FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SOUTH MIAMI K-8 CENTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: Anamarie G. Moreiras

SAC Chair: Vivian Gonzalez

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: 9/21/12

Last Modified on: 10/4/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
		Bachelor of Arts, Elementary Education			2012 School Grade: A AMO: High Standards Reading: 70 High Standards Math: 71 Learning Gains-Rdg: 72 Learning Gains-Math: 74 Gains-Rdg-25%: 70 Gains- Math-25%: 81 2011 School Grade: A AYP: No High Standards Reading: 84 High Standards Math: 83 Learning Gains-Rdg: 68 Learning Gains-Math: 71 Gains-Rdg-25%: 71 Gains- Math-25%: 71

Position	Name	Degree(s)/Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record
Principal	Anamarie G. Moreiras	Master of Science in Computer Education Specialist in Administration Endorsed in Gifted Education, ESOL, and Certified in Early Childhood Education	5	13	2010 School Grade: A AYP: Yes High Standards Reading: 82 High Standards Math: 82 Learning Gains-Rdg: 67 Learning Gains-Math: 67 Gains-Rdg-25%: 62 Gains- Math-25%: 67 2009: School Grade: A AYP: Yes High Standards Reading: 83 High Standards Math: 82 Learning Gains-Rdg: 72 Learning Gains-Math: 67 Gains-Rdg-25%: 69 Gains- Math-25%: 68 2008 School Grade: A AYP: Yes High Standards Reading: 85 High Standards Math: 81 Learning Gains-Rdg: 73 Learning Gains-Math: 69 Gains-Rdg-25%: 66 Gains- Math-25%: 70
Assis Principal	Alina Gallego	Bachelors in Social Work Education Masters in Social Work Specialist in Educational Leadership Certification(s) Exceptional Student Education K-12 School Social Worker Pre-K - 12 Educational Leadership (All Levels)	1	5	2012 School Grade: A AMO: High Standards Reading: 63 High Standards Math: 61 Learning Gains-Rdg: 67 Learning Gains-Math: 69 Gains-Rdg-25%: 70 Gains- Math-25%: 64 2011 School Grade: A AYP: No High Standards Reading: 78 High Standards Math: 77 Learning Gains-Rdg: 69 Learning Gains-Math: 74 Gains-Rdg-25%: 79 Gains- Math-25%: 73 2010 School Grade: A AYP: No High Standards Reading: 74 High Standards Math: 70 Learning Gains-Rdg: 67 Learning Gains-Math: 72 Gains-Rdg-25%: 65 Gains- Math-25%: 65 2009: School Grade: A AYP: No High Standards Reading: 74 High Standards Math: 70 Learning Gains-Rdg: 46 Learning Gains-Math: 69 Gains-Rdg-25%: 71 Gains- Math-25%: 62 2008 School Grade: A AYP: No High Standards Reading: 72 High Standards Math: 70 Learning Gains-Rdg: 65 Learning Gains-Math: 73 Gains-Rdg-25%: 63 Gains- Math-25%: 69

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

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

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Data chats with administration and reading coaches in order to target instruction.	Principal	On-going	
2	2. Soliciting personnel referrals from current employees.	Principal	On-going	
3	3. Attending career job fairs.	Guidance Counselors	On-going	
4	4. Teachers will be given common planning time in order to plan within their grade level and across other grade levels.	Principal and Assistant 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
Teaching out-of field 6.6%[4] Less than effective rating 0% [0]	District provided professional development and ongoing dialog with district to ensure pertinent documentation is received and recorded.

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
60	1.7%(1)	8.3%(5)	48.3%(29)	41.7%(25)	51.7%(31)	93.3%(56)	3.3%(2)	13.3%(8)	65.0%(39)

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
Karina Buznego	Georgina Mederos	Same field of knowledge	Monthly consultation

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

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

1.MTSS leadership team is vital, therefore, in building our team we have considered the following:

•Administrator(s) who will ensure commitment and allocate resources;
•Teacher(s) and Coaches who share the common goal of improving instruction for all students; and
•Team members who will work to build staff support; analyze student data from a variety of sources, internal capacity, and sustainability over time.

2.The school's MTSS Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:

•School reading, math, science, and behavior specialists
•Special education personnel
•Member of advisory group
•Community stakeholders

3. MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. MTSS/RtI uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.

•The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum; individual student data is analyzed to determine specific needs.
•The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions provided based on data in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support.
•The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally.

There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by baselines, QMBA, FAIR, Interims and progress monitoring data. The RtI four step problem-solving models will be used to plan, monitor, and revise instruction and intervention. The four steps are problem identification, problem analysis, intervention implementation, and response to intervention.

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 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the MTSS/RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team in conjunction with teacher(s) will:

1. Monitor academic and behavior data while 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? (Implement Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
•How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (Through enrichment opportunities)

2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student remediation and enhancement needs.

3. Hold regular team meetings focusing on data with the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team.
• The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet on a monthly basis with classroom teachers to engage in the following activities: review monthly test data to drive instruction, identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks or at risk for not meeting benchmarks.

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 through walkthroughs and data fluidity.

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 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and teachers will assist in identifying students based on performance data, will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis using monthly assessments, interims assessments, FAIR, and the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN).

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 to guide the instruction.

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 drive 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
• Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)
• Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)
• Baseline Assessments (Mathematics, Science, Civics, Writing, Reading
• Interim assessments
• State/Local Math and Science assessments
• QMBA
• FCAT 2.0
• Student grades
• Computer Resources (Think Central, Reading Plus, SuccessMaker, Accelerated Reader, IXL, I-Ready

Behavior
•Student Case Management System
•Detentions
•Suspensions/Expulsions
•Referrals for student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
•Office referrals per day/month
•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 MTSS/RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
2. Providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and
procedures; and
3. Providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS framework with district & school mission statements and organizational improvement efforts.

2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.

3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.

4. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.

5. Accessbility of Leadership Team to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.

6. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.

7. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and highlighting academic success frequently.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal: Anamarie G. Moreiras
Assistant Principals: Alina Gallego
Grade Level/Department Chairpersons: Lizette Lorenzo, Eileen Jewett, Maby Labrada, Kathy Fernandez, Virginia Sanchez, Giuseppe Semeraro
Exceptional Student Education (SPED) Teachers: Georgina Mederos

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets once a month during the school year. The team engages in the following activities while meeting: Review the assessment data of the previous school year and link to instructional decisions for the new school year; review progress monitoring data at grade level data chats in order to identify students who are working below, on grade, and beyond grade level. Based on the information the team discusses professional development, resources, intervention needs, intervention schedules and fluidity, enrichment, and best practices.

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

The major initiative of the LLT this year will be providing intensive learning activities to our lower performing students to increase/maintain the number of students working at high proficiency levels (Levels 3 and above).

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

The data leaders will provide professional development to content area teachers throughout the year focusing on the use of literacy strategies across the curriculum. Content area teachers will be part of on-going data chats focusing on best practices to integrate reading and targeting instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Administration will monitor this process throughout the school year.

*High Schools Only

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicate that 27% (160) of students achieved a level 3 (proficiency). Our Goal for 2012-2013 school year is to increase percentage of students achieving proficiency (level 3) by 3 percentage points to 30% (179).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (160)	30% (179)

Problem-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 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process. Students lack the skills to locate, interpret, and organize information.	Using real-world documents such as, how-to articles, brochures, fliers, and websites use text features to locate, interpret, and organize information.	Administration and reading coach	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test items	Formative: Mini-assessments and Interim Assessments Summative: 2012 FCAT.
2	In grade 3 and 8 the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 Administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application. Students have difficulties identifying authors purpose	Student's will use grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining or explaining.	Administration Literacy Team, MTSS/RtI Team	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test items using the FCIM process.	Formative: Mini-assessments and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT2.0.
3	In grade 4 and 6 the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 Administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 Vocabulary. Students have difficulties identifying root words, understanding suffixes/prefixes.	Students will determine meanings of words by using context clues. Instruction will allow students to build their general knowledge of words and word relationships. Teachers will provide students with practice in recognizing word relationships and identifying the multiple meanings of words	Administration Literacy Team, MTSS/RtI Team	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test items using the FCIM process.	Formative: Mini-assessments and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT2.0.
4	In grade 5 and 7 the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 Administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process. Students lack the skills	Using real-documents such as, how to articles, brochures, fliers, and websites use text features to locate, interpret and organize information	Administration Literacy Team, MTSS/RtI Team	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test items using the FCIM process.	Formative: Mini-assessments and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT2.0.

to locate, interpret, and organize information.				

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:	The school has less the n ten students taking Florida Alternate Assessment. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to have 50% (1) of the students achieve a level 4,5,6, or 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	50% (1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students require multiple reads of a selection prior to responding to comprehension questions	This can be accomplished by using read aloud, auditory tapes and text readers that provide print with visuals and or symbols. The use of picture walks will assist students in making predictions of a reading selection.	Administration	Review results of selection tests and teacher made test.	Formative: Mini-assessments Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicate that 42% (250) of students achieved above proficiency (level 4 and 5). Our Goal for 2012-2013 school year is to increase percentage of students achieving above proficiency (level 4 and 5) by 1 percentage points to 43% (256).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42%(250)	43%(256)

Problem-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	For grades 3-8 the area which showed minimal growth or lack of growth and would require students to maintain or improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application.	Students will read fiction and nonfiction to compare and contrast story elements within and across complex texts. Graphic organizers, anchoring conclusions back to the text and text marking will be the instructional tools used to enrich the reading application process	Administration, Literacy Team	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test items following the FCIM process.	Formative: Mini-assessments and Interim Assessments 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 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicates that 72% (325) of students making learning gains.

Our Goal for 2012-2013 school year is to increase percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to77% (347). |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 72%(325) | 77%(347) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 results students demonstrated a deficiency in reporting category 2 Reading Application. The limited time for students to use technology has hindered progress.	Work with grade levels and departments in order to develop a computer lab schedule for consistent use of Ticket to Read, FCAT Explorer, Gizmos, SuccessMaker and Reading Plus programs which strengthen reading application skills.	Administration, Literacy Team, MTSS/RtI	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test item following the FCIM process.	Formative: Mini-assessments and Interim Assessments 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:

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

Reading Goal #3b:	

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicates that 70% (76) of the lowest 25% making learning gains. Our Goal for 2012-2013 school year is to increase 5 percentage points to 75% (82).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70%(76)	75%(82)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 results students demonstrated a deficiency in reporting category 2 Reading Application. The Consistency of students receiving interventions and tutorials.	Implement before/after school tutoring focusing on FCAT 2.0 reading application and identifying students to intervene with strand specific interventions deficiencies as noted on the 2012 administration of FCAT 2.0. The students will use the Reading Task Cards on a daily basis incorporating them into the story of the week.	Literacy Leadership Team Administration, MTSS/RtI	Review District Interim Assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed following the FCIM process	Formative bi-weekly assessment/data reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # Our Goal for the 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient 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 reading. Reading 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
1					

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 72% (246) of economically disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase 3 percentage points to 75% (256).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (246)	75%(256)

Problem-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 transportation issues, economically disadvantaged students were not able to attend FCAT 2.0 before school tutorials. As noted on the FCAT 2.0 results students demonstrated a deficiency in category 2 Reading Application.	Provide FCAT 2.0 tutoring services targeting Reading Application skills after school as well as before school to accommodate students with transportation issues	Administration	Tutoring attendance logs, students portfolios, graphic organizers and student grades following the FCIM Process.	Formative District Interim Assessments/data reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Cross Curricular Planning	K-8	Administration	K-8 Teachers	Weekly August 2012- May 2013	Classroom observations/LLT walk through.	Administration and LLT.
RTI Data Collection and Monitoring	K-8	Kathy Fernandez/Bernal	K-8 Teachers	September 2012- May 2013 ongoing	Observation and meetings to include discussions with administration, reading coach, counselors, and classroom teachers.	Administration, LLT, and counselors

Reading Budget:

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 CELLA were 55% (52) of students were proficient in Listening/Speaking sub-section. The goal for 2012-2013 is to increase proficiency by at least one percentage point to 56% (53).

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

55% (52)

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 CELLA the area of deficiency is in the area of Listening.	Work with grade levels and departments in order to develop oral language across all subjects using repetition, think aloud, and the use of cooperative learning opportunities.	Administration, MTSS/RtI Team	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test item using the FCIM.	Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interims Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA
2	As noted on the 2012 CELLA the area of deficiency is in the area of Speaking.	Provide students with specific explanations of key words and special technical vocabulary, using examples and	Administration, MTSS/RtI Team	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students'	Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interims Assessments Summative: 2013

| | | nonlinguistic props when possible while using everyday language. | | performance on comparison test item using the FCIM process. | CELLA |

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 CELLA were 39% (37) of students scored were proficient in the Reading sub-section. The goal for 2012-2013 is to increase by one percentage point to 40% (38).

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

39% (37).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 CELLA the area of deficiency is in the area of Vocabulary.	Teachers will plan activities in their instruction to provide the relevant context to activate students' prior knowledge on the topic. The use of context clues in different texts.	Administration	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test item using the FCIM process.	Formative: Mini-assessments District Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 CELLA

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2012 CELLA were 39% (37) of students were proficient in Writing sub-section. The goal for 2012-2013 is to increase by one percentage point to 40% (38).

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

39% (37).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 CELLA the area of deficiency is in the area of Written Communication.	The students will reinforce their written communications skills with the use of dialogue journals. Implementing district writing prompts and monitoring their progress throughout the school year.	Administration	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test items using the FCIM process.	Formative: Mini-assessments and District Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 CELLA

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 30% (179) of students achieved proficiency (Level 3). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 2 percentage points to 32% (190).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30%(179)	32%(190)

Problem-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 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process. Students lack the skills to locate, interpret, and organize information.	Using real-world documents such as, how-to articles, brochures, fliers, and websites use text features to locate, interpret, and organize information.	Administration and reading coach	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test items	Formative: Mini-assessments and Interim Assessments Summative: 2012 FCAT.
2	In grade 3 according to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area with the greatest difficulty was Reporting Category 2Fractions	The use of manipulatives to introduce basic mathematical concepts, such as addition, subtraction, multiplication, and dividing fractions.	Administration, MTSS/RtI Team	Results of monthly assessments/ District Interim will be reviewed by leadership team/teachers to ensure progress. Adjustments to curriculum focus will be made accordingly using the FCIM process.	Formative: Monthly Assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
3	In grade 4 and 5 according to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area with the greatest difficulty was Reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement.	Engage students in activities to use technology (such as Gizmos, Riverdeep, FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, Intervention, Soar to Success and/or Think Central) that include visual stimulus to develop students' understanding of data analysis. In addition, incorporate the use of manipulatives in classroom lessons frequently.	Administration, MTSS/RtI Team	Results of monthly assessments/ District Interim will be reviewed by leadership team/teachers to ensure progress. Adjustments to curriculum focus will be made accordingly using the FCIM process.	Formative: Monthly Assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	The school has less the n ten students taking Florida Alternate Assessment. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to have 50% (1) of the students achieve a level 4,5,6, or 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	0% (0)	50% (1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students must have continuous repetition and practice when learning math concepts within the class schedule.	Use of repetition for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement. Students will have continuous review and practice when learning math concepts.	Administration	Review and analyze results of selection tests and teacher-made test.	Formative: Selection tests and teacher-made test Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicates that 40% (237) of students achieved above proficiency (Level 4 and 5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving above proficiency (Level 4 and 5) by one percentage point to 41% (244).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40%(237)	41%(244)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment results students demonstrated a deficiency in Category 3, Geometry and Measurement.	Use virtual manipulates as enrichment activities to explore Mathematical Geometric Concepts of two- dimensional figures using the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives.	Administration	Review and analyze results of selection tests and District Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on geometry test items using the FCIM process.	Formative: Selection tests and District Interim Assessments 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate74% (334) of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase 5 percentage points to 79% (356)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74%(334)	79%(356)

Problem-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	Participation of students in additional enrichment activities operating before school contributed to deficiencies in Category 3 Geometry and Spatial Sense in The 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment	Increased implementation of web based resources such as SuccessMaker, Gizmos, FCAT Explorer focusing on Geometry and Spatial Sense throughout the school day and home learning to account for the poor attendance of before and after school enrichment opportunities.	Administrators	Classroom walk-throughs, SuccessMaker logs, FCAT Explorer logs, Gizmos Logs following the FCIM process	Formative: Mini benchmark tests, District Interim Assessments 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:

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 FCAT Mathematics test indicate 71% (83) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase 5 percentage points to 76% (89).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71%(83)	76%(89)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, common areas of weakness include Category 1, Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics.	Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts, related subtraction facts, multiplication facts, related division facts, and fluency in basic operations in word problems.	Administration	Review of mini benchmark tests and Interim Assessments Using the FCIM process.	Formative: Mini Benchmark Tests, Chapter Tests, and Interim 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%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

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

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:

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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:

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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:

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the FCAT Mathematics Test Indicate that 71% (242) of the economically disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase 3 percentage points to 74% (252)

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	71% (242)	74% (252)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the Mathematics FCAT results students demonstrated a deficiency in Category 1, Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics.	Implementation of before and after school tutorials in Mathematics targeting or economically disadvantaged students in the area of number operations, problems, and statistics.	Administrators	Tutorial attendance logs and Review of mini benchmark tests and Interim Assessments Using the FCIM process	Formative: Mini Benchmark Tests, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 30% (179) of students achieved proficiency (Level 3). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 2 percentage points to 32% (190).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30%(179)	32%(190)

Problem-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 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process. Students lack the skills to locate, interpret, and organize information.	Using real-world documents such as, how-to articles, brochures, fliers, and websites use text features to locate, interpret, and organize information.	Administration and reading coach	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test items	Formative: Mini-assessments and Interim Assessments Summative: 2012 FCAT.
2	Grade 6-8 according to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment the area with the greatest difficulty was reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement.	Use virtual manipulates as enrichment activities to explore Mathematical Geometric Concepts of two- dimensional figures and the use of tangible manipulatives to gain further understanding geometric shapes.	Administration	Results of monthly assessments/ District Interim will be reviewed by leadership team/teachers to ensure progress. Adjustments to curriculum focus will be made as needed using the FCIM process	Formative: monthly assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicates that 40% (237) of students achieved above proficiency (Level 4 and 5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving above proficiency (Level 4 and 5) by one percentage point to 41% (244).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40%(237)	41%(244)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment results students demonstrated a deficiency in Category 3 geometry and spatial sense.</td><td>Provide students with both digital and physical models, to allow the students to visualize, feel and explorer a range of geometrical solids. Then allow students to recreate such figures on a two dimensional medium.</td><td>Administration</td><td>Review and analyze results of selection tests and District Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on geometry test items using the FCIM process</td><td>Formative: Selection tests and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate74% (334) of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase 5 percentage points to 79% (356)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74%(334)	79%(356)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student participation in additional enrichment activities operating before school contributed to deficiencies in Category 3 Geometry and Spatial Sense in The 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.	Increased implementation of web based resources such as SuccessMaker, Gizmos, FCAT Explorer focusing on Geometry and Spatial Sense throughout the school day and home learning.	Administrators	Classroom walk-throughs, SuccessMaker logs, FCAT Explorer logs, Gizmos Logs following the FCIM process	Formative: Mini benchmark tests, District Interim Assessments 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:

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 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicated 81% (83) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase 5 percentage points to 86% (88).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81%(83)	86%(88)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, common areas of weakness include Category 1, Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics. Students lack the quick recall of related addition, multiplication, subtraction, and division facts to be able to solve basic operations with ease	Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of the four basic operations and the ability to recognize the proper operation in a word problem using key vocabulary words. The use of underlining key vocabulary words in the problems.	Administration	Review of mini benchmark tests and Interim Assessments using the FCIM process.	Formative: Mini Benchmark Tests, Chapter Tests, and Interim 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%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students 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:	The results of the FCAT Mathematics Test Indicate that 71% (242) of the economically disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase 3 percentage points to 74% (252)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71%(242)	74%(252)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the Mathematics FCAT results students demonstrated a deficiency in Category 1, Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics.	Implementation of before and after school tutorials in Mathematics targeting or economically disadvantaged students in the area of number operations, problems, and statistics.	Administrators	Tutorial attendance logs and Review of mini benchmark tests and Interim Assessments Using the FCIM process	Formative: Mini Benchmark Tests, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicate that 59% (16) of the students scored a level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring a level three to 59% (16).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (16)	59% (16)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty was Reporting Category 3- Rationals, Radicals, Quadrics, and Discrete Mathematics.	Provide additional practice in solving and graphing quadratic equations that involve real world applications.	Administration	Review of mini benchmark tests and Interim Assessments using the FCIM process	Formative: Mini Benchmark Tests, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 Algebra EOC

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.

Algebra Goal #2:

The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicate that 41% (11) of the students scored a level 4 or higher.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring a level four or higher at 41% (11).

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (11)	41% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty was Reporting Category 3- Rationals, Radicals, Quadrics, and Discrete Mathematics.	Use Venn diagram in a variety of ways to illustrate intersection , union, difference, null, and disjoint sets and to solve a variety of real world problems.	Administration	Review of mini benchmark tests and Interim Assessments using the FCIM process	Formative: Mini Benchmark Tests, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 Algebra EOC

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

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

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

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
Data Analysis	K-8 Math/Reading/Science	K.Fernandez	All teachers	September 19, 2012	Analyzing District Assessments and Progress Monitoring	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment indicate that 36% (75) of the students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3). The goal for the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment is to increase the students achieving proficiency by 4 percentage points to 40% (82).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (75)	40% (82)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process. Students lack	Using real-world documents such as, how-to articles, brochures, fliers, and websites use text features to locate, interpret, and organize information.	Administration and reading coach	Review results of selection tests and quarterly Interim Assessments to evaluate students' performance on comparison test items	Formative: Mini-assessments and Interim Assessments Summative: 2012 FCAT.

#					
	the skills to locate, interpret, and organize information.				
2	The area where students in grade5 and 8 experienced the most difficulty is in reporting category 2: Earth and Space Science	Use of GIZMOs in different models with an emphasis on Earth and Space Science. Increase opportunities for students to apply concepts to real world problems within the classroom.	Administrators	Review of Mini Benchmark Tests and Interim Assessments. Following the FCIM process.	Formative: Mini Benchmark Tests, Chapter Tests, and Interim Assessments. 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:

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:

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment indicate that 15% (32) of the students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5). The goal for the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment is to increase students achieving above proficiency by 2 percentage points to 17% (35).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (32)	17% (35)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of most difficulty was reporting category 1: Nature of Science. Students need additional opportunities for inquiry-based and independent	Students will be given opportunities to pursue higher order thinking projects and participate in a school-wide science fair in preparation for the District Science Fair. From the beginning of	Administrators	Data from school-based assessments and District Interims will be analyzed monthly by the Leadership team and shared with teachers to determine if students are making	Formative: School based assessment and District Baseline and Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

investigations.	the school year, support will be provided for students to propose, develop and present independent investigations		adequate progress toward the goal. Adjustments to instructional focus will be made as appropriate using the FCIM process.	Science assessment

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Fair	2-8	V. Sanchez	Science teachers	December 2012	Entries into the District Science Fair	Administration

---

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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 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 assessment indicate that 88 % (172) of the students achieved proficiency (3.0). Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (3.0) to 89% (174).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% (172)	89% (174)

Problem-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	During the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test, fourth grade students demonstrated difficulty with expository writing. Students lack the necessary skills needed to clearly provide supporting details.	Emphasis will be given to support elaboration using explicit instruction techniques and providing time for independent practice. Formulate a writing plan which includes developing a Writer's Notebook and/or Portfolio centered on prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing.	The LLT will help the classroom teachers analyze student's work	The LLT will assist classroom teachers in analyzing students' writing in order to determine needs and tailor instruction using the FCIM process	Formative- District Interim Assessments.. Summative- 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test
2	During the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test, eighth grade students demonstrated difficulty with persuasive writing. Students lack the necessary skills needed to clearly provide supporting details	Model effective writing on an on-going basis by using mentor text, rubrics, and anchor papers. Incorporate sentence variety, writing conferences, and writing for a variety of audiences and purposes.	The LLT will help the classroom teachers analyze student's work.	The LLT will assist classroom teachers in analyzing students' writing in order to determine needs and tailor instruction using the FCIM process	Formative- District Interim Assessments.. Summative- 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 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
Teaching Creative Writing	Grades K-8/ Language Arts	Kathleen Fernandez	All Language Arts Teachers in grades K-8.	September 2012, November 2012, January 2013, March 2013	Teacher sign-in sheets, lesson plans and monthly writing samples using the FCIM process.	Administration and LLT

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 District Civics Baseline assessment indicate that 0% (0) of the students achieved proficiency (Level 3). Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency to 10% (6).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10%(6)

Problem-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 opportunities to strengthen their abilities to read and interpret graph, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons, and other graphic representations.	Provide activities that allow students to interpret primary and secondary sources of information while analyzing graphs and other graphic representations. Provide opportunities for students to examine opposing points of view on a variety of issues. Provide students with opportunities to discuss the values, complexities, and dilemmas involved in social, political, and economic issues; assist students in developing well-reasoned positions on issues.	Administration	Monthly Teacher generated assessments will be administered and scored in order to monitor students' progress and to adjust the instructional focus using the FCIM process.	District Interim Assessments Chapter Test/Unit Test 2013 Civics EOC.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 District Civics Baseline assessment indicate that 0% (0) of the students achieved above proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving above proficiency to 10% (6).

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	0%(0)	10%(6)

Problem-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 opportunities to strengthen their abilities to read and interpret graph, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons, and other graphic representations.	Provide opportunities for students to utilize print and non-print resources to research specific issues related to government/civics; help students provide alternate solutions to the problems researched. Provide opportunities for students to participate in project-based learning activities, including cross curricular programs offered by the District	Administrators	Monthly School generated assessments will be administered and scored in order to monitor students' progress and to adjust the instructional focus following the FCIM process	Monthly assessments Chapter Test/Unit Test 2013 Civics EOC.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Analyzing Data	K-8	K.Fernandez	All Teachers	September 19, 2012	Review of District Interims	Administration

Civics Budget:

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

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our goal for 2012-2013 school year is to increase attendance to 96.88% (827)
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.38% (823)	96.88% (827)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
180	171
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
156	148

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents and Students are unfamiliar with the District and Schools attendance policy.	Attendance campaign to decrease the number of absences school wide. Students with excessive absences will be identified and referred to the Attendance Committee for intervention	Principal, Assistant Principals and Counselors	Connect Ed messages explaining procedures for excused/unexcused absences.	Attendance and tardy records from ISIS report
2	Parents and Students are unfamiliar with the District and Schools tardy policy.	Tardy campaign to decrease the number of tardies school wide. Students with excessive tardies will be identified and referred to the Attendance Committee for intervention	Principal, Assistant Principals and Counselors	Connect Ed messages explaining procedures for excused/unexcused absences.	Attendance and tardy records from ISIS 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
Truancy	K-8	McCloud	School-Wide	September 2012-May 2013	Review of student attendance/tardies	Administration, Counselor

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of students serving indoor suspensions from 13 to 12 and students serving outdoor suspensions from 56 to 50.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
13	12
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
56	50
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
30	27

Problem-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 and students are unfamiliar with the Student Code of Conduct in regards to outdoor suspensions.	Utilize the Student Code of Conduct for compliance through the use of Elementary and Secondary SPOT Success Recognition Program. Recognize students on "Great Choices" Wall of Fame."	Administration	Monitor Spot Success report by grade level and monitor COGNOS report on student outdoor suspension rate. Monitoring of suspensions.	Participation log for students who are recognized for complying with the Student Code of Conduct along with the monthly COGNOS suspension report. Monthly COGNOS suspension report
2	Parents and students are unfamiliar with the Student Code of Conduct in regards to indoor suspensions.	Students will participate in discipline assemblies during the beginning of the school year in order to become familiar with The Student Code of Conduct Provide an orientation for parents to discuss the student code of conduct. Post a copy of the student code of conduct on the school website. Implementation of the RTI/MTSS Behavior Model.	Administration	Monitor Spot Success report by grade level and monitor COGNOS report on student outdoor suspension rate. Monitoring of suspensions.	Participation log for students who are recognized for complying with the Student Code of Conduct along with the monthly COGNOS suspension report. Monthly COGNOS 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
Orientation	6 grade	A. Gallego	Parents and 6 grade teachers	September 6, 2012	Review of Suspension rates	Administration

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the amount of parental involvement in school-wide activities by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
39% (333)	44% (374)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Parents have a limited	Parents and students	Administration	Review parent sign in	Sign In Sheets

	understanding of student data such as scores from the Baseline and Interim Assessments, Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), and FCAT 2.0 and its impact on teaching and learning.	are invited to attend a workshop focusing on District and State mandated tests where data will be explained. *PTA National Standards for Family-School Partnerships Assessment Guide; Standard 3- Supporting Student Success.	and LLT	sheets.	
1					

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
Resource Fair	K-8	K. Fernandez	School-Wide	September 6, 2012	Sign-in sheets /Logs	Administration

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

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

1. STEM

STEM Goal #1:

The students participate in Elementary-Science Fair and Middle School-Advanced Mathematics (6th & 7th grade Mathematics, 6 & 7 grade Science, Algebra and Earth and Space Science), Middle school Science Fair, and CAT.

Our goal for STEM in 2012-2013 is to introduce TEAM in the Elementary School and STEM in Business Education (video game programming) course.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of hands on opportunities for students, problem solving strategies and lessons, discovery learning, interactive technology involvement, access to appropriate technology and technology literacy for different core subjects.	The coaching cycle will be used so that the teachers receive support with planning, modeling and delivering project based lessons that are hands-on. Teachers will be given support through modeling and guided instruction in order to become independent in delivering STEM practices. The use of interactive lessons using the SMART board as the platform. Promote entries into the Youth Fair science competition and Fairchild Challenge.	Administration	Science Fair projects submitted and project rubrics.	Submission of Science Fair projects

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
Fairchild Challenge	6-8	Parra	6-8 Teachers	January 2013	Submissions of projects	Administration

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	Strengthen career academy structure increasing the use of Career Academy National Standards of Practice.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Curriculum not aligned to career theme across all disciplines.	Provide opportunities for CTE and academic teachers to develop and implement integrated curriculum. Schedule career academy students in cohorts with common academic and CTE instructors.	Administration	Monitor and review student schedules with CTE teachers and guidance counselor, to ensure enrollment of intermediate and advanced level courses, building strong academies.	Students accepted into career oriented magnet schools and career based course grades.

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
Resource Fair	K-8	K.Fernandez	School-Wide	September 6, 2012	Sign-in sheets /Logs	Administration

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
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

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

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 10/4/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The EESAC Committee comprised of faculty, staff, parents and community members, meet on a monthly basis to review and monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Additionally, the EESAC determines the expenditures of EESAC funds.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District
SOUTH MIAMI K-8 CENTER
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	84%	83%	87%	58%	312	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	68%	71%			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?	71% (YES)	71% (YES)			142	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					593	
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
SOUTH MIAMI K-8 CENTER
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	82%	82%	91%	58%	313	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	67%	67%			134	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	62% (YES)	67% (YES)			129	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					576	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested