FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: THE CHARTER SCHOOL AT WATERSTONE

District Name: Dade

Principal: Nathaniel Grasch

SAC Chair: Estelle Strader

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Melissa Aguilar	BS Special Education MS Reading Education K-12 Educational Leadership	7	8	12 11 10 09 08 School Grades A A A A A AYP N Y N N High Stds Reading 69 79 76 70 67 High Stds in Math 64 77 72 66 64 Lrng Gains Read 79 69 73 68 67 Lrng Gains Math 71 71 66 69 69 Gains R 25 85 68 67 71 61 Gains M 25 64 64 63 73 73
Assis Principal	Rebecca Valdes	Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education Master of Science in Reading Certification: Educational Leadership Elementary Education ESOL Reading K-12	4	1	12 11 10 09 08 School Grades A A A A AYP N Y N N High Stds Reading 79 76 70 67 High Stds in Math 77 72 66 64 Lrng Gains Read 68 73 68 67 Lrng Gains Math 71 66 69 69 Gains R 25 68 67 71 61 Gains M 25 64 63 73 73

		Gifted Endorsement			
Assis Principal	Nancy Roque	Certification: Elementary Education K-6 ESOL	7	1	12 11 10 09 08 School Grades A A A A AYP N Y N N High Stds Reading 79 76 70 67 High Stds in Math 77 72 66 64 Lrng Gains Read 68 73 68 67 Lrng Gains Math 71 66 69 69 Gains R 25 68 67 71 61 Gains M 25 64 63 73 73

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)
Reading	Pamela Picasso	Bachelor in Science in Political Science Master in Science in Reading Education Certification Elementary Education K-6 ESOL K-12 Reading K-12	4	1	12 11 10 09 08 School Grades A A A A A AYP N Y N N High Stds Reading 69 79 76 70 67 High Stds in Math 64 77 72 66 64 Lrng Gains Read 79 68 73 68 67 Lrng Gains Math 71 71 66 69 69 Gains R 25 85 68 67 71 61 Gains M 25 64 64 63 73 73
Math	Teresita Nieves	Bachelor of Music Performance Masters in Science in Curriculum and Instruction in Mathematics Education Certification: Middle School Mathematics (5-9)	6	3	12 11 10 09 08 School Grades A A A A A AYP N Y N N High Stds Reading 69 79 76 70 67 High Stds in Math 64 77 72 66 64 Lrng Gains Read 79 68 73 68 67 Lrng Gains Math 71 71 66 69 69 Gains R 25 85 68 67 71 61 Gains M 25 64 64 63 73 73

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	Provide salaries commensurate with district pay scale.	Governing Board	August 2012	
2	Employer will pay 90% of employee health costs.	Governing Board	August 2012	
3	Ads are placed in local newspaper and applicants are screened prior to making an appointment for an interview. Applicants are interviewed by appropriate personnel including the Director, the Principal, the Assistant Principal, the ESE Specialist, the ESOL Director and the Reading Coach, where applicable.	Principal	April 2012, as needed	
4	Soliciting referrals from current employees	Principal	September 14, 2012	
5	Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Asst. Principal	On-going	

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
None	N/A

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
49	14.3%(7)	55.1%(27)	24.5%(12)	6.1%(3)	14.3%(7)	100.0%(49)	10.2%(5)	0.0%(0)	100.0%(49)

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
Dianne Robbins	Melissa Guillermes	Ms. Robbins is a very experienced and accomplished teacher with over 30 years of experience. She is timeless and is always implementing the latest trends in education.	Lesson planning and data driven curriculum planning and instruction. Modeling of instruction.
Wanda Santana	Daniela Perez	Ms. Santana is an experienced teacher and is the grade level Lead Teacher. She has over 10 years of teaching experience in multiple elementary grades.	Lesson planning and data driven curriculum planning and instruction. Modeling of instruction.
Nicole Cummings	Christopher Delgado	Ms. Cummings is an experienced teacher with many years of accomplished teaching across multiple elementary grade levels.	Lesson planning and data driven curriculum planning and instruction.
		Ms. March is an experienced teacher with many years of	

Mary March	Danerys Diaz Delgado	accomplished teaching across multiple elementary grade levels. She is also the Elementary Reading Lead Teacher	Lesson planning and data driven curriculum planning and instruction. Modeling of instruction.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselor, Dean of Students, Science Lead Teacher, Language Arts Department Head and the ESE Program Specialist.

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

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

The Leadership Team will:
1. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following important questions:
• What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
• How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments)
• How will we respond when students have not learned? (Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
• How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (enrichment opportunities).
2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
3. Hold regular team meetings.
4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

1. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through frequent data gathering and data analysis.
2. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
3. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:
• adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
• adjust the delivery of behavior management system
• adjust the allocation of school-based resources
• drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
• create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions
2. Managed data will include:
Academic
• FAIR assessment/PMRN
• Interim and Baseline assessments
• EDUSOFT Managed data

• CELLA assessments
• In-house Reading, Writing, Math and Science assessments
• FCAT scores
• Student grades
Behavior
• Student Case Management System
• In-house behavior database using our school-wide discipline plan
• Detentions
• Suspensions/expulsions
• Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
• Team climate surveys
• Attendance
• Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:
1. Training for all administrators in the RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
2. Providing support for school staff to understand basic RtI principles and procedures; and providing a network of ongoing support for RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Frequent needs assessments will take place so as to support any areas with needed professional development. A focus on the FCIM will allow the MTSS to implement plans of action, evaluate their effectiveness, and make any necessary changes and adjustments.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Melissa Aguilar (Principal) , Rebecca Valdes (Reading Coach), Breezy Leza (Assistant Principal), Margaret Fahringer (Assistant Principal), Nancy Roque (ESOL Coordinator), Vania Capote (School Counselor) and Leila Ibanez (ESE Program Specialist), Mary March (Elementary Reading Lead Teacher), Pamela Picasso-Alarcon (Middle School Reading Lead Teacher), Dalisay Figuracion (Language Arts Department Head).

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

Our LLT meets during the summer to develop the reading pacing guide, thematic calendar and novels read per grade level. Throughout the year, our LLT meets to discuss student progress as evident by weekly school-wide assessments. The LLT analyzes the data, assists in changing curriculum to meet the needs of the students, and identifies students for remediation. Intervention is given to students whose scores indicate a need for remediation. Students who are in the bottom 25%, have significantly low FAIR scores, have been retained and/or demonstrate weakness in mastering grade level material are provided with intensive remediation and monitored on a monthly basis through assessments and progress monitoring.

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

School wide the students will be using Ticket to Read, FCAT Explorer, KidBiz, Reading Plus to improve fluency and reading comprehension. School will provide incentives to students who reach predetermined individual goals.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

applicable.

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 30% of the students achieved Level 3 Proficiency. Our goal for 2012-2013 school year is to Maintain level 3 proficiency at 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% 249	30% 249

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Category 1, Vocabulary. Students lack the vocabulary necessary to be successful readers.	During Reading instruction students will participate in a variety of vocabulary development activities that would enhance their word knowledge. Students will dissect vocabulary through exploration activities. Implement Worldly Wise School-wide to expose students to a wide range of vocabulary including but not limited to the study of synonyms, antonyms, etc.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments focusing on student knowledge of word meanings and their relationships. Data Chats will be used as a means to make students reflect on progress, set new goals and meet them . Data chats will be done at least once a month. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Mini Assessments Summative 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 39% of the students achieved Level 4 or 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain levels 4 and 5 student proficiency at 39%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% 324	39% 324

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Category 4, Informational Text and Research Process. These students lack the ability to utilize critical thinking strategies needed to locate, interpret and organize information and to determine the validity and reliability of information within and across	Use project based learning in order to move students from guided learning to more independent learning. Use real-world documents such as, how-to articles, brochures, fliers and websites to locate, interpret and organize information.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Data Chats will be used as a means to make students reflect on progress, set new goals and meet them . Data chats will be done at least once a month. (FCIM) Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 79% of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 84%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79% 540	84% 575

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited resources in materials specifically for English Language Learners.	English Language Learners will receive intensive reading intervention through small group instruction.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: 2012-2013 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:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012-2013 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 85% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 90%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% 152	90% 161

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was fluency, phonics and comprehension	Students will engage in timed fluency activities using Fluency Charts and Sand timers. Teachers will implement center activities to develop phonics and vocabulary skills through the use of Wordly Wise. Teachers will implement Common Core Standards and Exemplar Texts in order to build QAR (Question/Answer/Relationship), CRISS Strategies, Explicit Instruction in reading comprehension skills by benchmark.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Student work samples using rubrics, mini assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 5A : Our goal from the 2011-2017 is to reduce the percentage of non-proficient students by 50%.			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66	69	72	75	78	

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:	Our goal is to increase percentage of students scoring at levels 3-5 and reduce percentage of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years (using 2010-2011 as the baseline year). The 2010-11 results will be converted to FCAT 2.0/EOC vertical scales
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 71% Black: 63% Hispanic: 70% Asian: N/A	White: 72% Black: 72% Hispanic: 72% Asian: N/A

American Indian: N/A	American Indian: N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in the identified Black subgroup lack the ability to read fluently and apply reading strategies to help enhance comprehension.	Students in these subgroups will receive additional reading interventions during the school day. This intervention will teach reading strategies that help develop comprehension. Identified subgroups will also receive additional afterschool tutoring and instructional support to address the needs previously identified.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: In-house benchmark assessments, Baseline Assessment and Interim Assessment. Student work samples using rubrics, mini assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Our goal is to increase percentage of ELL students making satisfactory progress by 50% over six years (using 2010-2011 as the baseline year). The 2010-11 results will be converted to FCAT 2.0/EOC vertical scales.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (28)	61% (33)

Problem-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	ELL students lack vocabulary and the ability to use context clues, base words, and affixes, antonyms, synonyms, homographs, and homophones to determine the meanings of words.	English Language Learners will also receive in school reading intervention. This intervention will teach reading strategies that help students determine meanings of words by using context clues. English Language Learners will receive additional afterschool tutoring and instructional support to address the needs previously identified.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: CELLA, In-house benchmark assessments, Baseline Assessment and Interim Assessment. Student work samples using rubrics, mini assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Our goal is to increase percentage of SWD students making satisfactory progress by 50% over six years (using 2010-2011 as the baseline year). The 2010-11 results will be converted to FCAT 2.0/EOC vertical scales.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (24)	44% (26)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with disabilities lack, fluency, vocabulary and the ability to utilize critical thinking strategies needed for comprehension.	Students with disabilities will receive in school reading intervention. This intervention will teach reading strategies that help students determine meanings of words by using context clues along with helping them use critical thinking strategies needed for comprehension. Students will engage in timed fluency activities using Fluency Charts and Sand timers. Students will receive all accommodations needed to further enhance their abilities.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM).	Formative: In-house benchmark assessments, Baseline Assessment and Interim Assessment. Student work samples using rubrics, mini assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Our goal is to increase percentage of ED students making satisfactory progress by 50% over six years (using 2010-2011 as the baseline year). The 2010-11 results will be converted to FCAT 2.0/EOC vertical scales.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (411)	71% (423)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack vocabulary and the ability to use context clues, base words, and affixes, antonyms, synonyms, homographs, and homophones to determine the meanings of words.	Economically Disadvantaged will receive additional afterschool instructional support to address the needs previously identified. This intervention will teach reading strategies that help students determine meanings of words by using context clues.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Student work samples using rubrics, mini assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0 .

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Training	K-5	Reading Coach	Reading and Language Arts Teachers	September 26, 2012	Informal Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Reading Coach Assistant Principals
Wordly Wise Implementation	K-5	Reading Coach	Reading and Language Arts Teachers	August 14, 2012	Informal Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Reading Coach Assistant Principals

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementation of vocabulary development lessons	Wordly Wise Materials	School-based budget	$100.00
Review of Reading Strategies	Fluency Timers and laminated charts and sand timers	school based budget	$200.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of Mimeo Board lesson to implement CRISS strategies	Mimio Board Lessons	School-based budget	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
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: $400.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	Our goal is to increase the percentage of English Language Learners who are proficient in Oral Skills (listening and speaking) on CELLA by 3% in the 2012-

	2013 school year.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

77% (83)

Problem-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	ELL students lack vocabulary to gain comprehension from listening.	English Language Learners will receive specific explanations of key words and special or technical vocabulary, using examples and nonlinguistic props when possible.	RtI Leadership Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline, Interim Assessments Summative: CELLA 2013

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:	Our goal is to increase the percentage of English Language Learners who are proficient in Reading on CELLA by 3% in the 2012-2013 school year.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

50% (54)

Problem-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	ELL students lack vocabulary and the ability to use context clues, base words, and affixes, antonyms, synonyms, homographs, and homophones to determine the meanings of words.	Using brief excerpts or passages from text students are reading,, English Language Learners will paraphrase what they have read, accounting for the vocabulary words and concepts that are important to the excerpt. English Language Learners can then compare their paraphrasing to see if they put the vocabulary words and concepts into their own words without leaving out essential information.	RtI Leadership Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline, Interim Assessments CELLA 2013

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Our goal is to increase the percentage of English Language Learners who are proficient in Writing on CELLA by 3% in the 2012-2013 school year.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

49% (53)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students lack grammar and convention skills to write in complete sentences and paragraphs.	English Language Learners will generate narrative, expository, persuasive, or reference paper. Student produces written document that can be scored on content or language components as a written sample. It can be scored with a rubric or rating scale. This writing sample can determine what writing process the student needs direct instruction in.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Student work samples using rubrics, mini assessments and teacher observation46 CELLA 2013

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementation of vocabulary development lessons	ELL Vocabulary Cards	School-based budget	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of FCRR center activities	Paper and lamination	school-based budget	$150.00
			Subtotal: $150.00
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: $250.00

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 2011-12 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 37 % of the students achieved Level 3 Proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 40%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (304)	40% (332)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 3 FCAT Math Test was Category 2, Number: Fractions. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 4 FCAT Math Test was Category 3, Geometry and Measurement. The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 5 FCAT Math Test were Category 1, Number: Base Ten and Fractions and Category 3, Geometry and Measurement.	Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction, and multiplication and division of whole numbers. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. There will be continued opportunities for students to participate in concept based instruction through an understanding of differentiated instruction and the integration of technology.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly review of formative assessments to ensure that the students are showing progress and adjust teaching as necessary. Conduct grade level and department meetings to gather information and feedback from the instructional staff and adjust instruction as necessary. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Bi-weekly assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-12 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 27% of the students achieved Level 4 and 5 Proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 29%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (227)	29% (241)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 3 FCAT Math Test was Category 2, Number: Fractions. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 4 FCAT Math Test was Category 3, Geometry and Measurement. The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 5 FCAT Math Test were Category 1, Number: Base Ten and Fractions and Category 3, Geometry and Measurement.	Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction, and multiplication and division of whole numbers. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. There will be continued opportunities for students to participate in concept based instruction through an understanding of differentiated instruction and the integration of technology.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly review of formative assessments to ensure that the students are showing progress and adjust teaching as necessary. Conduct grade level and department meetings to gather information and feedback from the instructional staff and adjust instruction as necessary. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Bi-weekly assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011-12 FCAT Math Test indicate that 71% of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to76 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% 486	76% 520

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 3 FCAT Math Test was Category 2, Number: Fractions. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 4 FCAT Math Test was Category 3, Geometry and Measurement. The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 5 FCAT Math Test were Category 1, Number: Base Ten and Fractions and Category 3, Geometry and	Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction, and multiplication and division of whole numbers. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments In-house benchmark assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

	Measurement.	for practice. There will be continued opportunities for students to participate in concept based instruction through an understanding of differentiated instruction and the integration of technology.			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-12 FCAT Math Test indicate that 64% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% 115	69% 124

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 3 FCAT Math Test was Category 2, Number: Fractions. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the	Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction,	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments In-house benchmark assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment

1	Grade 4 FCAT Math Test was Category 3, Geometry and Measurement. The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Grade 5 FCAT Math Test were Category 1, Number: Base Ten and Fractions and Category 3, Geometry and Measurement.	and multiplication and division of whole numbers. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. There will be continued opportunities for students to participate in concept based instruction through an understanding of differentiated instruction and the integration of technology.		to assess student learning. (FCIM)	2.0

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percentage of non-proficient students by 50%					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67	70	73	76	79	

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:	Mathematics Goal #5B: Our goal is to increase percentage of students scoring at levels 3-5 and reduce percentage of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years (using 2010-2011 as the baseline year). The 2010-11 results will be converted to FCAT 2.0/EOC vertical scales.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 68% Black: 49% Hispanic: 65% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: 76% Black: 63% Hispanic: 70% Asian: N/A American Indian: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
	Students in the identified subgroups: White, Black, Hispanic need additional interventions and direct specialized instruction in order to make learning gains in the application of Mathematical concepts.	Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction,	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments In-house benchmark assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

1		and multiplication and division of whole numbers. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice. There will be continued opportunities for students to participate in concept based instruction through an understanding of differentiated instruction and the integration of technology.		to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Our goal is to increase percentage of ELL students making satisfactory progress by 50% over six years (using 2010-2011 as the baseline year). The 2010-11 results will be converted to FCAT 2.0/EOC vertical scales.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (32)	70% (35)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have difficulties with describing, analyzing, and comparing attributes in two and three dimensional objects. The new state standards may create learning curves in our students.	Provide grade 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. Implement explicit direct instruction based on the new Sunshine State Standards. Use of intervention material found in new Math curriculum purchased to implement RtI with full fidelity	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments In-house benchmark assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Our goal is to increase percentage of SWD students making satisfactory progress by 50% over six years (using 2010-2011 as the baseline year). The 2010-11 results will be converted to FCAT 2.0/EOC vertical scales.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (24)	57% (33)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have difficulties with describing, analyzing, and comparing attributes in two and three dimensional objects. The new state standards may create learning curves in our students.	Provide grade 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	MTSS/RtI Team.	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners . Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments In-house benchmark assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Our goal is to increase percentage of ED students making satisfactory progress by 50% over six years (using 2010-2011 as the baseline year). The 2010-11 results will be converted to FCAT 2.0/EOC vertical scales.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (375)	66% (393)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have difficulties with describing, analyzing, and comparing attributes in two and three dimensional objects. The new state standards may create learning curves in our students.	Provide grade 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	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners . Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning.	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments In-house benchmark assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

		attributes and properties of two and three dimensional shapes/objects.		(FCIM)	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.	

Mathematics Goal #2a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on 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	Middle School Mathematics Goal #

by 50%.	5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Algebra Goal # 3A :			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A :

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Effective Implementation of Math Manipulatives	K-5	Math Coach	All Math Teachers K-5	September 26, 2012	Lesson Plans and Observations	Math Coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Florida Math Ready	Florida Math Ready (3-5) FCAT	EESAC Funds	$200.00
Scoring High	Scoring High (K-2) for SESAT	EESAC Funds	$175.00
			Subtotal: $375.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementation of virtual Math Manipulatives	LCD Projectors	EESAC Funds	$300.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
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: $675.00

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 indicate that 37% of the students achieved Level 3 Proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 41%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% 108	41% 118

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was Earth Space. Students require additional exposure to real-world applications.	Teachers will expose students in grades 5 to real-world hands-on applications of science curriculum the use of technology, models, and real-life experiences from teacher resources (AIMS) and websites. Teacher will implement virtual labs (websites and virtual manipulatives) using LCD projector. Teacher will engage students in data chats using data sheets and Edusoft data.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments focusing on student knowledge of life and environmental sciences. (FCIM)	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Mini Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 12% of the students achieved Level 4 and 5 Proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year s to increase level 4 and 5 by 2 proficiency by 2 percentage points to 14%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
12% 35	14% 39

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012	Teachers will expose students in grades 5 to	MTSS/RtI Team	Monthly classroom assessments focusing	Formative: Baseline and

1	administration of the FCAT Science Test was Earth Space. Students require additional exposure to real-world applications.	real-world applications through the use of technology, models, and real-life experiences using Students will participate in an advanced Science curriculum including Earth Space Science. For enrichment, students will engage in the real life projects as part of the Jason Project curriculum.		on student knowledge of life and environmental sciences. (FCIM)	Interim Assessments Mini Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Implementation of New Science Curriculum	K-5	Science Lead	School-wide	October 2012	Student Lab Journals Lesson Plans	Assistant Principals

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementation of New Science Curriculum	Science Fusion	School-based Budget	$20,000.00

Implementation of hands-on, real-world Science lessons	AIMS Students and Teacher Kits (K-5)	school-based budget	$1,300.00
			Subtotal: $21,300.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementation of virtual labs	Virtual manipulatives and LCD projectors	School-based budget	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Data chats on Science Data	Data Chat sheets and Edusoft data	School-based budget	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $21,500.00

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 indicate that 92% of the students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain 93% proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92% 260	93% 262

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students difficulty with modifying word choices for ideas and content, logical organization, voice, focus, collaboration, conventions and fluency in the writing piece. Students are not fluent in editing for mechanics and punctuation.	An implementation of professional development to enhance the instructional strategies of the new instructional personnel. Students will be engaged in the Craft Plus and the use interactive board for peer editing activities and writing lessons.	MTSS/RtI Team	Continuous administrative walk-through evaluations (formal & informal). Administer and score monthly writing prompts to monitor student progress and adjust instruction as indicated. (FCIM)	Formative District Writing Pre-tests Mini Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
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
Implementing the Common Core Writing Standards	K-5	Department Chair	School-wide	August 16, 2012	Lesson plans and Sample writing	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementing the 1-5 Common Core Writing Standards	1-5 Common Core Writing Standards	School-based budget	$100.00
Implementing CraftPlus Daily Writing Lessons	CraftPlus Daily Writing Program	School-based budget	$14,000.00
			Subtotal: $14,100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of interactive boards for peer editing activities and writing lessons	Supplies	School-based budget	$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Review how to implement Common Core Writing Standards	Common Core K-5 Writing Standards	School-based budget	$50.00
			Subtotal: $50.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $14,350.00

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The Average Daily Attendance Rate for 2011-2012 was 96.54 %. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the attendance rate to 97.02%. In addition, our goal is to decrease the number of excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardies (10 or more) by 5%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.46% (1021)	96.96% (1026)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

219	208
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
66	63

Problem-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	New Arrival and dismissal procedures will take time for parents to acclimate and adjust.	Continue to work with community to establish the new arrival and dismissal procedures that facilitate the flow of traffic reducing the number of tardies. Use sign-in /check-out system to monitor tardies and recognize students with perfect attendance each quarter. Issuance of parent letter that will inform parents of their child's attendance records and the district's attendance policies. Implement a class incentive for 100% attendance goals quarterly	MTSS/RtI Team	Observation, adjust and monitoring of traffic and attendance records.	Attendance records Parent Survey Completion of evaluation

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
Parent Meetings	K-5	Admin.	School-wide	Novemebr 2012	Attendance Report	Adminstration

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Class 100% incentives per quarter & Information regarding new procedures	Paper for quarterly attendance goals coloring pages & arrival/dismissal procedures flyers	PTSO funds	$500.00

			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Scan ID badges in order to assist in the flow of tardies	ID badge and barcode reader	School-based budget	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parental Involvement = Success	Parent nights to discuss positive outcomes of parental involvement and strategies to be involved parents	PTSO Funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,100.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	The number of in-school suspensions in the 2011-2012 school year was 10. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of in school suspensions to 9. The number of out-of- school suspensions in the 2010-2011 school year was 74. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of out-of-school suspensions to 67.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
10	9
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
9	8
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
74	67
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
55	50

Problem-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	Due to the expansion of students in K-5, new students and parents may not be familiar with the Student Code of Conduct.	Parent Workshops to increase parental involvement. Continuation of recognition programs such as Student of the Month, Do The Right Thing, Lessons on Character Education in an effort to take a proactive approach to discipline using videos. School-wide implementation of discipline plan.	Leadership Team	Review of suspension report and make appropriate adjustments	Suspension Report.

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
School-wide Discipline Plan	K-5	Dean of Students	School-wide	August 16, 2012	School-Wide Plan documentation	Decrease in suspensions and detentions

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
School-wide implementation of: Do the Right Thing, Character Education and Students of the Month	Student rewards, recognition and incentives	SAC funds	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Show videos that pertain to character education	Purchase enough TVs and DVD players to ensure 1 per grade level	School-based budget	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Classroom Management	School-wide discipline plan and procedures	School-based budget	$150.00
			Subtotal: $150.00
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $750.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	85% of the parents completed their volunteer hours by contributing time to the school. Our goal is that 90% of parents complete their volunteer hours.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
85%	90%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents are unfamiliar with the availability of opportunities for parental involvement.	Use the Black Board Connect call out system to invite parents to school sponsored activities. Give incentives for parents to attend such activities. Work closely with our PTSO to further enhance communication and participation of parents in school activities. Parents received orientation	Leadership Team	Monthly review of volunteer Spreadsheet and sign in sheets for events. Send updates on completed parent volunteer hours.	Volunteer Spreadsheet and data from Raptor.

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

Homeroom Parent Procedures	Grades K-5	Administration	One designated parent per Homeroom	September 2012	Parent Exit Survey	Principal & PTSO

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementation of Homeroom Parent	Homeroom Parent assists in communicating classroom needs, events and volunteer opportunities.	PTSO Funds	$700.00
			Subtotal: $700.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Online Assessment Programs	In Student Portal MDCPS and pay for handout information	SAC funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Training of PTSO so that parents can hear from other parents	Handouts	SAC Funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $900.00

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:	1. Increase the implementation of virtual labs in science using manipulatives and LCD projectors. 2. Increase the implementation of virtual manipulatives in math by promoting the participation of Mathletics. 3. Increase the usage of the Mac labs within the instructional lessons. 4. Increase the understanding of the scientific process by promoting the Science Fair participation.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The need for ongoing technology Professional Development.	Integrate technology to enhance lessons. Use activities such as Science Fairs and weekly Science Labs to reinforce the Scientific Process and Scientific	Leadership team.	Continuous administrative walk-through evaluations (formal & informal).	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments. Informal: 2013 FCAT Math and Science 2.0

		Thinking			

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
Integration of Mimio in the classroom	K-5	Hired Trainer	Cross-Curricular	October 2012	Lesson plans and walktroughs	Administrative Team

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
Integrating Mimio in the classroom	Manuals and presentations	School-based budget	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,500.00

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:	
Problem-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						

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Implementation of vocabulary development lessons	Wordly Wise Materials	School-based budget	$100.00
Reading	Review of Reading Strategies	Fluency Timers and laminated charts and sand timers	school based budget	$200.00
CELLA	Implementation of vocabulary development lessons	ELL Vocabulary Cards	School-based budget	$100.00
Mathematics	Florida Math Ready	Florida Math Ready (3-5) FCAT	EESAC Funds	$200.00
Mathematics	Scoring High	Scoring High (K-2) for SESAT	EESAC Funds	$175.00
Science	Implementation of New Science Curriculum	Science Fusion	School-based Budget	$20,000.00
Science	Implementation of hands-on, real-world Science lessons	AIMS Students and Teacher Kits (K-5)	school-based budget	$1,300.00
Writing	Implementing the 1-5 Common Core Writing Standards	1-5 Common Core Writing Standards	School-based budget	$100.00
Writing	Implementing CraftPlus Daily Writing Lessons	CraftPlus Daily Writing Program	School-based budget	$14,000.00
Attendance	Class 100% incentives per quarter & Information regarding new procedures	Paper for quarterly attendance goals coloring pages & arrival/dismissal procedures flyers	PTSO funds	$500.00
Suspension	School-wide implementation of: Do the Right Thing, Character Education and Students of the Month	Student rewards, recognition and incentives	SAC funds	$500.00
Parent Involvement	Implementation of Homeroom Parent	Homeroom Parent assists in communicating classroom needs, events and volunteer opportunities.	PTSO Funds	$700.00
				Subtotal: $37,875.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Use of Mimeo Board lesson to implement CRISS strategies	Mimio Board Lessons	School-based budget	$100.00
CELLA	Use of FCRR center activities	Paper and lamination	school-based budget	$150.00
Mathematics	Implementation of virtual Math Manipulatives	LCD Projectors	EESAC Funds	$300.00
Science	Implementation of virtual labs	Virtual manipulatives and LCD projectors	School-based budget	$100.00
Writing	Use of interactive boards for peer editing activities and writing lessons	Supplies	School-based budget	$200.00
Attendance	Scan ID badges in order to assist in the flow of tardies	ID badge and barcode reader	School-based budget	$500.00
Suspension	Show videos that pertain to character education	Purchase enough TVs and DVD players to ensure 1 per grade level	School-based budget	$100.00
Parent Involvement	Online Assessment Programs	In Student Portal MDCPS and pay for handout information	SAC funds	$100.00
				Subtotal: $1,550.00
Professional Development				

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	Data chats on Science Data	Data Chat sheets and Edusoft data	School-based budget	$100.00
Writing	Review how to implement Common Core Writing Standards	Common Core K-5 Writing Standards	School-based budget	$50.00
Attendance	Parental Involvement = Success	Parent nights to discuss positive outcomes of parental involvement and strategies to be involved parents	PTSO Funds	$100.00
Suspension	Classroom Management	School-wide discipline plan and procedures	School-based budget	$150.00
Parent Involvement	Training of PTSO so that parents can hear from other parents	Handouts	SAC Funds	$100.00
STEM	Integrating Mimio in the classroom	Manuals and presentations	School-based budget	$1,500.00
				Subtotal: $2,000.00
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: $41,425.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (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
In an attempt to support the mission and vision of the school and increase student achievement, SAC funds may be used to purchase student incentives for attendance and demonstration of positive behavior. Incentives include supplies for pizza, pop corn and Snow Cone parties, stickers, pencils, goodie bags, certificates.	$500.00
SAC funds may be used to purchase teacher resource materials and books and supplies to further develop our school library. Exemplar text books, more library books for students in grades K-1, one-year membership to Accelerated Reader.	$2,000.00
Florida Math Ready Florida Math Ready (3-5) FCAT EESAC Funds	$200.00

Scoring High Scoring High (K-2) for SESAT EESAC Funds	$175.00
School-wide implementation of: Do the Right Thing, Character Education and Students of the Month Student rewards, recognition and incentives SAC funds	$500.00
Online Assessment Programs In Student Portal MDCPS and pay for handout information SAC funds	$100.00
Training of PTSO so that parents can hear from other parents Handouts SAC Funds	$100.00

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 THE CHARTER SCHOOL AT WATERSTONE 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	77%	94%	61%	311	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	69%	71%			140	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?	68% (YES)	64% (YES)			132	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					583	
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 THE CHARTER SCHOOL AT WATERSTONE 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	76%	72%	96%	41%	285	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%	66%			139	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	63% (YES)			130	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					554	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested