Teachers	August 15, 2012	Monthly lesson plan check and meetings with social studies department lead	Administration

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.1	Social Studies textbook program K-8	General	\$77,880.00
1.1	Social Studies textbook program K-8	EESAC	\$2,992.00
			Subtotal: \$80,872.00
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: \$80,872.00

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:	Attendance Goal #1: In the 2211-2012 school year or Average Daily Attendance Rate was 96.04% Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase attendance to 96.54%. In addition, the number of students with excessive tardies (10 or more) was 252 for the 2011-2012 school year. Our goal for 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the number of students with excessive tardies (10 or more) to 239.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.04%(953)	96.54%(958)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
247	235
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
252	239

Problem-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. The number of students with excessive absences has remained consistent over the past two years. Many of our families have relatives in other countries and often travel for family or religious events.	1.1. Require notification of absences form for all planned unexcused absences and counsel families as to the anticipated effect on their child's academics due to absence.	1.1. Administration	1.1. Track the number of unexcused absences	1.1. Compare total number of students with excessive absences from the 2011 – 2012 and the 2012 – 2013 school year.

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	Our goal for 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the total number of indoor suspensions at 0. Our goal for 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 1 to 0.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
1	1			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
1	1			
Problem-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
No Data Submitted						

Suspension Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		During the 2011-2012 school year parent participation in school wide activities was 100%.			
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain current levels of parental involvement.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
100%		100%			
Problem-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	Communication to new parents of volunteer requirement	Utilize Connect-Ed messaging to notify parents of upcoming events.	Administration	Monitor attendance at school events	Track the number of families completing their volunteer hours.

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		Increase student participation in STEM programs such as - SECME - Science Fair - Fairchild Challenge			
Problem-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. Increasing student interest and performance in STEM related content	1.1. Create a STEM club for participation in STEM related programs Create integrated projects combining STEM content with other curriculum subjects	1.1. Administration	1.1. Evaluate student's enrollment in STEM related club Monitor lesson plans for STEM integrated project implementation	1.1. Calculate number of students who participated in STEM programs

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:			Increase the connection between our 8th grade career class and real life experiences in the community.		
Problem-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	Finding mentors and corporate hosts to provide work related experiences and internships to our students	Create a unit of study for the career class incorporating mentoring themes and recruit local business people to participate. 8th grade career class will participate with Junior Achievement.	Career teacher and administration	Monitor implementation of unit plan and number of mentors recruited	Calculate number of hours students participated in mentoring, and internship experiences

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Civics	1.1	Social Studies textbook program K-8	General	\$77,880.00
Civics	1.1	Social Studies textbook program K-8	EESAC	\$2,992.00
				Subtotal: \$80,872.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	1.1 and 2.1	I-Ready, Accelerated Reader, and Reading Plus	General	\$23,478.00
Reading	1.1 and 2.1	I-Ready, Accelerated Reader, and Reading Plus	General	\$4,860.00
Science	2.1	Gizmos interactive online simulations for math and science education in grades 3-12	EESAC	\$1,900.00
				Subtotal: \$30,238.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$111,110.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
To provide additional technology and instructional resources-IReady and Reading Plus Gizmos Textbooks	\$9,752.00

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

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District AVENTURA CITY OF EXCELLENCE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	92%	90%	76%	350	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	73%	83%			156	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?	73% (YES)	82% (YES)			155	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					661	
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 AVENTURA CITY OF EXCELLENCE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	85%	87%	67%	331	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%	69%			144	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?	75% (YES)	70% (YES)			145	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					620	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested