FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: DOCTORS CHARTER SCHOOL OF MIAMI SHORES

District Name: Dade

Principal: Mr. Gary Meredith

SAC Chair: Ms. Patty Walker

Superintendent: Mr. Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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)
Principal	Mr. Gary Meredith	B.A. (Psychology) Western Kentucky University, M.A. (Secondary Education) Western Kentucky University, Rank I (Educational Leadership) Western Kentucky University, Florida Professional Certificate for Educational Leadership Experience - 8 years as classroom teacher (Middle &	5	23	DCS was awarded the Florida Gold Seal of Excellence May 12, 2011. Year Grade AYP Reading High Standards Reading Learning Gains Reading Lowest Quartile Math High Standards Math Learning Gains Math Lowest Quartile 2012 Pending - 76 71 74 82 82 2011 A N 80 65 66 91 85 84 2010 B N 74 65 62 86 75 73 2009 A Y 70 69 62 86 82 82 2008 A Y 76 58 69 84 84 81

					Year Grade AYP Reading High Standards Reading Learning Gains Reading Lowest Quartile Math High Standards Math Learning Gains Math Lowest Quartile
Assis Principal	Shirley Brunache	Nova Southeastern University Professional Certificate in Educational Leadership		4	2012 Pending - 76 71 74 82 82 2011 B N 42 71 87 46 62 84 2010 F N 41 40 37 45 38 73 2009 A Y 70 69 62 86 82 82 2008 A Y 76 58 69 84 84 81

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

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

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. Doctors Charter School has successfully recruited and retained highly qualified teachers who have proven track records of excellence in the classroom. Some of the techniques employed to actualize these goals are a complete fringe benefits package and opportunities for career advancement.	Principal	8/1/2012	
2	2. Recruitment techniques have included advertising through the Teachers-Teachers.com website, contacting various Florida universities, specifically their schools of education, and inviting local university students to intern in our school. In addition, our stellar reputation has resulted in numerous inquiries concerning open faculty positions.	Principal	8/1/2012	
3	3. Regular meetings will be held for new teachers with appropriate department chairpersons and with the Assistant Principal/Director of Curriculum and Instruction.	Assistant Principal	6/1/13	

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
1	With assistance from the Director of Curriculum, teacher will design and implement a plan to meet FL requirements for a Professional Educator's Certificate.

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
31	3.2%(1)	19.4%(6)	35.5%(11)	41.9%(13)	61.3%(19)	96.8%(30)	12.9%(4)	3.2%(1)	12.9%(4)

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
Teri Tennison, L.A. Department Chair	Misheala Sorey	The English department chair is a master teacher and has experience in teaching the content.	Teacher observation and feed-back Cooperative lesson planning
Abeer Jadallah, Social Sciences Department Chair	Karen Francis	The Social Sciences department chair is a master teacher and has experience in teaching the content.	Teacher observation and feed-back Cooperative lesson planning
Jeannette Borg, Fine Arts Department Chair	Maria Traxler	The Fine Arts department chair is a master teacher and has experience in teaching the content.	Teacher observation and feed-back Cooperative lesson planning

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

NA

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

NA

Title III

NA

Title X- Homeless

NA

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

NA

Violence Prevention Programs

NA

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

NA

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

MTSS/RtI leadership is vital. Therefore, in building the team, the following personnel are included:
 * Principal will ensure commitment and allocate resources.
 * Director of Curriculum and Instruction will provide systemic examination of data with the
goal of impacting student achievement.
 * School Counselor/CAP Advisor will assist with the process of problem solving issues involving
student attendance, academic progress, career choices, student social/emotional well-being, and prevention of student failure.
 * Assistant Principal for Discipline will assist with the process of problem solving issues involving student
attendance and school culture.
 * ESE Teacher will collaborate with general education teachers, participate in student data collection, and
integrate core instructional activities/materials.
 * Intensive Reading Teacher will provide guidance with 6-12 reading plan , and assist general education
teachers with reading instruction in the regular classroom.
Additional personnel to participate and contribute based on problems or concerns, as warranted are:
 * Technology Specialist will develop and/or broker technology necessary to manage and display data,
provide professional development, and technical support to teachers and staff.
 *Core Content Area Department Chairs will provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection
and analysis, and collaborate with other content
teachers regarding classroom instruction.
 * Media Specialist and Assessment Coordinator will assist in facilitating all required assessments (e.g., BBA, FAIR, FCAT,

MDCPS Interim Assessments, EOC, CELLA).

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?

1. Monitor academic and behavioral data evaluating progress by addressing the following questions:
 * What will students learn?
 * How will we determine if the students have learned?
 * What will we do when students have not learned?
 * How will we respond when students have prior knowledge?
2. Gather and analyze data for student and staff needs.
3. Determine appropriate professional development for staff.
4. Communicate with staff regarding input and feedback.
5. Set clear expectations for monitoring student progress.

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

The leadership team will:
1. Monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data collection and analysis.
2. Work closely with SAC throughout the school year regarding the SIP.
3. Monitor the classroom instruction for effective lesson development and teaching strategies (Depth of Knowledge, Five Types of Questions, Effective Lesson Plan Development, Active Student Engagement, Mike Rutherford's The Learning Centered School – The Essential Principles of High-Performance Learning and Leading).
4. Provide support to classroom teachers in analyzing student work.

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.

 * Baseline data: BBA, FAIR, FCAT and EOC
 * Progress Monitoring: M-DCPS Interim Assessments with the core content areas: Reading, Mathematics, Science, Student Interim Progress Reports and Quarterly Grades,Teacher-made assessments,
 student attendance records; disciplinary reports
 * End-of-the Year: FCAT, Algebra I, Geometry, Civics, US History and Biology End-of Year Exam, and Final Examinations
 * Attendance records, and Referrals to RtI team
 * Behavioral referrals from staff, one-on-one conferences, detentions, and suspensions/expulsions
 * Data used to guide instructional and behavioral decisions
 * Use of "Edusoft" for data disaggregation

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All staff will complete the FL On-Line Component.
Professional development will be provided during teacher planning times and after school sessions throughout the school year.
Doctors Charter School sponsored "Sun-n-Fun Teaching and Learning Conference" will be available to all staff with no costs.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Professional development will include:
1. Train all administrators in RTI problem solving for all Tier levels using the problem solving worksheets.
2. Provide support for all school staff to understand RTI principles and procedures.
3. Provide network for ongoing support within the school setting.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Teri Tennison - Language Arts Department Chair
Meryl Cohen - Intensive Reading Teacher
Michelle Mosher - Middle School Language Arts Teacher
Elise Turner - 9th Grade English Teacher
Kristina Martinez - 10th grade English Teacher
Melynda Boutcher-Hadad - ESE Coordinator
Jessica Tylenda - 11th and 12th Grade English Teacher
Shirley Brunache - Director of Curriculum and Instruction

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

The leadership team will meet each quarter to:
1. Gather and analyze data to determine student achievement (e.g., BBA, Interim Assessments, teacher-made course tests).
2. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following questions:
* What will students learn?
* How will we determine if the students have learned?
* What will we do when students have not learned?
3. Determine the appropriate professional development for staff.
4. Communicate with staff for input and feedback.

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

The leadership team will:
1 .Promote, train, implement, and monitor reading and comprehension skills across the content areas.
2. Monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data collection and analysis.
3. Monitor the classroom instruction for effective lesson development and teaching strategies to support reading through the content areas (Depth of Knowledge, Five Types of Questions, Effective Lesson Plan Development, Active Student Engagement, Mike Rutherford's The Learning Centered School – The Essential Principles of High-Performance Learning and Leading).
4. Provide support to classroom teachers in analyzing student work.
5. Work closely with the SAC throughout the school regarding the SIP.

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.

NA

*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.

Results from disaggregation of the 2012 FCAT Reading indicate that the largest discrepancy across all grade levels in the content areas involve "Informational Text and Research Process." As a result, every DCS teacher will be trained by our two reading endorsed teachers in strategies for reading across the content, with emphasis on writing using research strategies. Monitoring will include: review of teacher lesson plans, classroom observation by administration, results from assessments (e.g., BBA, FAIR, and Interim Assessments). Results from assessments will be shared among teachers for implementation of any mid-course directional changes. Students scoring in the lowest quartile for reading will be targeted for intensive reading instruction.

*High Schools Only

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

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

DCS offers elective courses in the fine arts, technology, business and career studies. Many of the topics are integrated into the core content. Instruction is based on real-world problem solving and critical thinking. Teachers use daily "bell ringers" based on real-world experiences.

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?

DCS offers elective courses in the fine arts, technology, business and career studies. Many of the topics are integrated into the core content. Instruction is based on real-world problem solving and critical thinking. Teachers use daily "bell ringers" based on real-world experiences. Each spring, during advisee/advisor sessions, students participate in course selections that expose them to the next year's curriculum. Students also have the opportunity to make requests and suggestion for courses offerings. DCS being a small high school and unable to offer all high schools coursed available, students have access to FLVS during school hours in order to
meet their individual needs in course work according to their selection "major". The school's guidance counselor meets one-on-one with each student to decide which classes will be chosen and a final
course selection is sent home for parents' input and approval.

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

Doctors Charter School of Miami Shores is a college preparatory school that offers a broad education focusing on the academic, as well as the personal growth of each student. All graduating students shall complete the college prep curriculum, which includes the following:
* 4 Credits English
* 4 Credits Mathematics (a mathematics course is required for each year of high school)
* 4 Credits Science
* 3 Credits Social Sciences
* 2 Credits World Languages (two-year sequence)
* 1.5 Credit Physical Education
* 1 Credit Performing/Fine Arts/Practical
* 8.5 Credits Electives
Total Requirements: 28 Credits
A cumulative GPA of 2.0
100 Community Service Hours during the high school years
All high school students are required to meet at least once during the fall and spring semesters, with the school counselor, to discuss academic progress and course selection for the next school year. All seniors are required to meet one-on-one with the CAP Advisor/School Counselor throughout the fall and spring semesters, and are required to submit to an exit interview with the CAP Advisor/School Counselor. Discussions will include college applications and acceptance requirements, as well as eligibility for Bright Futures. Various local and state postsecondary institutions are invited on-campus throughout the school year to meet with students and parents. During the school year 10th and 11th grade students are given the PSAT in order to prepare them for college admissions testing. College admissions tests such as the ACT and SAT are arranged with local high schools for juniors and seniors. DCS participates in the College Boards Advanced Placement Program including all core subject areas. The AP Exam administration includes courses taught both on and off campus. DCS sponsors a week-long trip to various state colleges/universities for interested sophomores and juniors. The guidance department schedules evening meetings for parents regarding college requirements and the application process, Bright Futures, college loans and grants, and FAFSA procedures. Seniors in danger of not completing graduation requirements are targeted and interventions are designed to assist the students. Parent conferences with the CAP Advisor/School Counselor are required for all targeted seniors.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 35% of the students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 39%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35%(150)	39%(168)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was reporting category 4- Informational Text/Research Process.	1.1. The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support reporting category 4: Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include building strong arguments to support answers, exploring shades of meaning, using reciprocal teaching and question-answer relationships and summarizing.	1.1. Leadership Literacy Team (LLT) will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	1.1. Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	1.1. Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Reading Test results.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 41% of the students scored at or above achievement levels 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student achievement Levels 4 and 5 by 2 percentage points to 43%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%(177)	43%(186)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 "Reading Application". Students need additional support in identifying author's purpose and summarizing.	2.1. Provide students with instruction utilizing grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining and or explaining.	2.1. RtI Team	2.1. Review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	2.1. Formative FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work Summative 2012 FCAT Reading 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:

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 Reading Test indicate that 72% of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase learning gains by 5 percentage points to 77%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%(283)	77%(303)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was reporting category 1- Vocabulary.	3.1. The following instructional strategies will be used to support reporting category 1: the use of vocabulary maps, word walls and personal dictionaries and thesaurus. Instruction will be used through various content related areas and courses.	3.1. LLT will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	3.1. Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	3.1. Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Reading Test results.

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%	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 78% of the students in the lowest quartile made learning

making learning gains in reading.

Reading Goal #4:

gains.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the student learning gains in the lowest quartile by 5 percentage points to 83%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78%(69)	83%(73)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 "Reading Application". Students need additional support in identifying author's purpose and summarizing.	4.1. The following instructional strategies will be used to support reporting category 2: Utilize grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining and or explaining.	4.1. LLT Team will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	4.1. Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed	4.1. Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Reading Test results.

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 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
	80	82	84	85	87	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The 2012 FCAT reading results indicated that all students within the reported ethnicity groups did not make satisfactory progress in reading for the 2011-2012 school year. Our goal is to increase the ethnic subgroups for following: • White students by at least 7 percentage points (87%); • Black students by at least 4 percentage points (78%); • Hispanic students by at least 11 percentage points (86%); • Asian students by at least 7 percentage points (80%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 80%(74) Black: 74%(155) Hispanic:75% (79) Asian:73%(16) American Indian: NA	White: 87%(80) Black: 78%(164) Hispanic: 86%(90) Asian: 80%(18) American Indian: NA

Problem-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	5A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 "Reading Application". Students need additional support in identifying author's purpose and summarizing.	5A.1. Utilize grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining and or explaining.	5A.1. RtI Team	5A.1. Review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	5A.1. Formative FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work Summative 2012 FCAT Reading Test
2	5A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 "Information Text and Research Process. Students need additional instruction in supporting statements.	5A.2. Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include building strong arguments to support answers, exploring shades of meaning, using reciprocal teaching and question-answer relationships, questions the author, and summarizing.	5A.2. RtI Team	5A.2. Review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed	5A.2. Formative FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work Summative 2012 FCAT Reading Test

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Less than ten students identified ELL participated in the FCAT Reading test. Due to confidentiality, scores are not reported.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT test was reporting category: Vocabulary.	The following instructional strategies will be used to support reporting category, Vocabulary: the use of vocabulary maps, word walls and personal dictionaries and thesaurus. Instruction will be used through various content related areas and courses.	LLT will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Reading Test results.
2					

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:	The 2012 FCAT reading results indicated that the students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in reading for the 2011-2012 school year. Our goal is to increase the students with disabilities to make satisfactory progress in reading by at least 21 percentage points (75).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54%(14)	75%(19)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 "Reading Application". Students need additional support in identifying author's purpose and summarizing.	The following instructional strategies will be used to support reporting category 2: Utilize grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining and or explaining.	LLT will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Reading Test results.
2					
3					

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 2012 FCAT reading results indicated that the economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading for the 2011-2012 school year. Our goal is to increase the economically disadvantaged students to make satisfactory progress in reading by at least 3 percentage points (73%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70%(74)	73%(77)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was	The following instructional strategies will be used to support reporting category 2:	LLT will be responsible for monitoring instructional	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments,

1	Reporting Category 2 "Reading Application". Students need additional support in identifying author's purpose and summarizing.	Utilize grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining and or explaining.	strategies.	weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	FAIR, FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Reading Test results.
2					

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
Book Study: What Great Teachers Do Differently by Todd Whitaker.	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting August 18, 2012 and ending December 19, 2012.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used as follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Common Core State Standards	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting January 16, 2013 and ending May15, 2013.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used as follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Florida Continuous Improvement Model	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	Professional Development meeting will be scheduled on August 17, 2012	Formal and informal assessments, creation and implementation of instructional focus calendars will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Fund	$930.00
CCSS	Copies of documents	School General Fund	$100.00
FCIM	Copies of documents	School General Fund	$100.00
			Subtotal: $1,130.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00

			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,130.00

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:	7 students participated in the CELLA administration. Our goal is to have at least 50% of our students scoring proficient in the Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA assessment.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:
NA

Problem-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	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA test was reporting category: Listening and Speaking.	Teacher-led groups will be implement such as whole-class, small group, and individual instruction. In general, communication paths in teacher-led groups are almost exclusively between teacher and student. Teacher-led groups are an effective and efficient way of introducing material, summing-up the conclusions made by individual groups, meeting the common needs of a large or small group, and providing individual attention or instruction.	MTSS/RtI Team and LEP committee will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, CELLA, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Writing Test results.

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:	7 students participated in the CELLA administration. Our goal is to have at least 50% of our students scoring proficient in the Reading section of the CELLA assessment.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA test was reporting category: Reading.	The following instructional strategies: activating prior knowledge and eliciting prediction. Teachers must plan activities in their instruction to provide the relevant context to activate students' knowledge on the topic discussed. Students will be given opportunities to use prediction as a "before reading" strategy, students rely on their background knowledge to make global predictions. When prediction is used as a "during reading" strategy, the students will combine their background knowledge with the textual information provided to assess those global predictions and revise those which have been found to be inappropriate.	MTSS/RtI Team and LEP committee will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, CELLA, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Reading Test results.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	7 students participated in the CELLA Our goal is to have at least 50% of our students scoring proficient in the Writing section of the CELLA assessment.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
NA	

	Problem-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	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA test was reporting category: Wrting.	Students will be given opportunities to use graphic organizers. The graphic organizers will give the students another way to see the information. In addition, this allows students with different levels of	MTSS/RtI Team and LEP committee will monitor progress.	Administer and score students' monthly writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust focus.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, District baseline and monthly writing prompts, Summative assessments and

		language proficiency to use them effectively.			2013 FCAT Writing Test.

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $1,130.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,130.00

End of CELLA 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 Mathematics Test indicate that 30% of the students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 35%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30%(78)	35%(92)

Problem-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	Areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math test were Geometry and Measurement.	1.1. Students will have the opportunity to design their own geometric shapes and then use manipulatives to explore measurements of two- and three-dimensional figures.	1.1. MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	1.1. Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	1.1 Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Khan Academy, Florida Achieves, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Math Test results.

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 49% of the students scored at or above achievement levels 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student achievement Levels 4 and 5 by 3 percentage points to 52%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49%(129)	52%(136)

Problem-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	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math test was reporting category "Geometry and Measurement."	Students will have the opportunity to design their own geometric shapes and then use manipulatives to explore measurements of two- and three-dimensional figures.	MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Florida Achieves, Khan Academy , Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Math Test results.

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 Mathematics Test indicate that 82% of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase learning gains by 5 percentage points to 87%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82%(234)	87%(248)

Problem-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	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math test was reporting category Geometry and Measurement.	Students will have the opportunity to design their own geometric shapes and then use manipulatives to explore measurements of two- and three-dimensional figures.	MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Florida Achieves, Khan Academy , Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Math Test results.

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.	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 68% of the students in the lowest quartile made learning gains.

Mathematics Goal #4:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the student learning gains in the lowest quartile by 5 percentage points to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%(38)	73%(41)

Problem-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	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math test was reporting category Geometry and Measurement.	Students will have the opportunity to design their own geometric shapes and then use manipulatives to explore measurements of two- and three-dimensional figures.	MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Florida Achieves, Khan Academy , Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Math Test results.

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 for 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
	87%	88%	90%	91%	92%	

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:	The 2012 FCAT Mathematics results indicated that all students within the reported ethnicity groups did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics for the 2011-2012 school year. Our goal is to increase the ethnic subgroups for following: • White students by at least 6 percentage points (94%); • Black students by at least 2 percentage points (83%); • Hispanic students by at least 6 percentage points (88%); • Asian students by at least 17 percentage points (95%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:88%(58) Black:81%(92) Hispanic:82%(55) Asian:79%(11) American Indian: NA	White:94%(62) Black:83%(94) Hispanic:88% (55) Asian:95%(13) American Indian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math test was reporting category Geometry and Measurements.	Students will have the opportunity to design their own geometric shapes and then use manipulatives to explore measurements of two- and three-dimensional figures.	MTSS/RtI and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Florida Achieves, Khan Academy , Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Math Test results.

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:	Less than ten students identified ELL participated in the FCAT Math test. Due to confidentiality, scores are not reported.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math test was reporting category Geometry and Measurements.	Students will have the opportunity to design their own geometric shapes and then use manipulatives to explore measurements of two- and three-dimensional figures.	MTSS/RtI and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Florida Achieves, Khan Academy , Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Math Test results

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The 2012 FCAT reading results indicated that the students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics for the 2011-2012 school year. Our goal is to increase the students with disabilities to make satisfactory progress in mathematics by at least 15 percentage points (85%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| | 70%(13) | | | 85%(15) | |

Problem-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	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math test was reporting category Geometry and Measurements.	Students will have the opportunity to design their own geometric shapes and then use manipulatives to explore measurements of two- and three-dimensional figures.	MTSS/RtI and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Florida Achieves, Khan Academy , Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Math Test results

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 2012 FCAT Mathematics results indicated that the economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading for the 2011-2012 school year. Our goal is to increase the economically disadvantaged students to make satisfactory progress in mathematics by at least 3 percentage points (84%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81%(47)	84%(49)

Problem-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	Area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math test was Geometry and Measurement.	Students will have the opportunity to design their own geometric shapes and then use manipulatives to explore measurements of two- and three-dimensional figures.	MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Florida Achieves, Khan Academy , Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 FCAT Math Test results.

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 37% (27) of students scored in the middle third (levels 3-5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (levels 3-5) by1 percentage point to 38%(28).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37%(27)	38%(28)

Problem-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 I EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was functions, linear equations and inequalities.	Provide all students with more practice in solving real-world problems involving relations and functions, linear equations and inequalities.	MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, Florida Achieves,summative assessments, and 2013 Algebra I EOC test results.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC Assessment indicate that 56% (41) of students scored in the upperthird (levels 4-5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (levels 4-5) by1 percentage point to 57%(42).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

56%(41) | 57%(42)

<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>According to the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was functions, linear equations and inequalities.</td><td>Provide all students with more practice in solving real-world problems involving relations and functions, linear equations and inequalities.</td><td>MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.</td><td>Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.</td><td>Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, Florida Achieves, Interim Assessments and 2013 Algebra I EOC test results.</td></tr>
</table>

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 for 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
	87	88	90	91	92	

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:	The 2012 EOC Algebra results indicated that all students within the reported ethnicity groups did not make satisfactory progress in reading for the 2011-2012 school year. Our goal is to increase the ethnic subgroups for following: • White students by at least 6 percentage points (94%); • Black students by at least 2 percentage points (83%); • Hispanic students by at least 6 percentage points (88%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 88%(14) Black: 81%(29) Hispanic: 82%(15) Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 94%(15) Black: 83%(30) Hispanic: 88%(16) Asian: NA American Indian: NA

<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></td><td>According to the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students functions, linear</td><td>Provide all students with more practice in solving real-world problems involving relations and functions, linear</td><td>MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring</td><td>Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data</td><td>Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, teacher-generated</td></tr>
</table>

1	equations and inequalities.	equations and inequalities.	instructional strategies.	to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, Florida Achieves, Interim Assessments, and 2013 Algebra I EOC test results.

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:	Less than ten students identified ELL participated in the EOC Algebra test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<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>According to the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students functions, linear equations and inequalities.</td><td>Provide all students with more practice in solving real-world problems involving relations and functions, linear equations and inequalities.</td><td>MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies.</td><td>Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.</td><td>Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, Florida Achieves, Interim Assessments, and 2013 Algebra I EOC test results.</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 subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<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>
</table>

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:	The 2012 EOC Algebra results indicated that the economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in Algebra for the 2011-2012 school year. Our goal is to increase the economically disadvantaged students to make satisfactory progress in Algebra by at least 3 percentage points (84%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81%(9)	84%(9)

Problem-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 I EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was the reporting category regarding functions, linear equations and inequalities.	Provide all students with more practice in solving real-world problems involving relations and functions, linear equations and inequalities.	MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 Algebra I EOC test results.

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicate that 35%(34) of the students scored in the middle third (levels 3-5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (levels 3-5) by1 percentage point to 38%(28).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35%(34)	36%(34)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicated that the area of greatest difficulty for students was Standard: "3-dimensional geometry".	Provide students with practice in solving real-world problems using 3-D geometric concepts.	MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 Geometry EOC test results.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC Assessment indicate that 58% (56) of students scored in the upper third (levels 4-5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (levels 4-5) by1 percentage point to 59%(56).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%(56)	59%(56)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicated that the area of greatest difficulty for students was the Standard: trigonometry and discrete mathematics.	Provide students with practice in solving real-world problems using trigonometric ratios (sine, cosine, and tangent).	MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 Geometry EOC test results.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target					
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # Our goal for 2011-2017 is to reduce the percentage of non-proficient students by 50% 3A :				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	88	90	91	92	

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

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicated that the area of greatest difficulty for students was the Standard: 3-dimensional geometry.	Provide students with practice in solving real-world problems using 3-D geometric concepts.	MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 Geometry EOC test results.

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

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicated that the area of greatest difficulty for students was the Standard: 3-dimensional geometry.	Provide students with practice in solving real-world problems using 3-D geometric concepts.	MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies	Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of

					students work, summative assessments, and
					2013 Geometry EOC test results.

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:	Less than 10 students identified as SWD participated in the Algebra I EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<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>The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicated that the area of greatest difficulty for students was the Standard: 3-dimensional geometry.</td><td>Provide students with practice in solving real-world problems using 3-D geometric concepts.</td><td>MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring instructional strategies</td><td>Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.</td><td>Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Interim Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 Geometry EOC test results.</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 subgroup:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<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></td><td>The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicated that the area of greatest</td><td>Provide students with practice in solving real-world problems using 3-D geometric concepts.</td><td>MTSS/RtI Team and Math Department will be responsible for monitoring</td><td>Process used to determine effectiveness of the strategies will be to review formative bi-weekly assessment</td><td>Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Interim</td></tr>
</table>

1	difficulty for students was the Standard: 3-dimensional geometry.		instructional strategies	data to ensure progress is being made and to adjust instruction as needed.	Assessments, teacher-generated assessments, samples of students work, summative assessments, and 2013 Geometry EOC test results.

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
What Great Teachers Do Differently by Todd Whitaker.	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting August 18, 2012 and ending December 19, 2012.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used as follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Common Core Standards	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting January 16, 2013 and ending May 15, 2013.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used as follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Florida Continuous Improvement Model	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	Professional Development meeting will be scheduled on August 17, 2012	Formal and informal assessments, creation and implementation of instructional focus calendars will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
CCSS	Copies of documents	School General Funds	$100.00
FCIM	Copies of documents	School General Funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $1,130.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00

	Subtotal: $0.00
	Grand Total: $1,130.00

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 55% of the students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 57%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55%(48)	57%(50)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was Reporting Category: Nature of Science. Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities that are linked to increased rigor through inquiry-based learning in Earth Space Science.	Provide students the opportunity to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze, and explain science concepts during laboratory activities and classroom discussions.	MTSS/RtI Team and Science Department will monitor progress.	The MTSS/RtI Team and Science Department will review student work samples for evidence of the use of inquiry-based learning activities and the interim assessments to ensure adequate progress and adjust intervention.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative Assessments, Florida Achieves, Interim Assessments Teacher-made assessments, Summative assessment and 2013 FCAT Science 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 Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 15% of the students scored at or above achievement levels 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student achievement Levels 4 and 5 by 1 percentage point to 16%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15%(13)	16%(14)

Problem-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 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was Reporting Category "Physical Sciences". Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities that are linked to increased rigor through inquiry-based learning in Physical Science.	Examine and explore student misconceptions using formative assessments using MDCPS Pacing Guides and Learning Village resources; and provide opportunities for students to apply physical science concepts in real-world scenarios.	MTSS/RtI Team and Science Department will monitor progress.	The MTSS/RtI Team and Science Department will review student work samples for evidence of the use of inquiry-based learning activities and the interim assessments to ensure adequate progress and adjust intervention.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Florida Achieves, Interim Assessments, Teacher-made assessments Summative assessments and 2013 FCAT Science 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:	
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				

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Biology EOC assessment indicate that 36%(17) of the students scored in the middle third (levels 3-5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (levels 3-5) by1 percentage point to 37%(17).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36%(17)	37%(17)

Problem-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 2012 administration of the Biology EOC assessment was category of classification, heredity and evolution.	Examine and explore student misconceptions using formative assessments using MDCPS Pacing Guides and Learning Village resources; and provide opportunities for students to apply classification, heredity evolutional concepts in real-world scenarios.	MTSS/RtI Team and Science Department will monitor progress.	The MTSS/RtI Team and Science Department will review student work samples for evidence of the use of inquiry-based learning activities and the interim assessments to ensure adequate progress and adjust intervention.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Florida Achieves, Interim Assessments Teacher-made assessments Summative test, and 2013 Biology EOC test results.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 Biology EOC Assessment indicate that 57% (27) of students scored in the upperthird (levels 4-5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (levels 4-5) by1 percentage point to 58%(27).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57%(27)	58%(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
	The area of deficiency as noted 2012 administration of the	Provide students the opportunity to use microscopes to	MTSS/RtI Team and Science Department will	The MTSS/RtI Team and Science Department will review	Evaluation tools will include: Formative

1	Biology EOC assessment was the category: modular and cellular biology.	compare cell structure to cell specialization.	monitor progress.	student work samples for evidence of the use of inquiry-based learning activities and the interim assessments to ensure adequate progress and adjust intervention.	assessments, Florida Achieves, Interim Assessments Teacher-made assessments Summative test, and 2013 Biology EOC test results.

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
Book Study: What Great Teachers Do Differently by Todd Whitaker.	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting August 18, 2012 and ending December 19, 2012.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used as follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Common Core State Standards	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting January 16, 2013 and ending May 15, 2013.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used as follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Florida Continuous Improvement Model	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	Professional Development meeting will be scheduled on August 17, 2012	Formal and informal assessments, creation and implementation of instructional focus calendars will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $1,130.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,130.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate 98% of the students scored level 4 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school is to increase the percentage of students scoring level 4 or higher from 98% to 98 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
98%(160)	98%(160)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Writing FCAT persuasive writing was the reporting category: using textual support.	Review writing techniques with students using poetry,fiction, nonfiction, media, and speeches as examples for students to evaluate techniques. In addition, students will be given opportunities to incorporate factual evidence to support main ideas in body paragraphs.	LLT will monitor progress	Administer and score students' monthly writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust focus.	Evaluation tools include: Formative Assessments, Diagnostic Writing, District Writing, Summative assessments and 2013 FCAT 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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Book Study: What Great Teachers Do Differently by Todd Whitaker.	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting August 18, 2012 and ending December 19, 2012.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Common Core State Standards	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting January 16, 2013 and ending May15, 2013.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Florida Continuous Improvement Model	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	Professional Development meeting will be scheduled on August 17, 2012.	Formal and informal assessments, creation and implementation of instructional focus calendars will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $1,130.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
		Grand Total:	$1,130.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	2012 M-DCPS Baseline data were used for goals 1-2.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(1)	11%(9)

Problem-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 anticipated barrier for the Civics EOC test results will be students deficient in the area of Civics Education.	Examine and explore student misconceptions using formative assessments using MDCPS Pacing Guides and Learning Village resources opportunities for students to apply Civics Educational concepts in real-world scenarios.	MTSS/RtI Team and Social Studies Department will monitor progress.	The MTSS/RtI Team and Social Studies will review student work samples for evidence of the use of inquiry-based learning activities and assessments to ensure adequate progress and adjust intervention.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative assessments, Interim Assessments, Teacher-made assessments Summative tests, and 2013 District Spring Assessment test results.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	2012 M-DCPS Baseline data were used for goals 1-2.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(1)	11%(9)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The anticipated barrier for the Civics EOC test	Examine and explore student misconceptions	MTSS/RtI Team and Social	The MTSS/RtI Team and Social Studies	Evaluation tools will include:

1	results will be students deficient in the area of the role of government.	using formative assessments using MDCPS Pacing Guides and Learning Village resources opportunities for students to apply governmental concepts in real-world scenarios.	Studies will monitor progress.	Department will review student work samples for evidence of the use of inquiry-based learning activities and assessments to ensure adequate progress and adjust intervention.	Formative assessment, Interim Assessment, Teacher-made assessments Summative tests, and 2013 District Spring Assessment test results.

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
What Great Teachers Do Differently by Todd Whitaker.	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting August 18, 2012 and ending December 19, 2012.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Common Core State Standards	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting January 16, 2013 and ending May 15, 2013.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Florida Continuous Improvement Model	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	Professional Development meeting will be scheduled on August 17, 2012	Formal and informal assessments, creation and implementation of instructional focus calendars will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration

---

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
FCIM	Copies of Documents	Scool General Funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $1,130.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,130.00

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Cource (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	2012 M-DCPS Baseline data were used for goals 1-2.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(1)	12%(8)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have limited understanding and knowledge of the U.S. History from the period of 1840-2010.	udents will be given the opportunity to increase their knowledge of U.S. History by analyzing information from the antebellum period to the present using primary source documents.	MTSS/RtI Team and Social Studies Department will monitor progress.	The MTSS/RtI Team and Social Studies Department will review student work samples for evidence of the use of inquiry-based learning activities and assessments to ensure adequate progress and adjust intervention.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative – Teacher-made assessments and Summative test, and 2013 District Spring Assessment test results.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	2012 M-DCPS Baseline data were used for goals 1-2.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(1)	12%(8)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

| 1 | Students have limited understanding and knowledge of the U.S. History from the period of 1840-2010. | Students will be given the opportunity to increase their knowledge of U.S. History by analyzing information from the antebellum period to the present using primary source documents. | MTSS/RtI Team and Social Studies Department will monitor progress. | The MTSS/RtI Team and Social Studies Department will review student work samples for evidence of the use of inquiry-based learning activities and assessments to ensure adequate progress and adjust intervention. | Evaluation tools will include: Formative – Teacher-made assessments and Summative test, and 2013 District Spring Assessment test results. |

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
Book Study: What Great Teachers Do Differently by Todd Whitaker	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting August 18, 2012 and ending December 19, 2012.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Common Core State Standards	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting January 16, 2013 and ending May 15, 2013.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Florida Continuous Improvement Model	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	Professional Development meeting will be scheduled on August 17, 2012	Formal and informal assessments, creation and implementation of instructional focus calendars will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration

U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $1,130.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,130.00

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 97.76% by minimizing absences and illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated. Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 5%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
97.76%(542)	97.26 % (521)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
61	58
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
181	150

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Unexcused tardies have increased from the previous school year.	Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of tardiness to the assistant principal and/or school counselor to develop intervention strategies.	Administration and attendance clerk will monitor progress.	Monthly updates will be reported to administration and faculty members.	Attendance logs will be used as the evaluation tool.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Truancy Prevention	Grades 6-12	Assistant Principal and Attendance Clerk	All Staff	September 17, 2012 – Teacher Planning Day September 26, 2012 – Teacher Planning Day	A Truancy Intervention Program will be developed during the first semester. An assistant principal will monitor the implementation of this program by all staff.	Assistant Principal and School Counselor will monitor progress.

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Truancy Prevention Plan	Copies of documents	School General Fund	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
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: $100.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
5	5
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
3	3

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	New incoming students are not familiar with the DCS Student Code of Conduct.	Teachers will review various sections in the Student Code of Conduct during the first few minutes of class, at the beginning of school. Information sessions will be held during Middle School Orientation for new students on August 1, 2012 and High School Orientation for new students on August 2, 1012.	School administration will be responsible for monitoring suspension data.	The process to determine the effectiveness of the strategy includes monitoring contact logs for evidence of communication with parents/students who have received notices regarding demerits, detentions and suspensions.	Evaluation tools are, but not limited to, meeting agenda and minutes, and Parent/Student Code of Conduct Acknowledgement forms.
2	New incoming students are not familiar with the DCS Student Code of Conduct	The assistant principal will contact parents of students whose behaviors are beginning to escalate. Parents will receive information on parenting resources.	Assistant principal will be responsible for monitoring data.	The process to determine the effectiveness of the strategy includes monitoring contact logs for evidence of communication with parents/students who have received notices regarding demerits, detentions and suspensions.	Evaluation tools are, but not limited to, meeting agenda and minutes, and Parent/Student Code of Conduct Acknowledgement forms.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Training regarding the DCS						

Student Handbook and Code of Conduct PD for staff and parents will be provided on understanding the Student Handbook and Code of Conduct	Grades 6-12	Administration and faculty	Faculty and Students School-wide	August 16 – August 27, 2012 and ongoing	The strategies for follow-up monitoring be to used are: classroom walkthroughs/observations to monitor review of Handbook and Code of Conduct at the beginning of first period classes, as well as teachers' enforcement of school policies for conduct during the school year.	Administration will be responsible for monitoring.

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Training on DCS Student Handbook and Code of Conduct	Document copies	School General Fund	$300.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
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: $300.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the dropout rate by 0.5 percentage points and to increase the graduation rate by 2 percentage points.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
0	0
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:

			95.7%(66)	95.7% (66)	

Problem-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	Less than 100% of students scores high enough in Reading on the FCAT, ACT, or SAT to graduate with a standard high school diploma	Identify and meet with at-risk students and their parents to discuss the MDCPS Student Progression Plan options and credit-recovery programs. Targeted students will enroll in the respective program.	The school counselor will be responsible for monitoring.	Enrollment logs will be tracked for at-risk students regarding assistance.	Evaluation tools will include enrollment logs and school counselor parent/student contact logs.
2	Less than 100% of students scores high enough in Reading on the FCAT, ACT, or SAT to graduate with a standard high school diploma	Zero dropout level will be maintained by identifying students at risk and their parents to discuss Progression Plan options and credit-recovery programs. Targeted students will enroll in the respective program.	The school counselor will be responsible for monitoring.	Intervention logs will be tracked for at-risk students regarding assistance.	Evaluation tools will include intervention logs and school counselor parent/student contracts.

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
Graduation Requirements	Grades 6-12	School Counselor	All staff	August 16, 2012	The strategy for follow-up will be to monitor parent sign-in roster and other contact logs (e.g., email, phone calls) for parents that did not attend	The school counselor will be responsible for monitoring.

Dropout Prevention Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Review of MDCPS Student Progression Plan	Document copies	School General Fund	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
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: $100.00

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of parents participating in school-wide activities.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
4%	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	Parents have limited knowledge and understanding as of how to volunteer and the various ways that a parent/guardian can be involved at school.	Informational meetings (Middle and High School Orientation, PTSA and EESAC) in the early fall will promote volunteerism and explain the process for background checks.	The Activities Coordinator will be responsible for monitoring.	There will be review of attendance logs and number of volunteer hours served at the school.	Meeting minutes, volunteer logs, and receipts of background checks will be use as evaluation tools.

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

| Benefits of Attending PTSA/EESAC/Board of Directors Meetings | Grades 6-12 | Director of Curriculum and Instruction, EESAC chairperson and PTSA President | Parents and Community Members | The first regularly scheduled PTSA, EESAC and Board of Directors meetings for the 2012-2013 school year will be the target dates. | There will be reviews of attendance logs and number of volunteer hours served at the school. | DCS Activities Coordinator will be responsible for monitoring. |

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Students will gain proficiency in the areas of math and science using technology to solve real-world engineering problems. Additionally, the school increase performance and enrollment in AP Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Calculus, and Statistics. The school will increase dual enrollment in Anatomy & Physiology and Calculus.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have limited exposure to solving engineering problems.	Students in the physics and calculus classers will participate in cooperative learning experiences using technology to solve real-world engineering situations.	MTSS/RtI Team will monitor progress.	The MTSS/RtI Team will review student work samples for evidence of the use of inquiry-based learning activities and assessments to ensure adequate progress and adjust interventions.	Evaluation tools will include: Formative, teacher-made assessments and summative tests.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Book Study: What Great Teachers Do Differently by Todd Whitaker.	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting August 18, 2012 and ending December 19, 2012.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used as follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Common Core State Standards	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting January 16, 2013 and ending May15, 2013.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used as follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Florida Continuous Improvement Model	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	Professional Development meeting will be scheduled on August 17, 2012	Formal and informal assessments, creation and implementation of instructional focus calendars will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $1,130.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,130.00

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:	The percentage of students enrolled in the middle school college and careers class will increase by 1 percentage point. Student participation in the CTE course will increase with new course offering of computer program certification. The percentage of students enrolled in full or part time dual enrollment programs at FIU or Miami Dade College will increase.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not all students are aware of the full range of college and career opportunities offered at the secondary and post-secondary school.	Middle school students will be exposed to college and career planning through technology and college and career readiness using the E-Pep program through a Civics career planning course. The Guidance Department will expose high school students to information regarding dual enrollments and CTE course opportunities.	MTSS/RtI Team will monitor progress.	The MTSS/RtI Team will monitor student usage of the E-Pep program. Guidance will monitor student enrollment in CTE courses and participation in dual enrollment opportunities.	Student log-in data, enrollment data and student grades on report cards will be used as evaluation tools.

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
Book Study: What Great Teachers Do Differently by Todd Whitaker	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting August 18, 2012 and ending December 19, 2012.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Common Core State Standards	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	After school meetings will be held on the third Wednesday of each month, starting January 16, 2013 and ending May 15, 2013.	Formal and informal assessments and results from analyzing student work will be used for follow-up monitoring.	Administration
Florida Continuous Improvement Model	Grades 6-12	DCS Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Grades 6-12	Professional Development meeting will be scheduled on August 17, 2012	Professional Development meeting will be scheduled on August 17, 2012	Administration

CTE Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Fund	$930.00
CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Fund	$100.00
FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Fund	$100.00
			Subtotal: $1,130.00

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,130.00

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

N/A Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of N/A Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Fund	$930.00
Reading	CCSS	Copies of documents	School General Fund	$100.00
Reading	FCIM	Copies of documents	School General Fund	$100.00
CELLA	Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
CELLA	CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
CELLA	FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
Mathematics	Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
Mathematics	CCSS	Copies of documents	School General Funds	$100.00
Mathematics	FCIM	Copies of documents	School General Funds	$100.00
Science	Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
Science	CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
Science	FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
Writing	Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
Writing	CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
Writing	FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
Civics	Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
Civics	CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
Civics	FCIM	Copies of Documents	Scool General Funds	$100.00
U.S. History	Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
U.S. History	CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
U.S. History	FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
Attendance	Truancy Prevention Plan	Copies of documents	School General Fund	$100.00
Suspension	Training on DCS Student Handbook and Code of Conduct	Document copies	School General Fund	$300.00
Dropout Prevention	Review of MDCPS Student Progression Plan	Document copies	School General Fund	$100.00
STEM	Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Funds	$930.00
STEM	CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
STEM	FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Funds	$100.00
CTE	Book Study	Book per teacher	School General Fund	$930.00
CTE	CCSS	Copies of Documents	School General Fund	$100.00
CTE	FCIM	Copies of Documents	School General Fund	$100.00
				Subtotal: $10,670.00

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: $10,670.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ʄ Priority	ʄ Focus	ʄ Prevent	ʄ NA

Are you a reward school: ʄ Yes ʄ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
First priority for SAC funds is to be used for science equipment and consumable materials to assist in increasing science proficiency scores. If any remaining funds are unused, the SAC committee will survey the teachers asking for a prioritized needs assessment. Consensus among the SAC committee determines which needs are addressed. Teacher needs not met will be referred to other funding sources (e.g., PTSA mini-grants).Based on current number of students the amount of SAC funds will be $2,790.00 Expenses Itemized: Science equipment ($1000.00) Math: texts, manipulatives, online programs ($895.00) Reading: Texts, online programs, software ($895.00)	$2,790.00

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

1. Review and adopt the 2012/2013 School Improvement Plan.
2. Review and endorse the School Wellness Plan.
3. Review and endorse the School Technology Plan.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District DOCTORS CHARTER SCHOOL OF MIAMI SHORES 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	80%	91%	92%	48%	311	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	65%	85%			150	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?	66% (YES)	84% (YES)			150	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					611	
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 DOCTORS CHARTER SCHOOL OF MIAMI SHORES 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	74%	86%	96%	58%	314	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	65%	75%			140	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	62% (YES)	73% (YES)			135	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					589	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested