

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: SOMERSET ACADEMY ELEMENTARY (MIRAMAR CAMPUS)

District Name: Broward

Principal: Alexandra Prieto

SAC Chair: Jennifer Castillo

Superintendent: Robert W. Runcie

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Alexandria Prieto	B.A. in Pre-K Primary Education from Barry University; M.S. in Reading from Barry University; ED. Specialist in Educational Leadership from Nova University	6	3	2011-2012: Somerset Academy Yes Grade: A, Reading Mastery 73% Learning Gains: 79% Math Mastery: 80% Learning Gains: 68% 2010-2011: Somerset Academy Yes Grade: A, Reading Mastery 86% Learning Gains: 76% Math Mastery: 85% Learning Gains: 60% 2009-2010: Somerset Miramar Academy Grade A Reading : Learning Gains: 73% Lowest 25%: 65% AYP : Yes Mathematics : Learning Gains: 76% Lowest 25%: 62% AYP: NO: Science: 59% 2008-2009: Somerset Academy Grade: A, Math Mastery: 78%, Math Mastery: 78%, Science 52% Mastery: 60%, Writing 100%: AYP: Yes

Assis Principal	Dennis Mulrooney	B.A in Elementary Education 1-6 from Florida International University; M.S. in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University	2	1	2011-2012: Somerset Academy Yes Grade: A, Reading Mastery 73% Learning Gains: 79% Math Mastery: 80% Learning Gains: 68% 2010-2011: Somerset Academy Yes Grade: A, Reading Mastery 86% Learning Gains: 76% Math Mastery: 85% Learning Gains: 60%
-----------------	------------------	---	---	---	--

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)
Math and Science	Rosa Peddy	B.A in Elementary Education K-6, with ESOL Endorsement from Florida Atlantic University	4	1	2011-2012: Somerset Academy Yes Grade: A, Reading Mastery 73% Learning Gains: 79% Math Mastery: 80% Learning Gains: 68% 2010-2011: Somerset Academy Yes Grade: A, Reading Mastery 86% Learning Gains: 76% Math Mastery: 85% Learning Gains: 60% 2009-2010: Somerset Miramar Academy Grade A Reading : Learning Gains: 73% Lowest 25%: 65% AYP : Yes Mathematics : Learning Gains: 76% Lowest 25%: 62% AYP: NO: Science: 59% 2008-2009: Somerset Academy Grade: A, Math Mastery: 78%, Math Mastery: 78%, Science 52% Mastery: 60%, Writing 100%: AYP: Yes
Reading	Michelle Rojas	B.A. in Elementary Education K-6, certified PK-3 and Intergraded Curriculum 5-9 from Florida International University	4	1	2011-2012: Somerset Academy Yes Grade: A, Reading Mastery 73% Learning Gains: 79% Math Mastery: 80% Learning Gains: 68% 2010-2011: Somerset Academy Yes Grade: A, Reading Mastery 86% Learning Gains: 76% Math Mastery: 85% Learning Gains: 60% 2009-2010: Somerset Miramar Academy Grade A Reading : Learning Gains: 73% Lowest 25%: 65% AYP : Yes Mathematics : Learning Gains: 76% Lowest 25%: 62% AYP: NO: Science: 59% 2008-2009: Somerset Academy Grade: A, Math Mastery: 78%, Math Mastery: 78%, Science 52% Mastery: 60%, Writing 100%: AYP: Yes

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. Teach in Florida web-site to advertise openings	Principal and Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
2	Teacher will have the opportunity to participate in Merit Pay.	Administration	Ongoing	
3	3. Professional Learning Communities	Principal and Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
4	4. New Educator Support System (NESS)	NESS Coach	Ongoing	

5	5. Leadership Academy	Dr. Ruth Jacoby	Ongoing	
---	-----------------------	-----------------	---------	--

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
No data submitted	

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
30	13.3%(4)	46.7%(14)	40.0%(12)	0.0%(0)	23.3%(7)	100.0%(30)	6.7%(2)	0.0%(0)	73.3%(22)

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
Tina Guandalini	Shelly Macias	By Subject Area and Teaching expertise	Observation, Walkthroughs, Bi-Weekly meetings, Professional Development, Data Chats, and Mentee Observations
Tensy Rothman	Priscilla Carillo	By Subject Area and Teaching expertise	Observation, Walkthroughs, Bi-Weekly meetings, Professional Development, Data Chats, and Mentee Observations
Christine Plaza	Jessica Summers	By Subject Area and Teaching expertise	Observation, Walkthroughs, Bi-Weekly meetings, Professional Development, Data Chats, and Mentee Observations

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.

Because Somerset Miramar Charter School is a Title I school, many programs are offered to the students. The Title I program requires a Teacher Assistant with sufficient credits to be hired at the school and offer assistance to struggling students. Furthermore, funds are available for Parent Participation programs which reinforce to the school-home connection. School Resource Officers(SROs) offer safety and violence prevention workshops for students and parents. Bullying, especially cyber-bullying, are topics that are discussed by teachers to avoid any possible situations that may arise throughout the year. The school is part of National School Lunch Program and students are provided high-quality meals each day. Nutritional information is disseminated in the cafeteria and students are informed of proper cleanliness techniques that should be used routinely.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:

- Training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher Program
- Training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ELL
- Training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation and protocols.

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

1. The school adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy
2. Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extend an open invitation to our school's parent resource center in order to inform parents regarding available programs, their rights under No Child Left Behind and other referral services.

Increase parental engagement/involvement through developing (with on-going parental input) our Title I School-Parent Compact (for each student); our school's Title I Parental Involvement Policy; scheduling the Title I Orientation Meeting (Open House); and other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements. Conduct informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents, and schedule workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents' schedule as part of our goal to empower parents and build

their capacity for involvement. Complete Title I Administration Parental Involvement Monthly School Reports (FM-6914 Rev. 06-08) and the Title I Parental Involvement Monthly Activities Report (FM-6913 03-07), and submit to Title I Administration by the 5th of each month as documentation of compliance with NCLB Section 1118.

Other

Involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extend an open invitation to our school's parent resource center in order to inform parents regarding available programs, their rights under No Child Left Behind and other referral services.

Increase parental engagement/involvement through developing (with on-going parental input) our Title I School-Parent for each student; our school's Title I Parental Involvement Policy; scheduling the Title I Orientation Meeting (Open House); and other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements that will include Parent Universities that involve FCAT 2.0 strategies, reading clinics and tips for assisting their children with mathematics strategies and concepts (Grade level specific). Conduct informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents, and schedule workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents' schedule as part of our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Alexandra Prieto – Principal
Dennis Mulrooney - Assistant Principal
Michelle Rojas - Reading Coach
Rosa Peddy - Math/Science Coach
Ofelia Barcelo - ESE Specialist
Diana Tello - K Team Leader
Anelle Thompson -Team Leader 1st Grade
Melissa Tepper – Team Leader 2nd grade
Angela Calvacca-Team Leader 3rd Grade
Tensy Rothman -Team Leader 4th Grade
Christine Plaza -Team Leader for 5th Grade
Ketura Samoza - Social Science Department Chair
Henry Norton - Math Department Chair
Nicole Jones - Science Department Chair
Ingrid Campbell - Language Arts/Reading Department Chair
Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-driven decision-making. Communicates with parents and staff about the early intervention programs. Ensures implementation of RtI model.
General Education Teachers (Reading and Math):
Participate in student data collection; provides information and data about core instruction; and maintains communication with staff for input and feedback. Develop intervention strategies for failing students.
Exceptional Student Education Teacher (ESE):
Participate in student data collection; provides information and data about core instruction; maintains communication with general education teacher; and collaborates with teachers, counselors, and resource psychologist.
Counselors:
Monitor student achievement; set-up parent-teacher conferences; develop academic contracts; and communicate with all stake-holders

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

The RTI Leadership Team will focus its meetings around questions pertaining to the implementation of instruction and intervention strategies.
The team will meet on a bi-weekly basis to engage the following activities:
Monitor progress of Level 1 and 2 students in Intensive Reading, Intensive Reading+ and Intensive Math classes.
Monitor the implementation of the Comprehensive Reading Plan throughout the Intensive Reading classes, regular curriculum classes, and developmental ELL classes.
Develop and monitor the FCAT morning tutoring that will be offered to all Level 1 and Level 2, ELL students.
Review progress of all students using FCAT Explorer as a supplement to the instruction.
Use data from in-house Interim Assessments to determine mastery of benchmarks for all students in Reading, Mathematics and Science.
Ensure that the FCAT reading benchmarks will be taught across the curriculum by all teachers throughout the school year.
Ensure that the Strategies Benchmark calendar is evident within the teacher's lesson plans.

The use of instructional delivery strategies such as; the Socratic Method, reciprocal teaching, teacher model, fluency instruction, reading across the content area curriculum, and concept mapping are evident within the teacher's lesson plans as well as throughout the professional development calendar. Based on all of the information gathered above, the Leadership team will determine the professional development and resources needed to optimize instruction and intervention.

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 provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data. It will also monitor the fidelity of instructional delivery.

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.

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:

Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), School-wide Diagnostic Assessment

Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

Progress Monitoring:

Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Mini-assessments

Midyear:

Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR)

End of Year:

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

Frequency of Data Days:

Once a quarter for data analysis

Success maker, IXL, Carnegie, Stop Drop and Test

Teacher made test

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during first week of school. Small sessions are planned throughout the year.

Professional development sessions entitled.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Alexandra Prieto – Principal

Dennis Mulrooney - Assistant Principal

Michelle Rojas - Reading Coach

Rosa Peddy - Math/Science Coach

Ofelia Barcelo - ESE Specialist

Diana Tello - K Team Leader

Anelle Thompson -Team Leader 1st Grade

Melissa Tepper – Team Leader 2nd grade

Angela Calvacca-Team Leader 3rd Grade

Tensy Rothman -Team Leader 4th Grade

Christine Plaza -Team Leader for 5th Grade

Ketura Samoza - Social Science Department Chair

Henry Norton - Math Department Chair

Nicole Jones - Science Department Chair
Ingrid Campbell - Language Arts/Reading Department Chair

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will focus its meetings around questions pertaining to the implementation of instruction and intervention strategies. The team will meet on a monthly basis to engage the following activities: Monitor progress of Level 1 and 2 students in Intensive Reading classes. Monitor the implementation of the Comprehensive Reading Plan throughout the Intensive Reading classes, regular curriculum classes, and developmental ELL classes. Develop and monitor the FCAT morning tutoring that will be offered to all Level 1, Level 2, ELL, and SWD students. Review progress of all students using Reading Plus, FCAT Explorer and Florida Focus, as a supplement to the instruction. Use data from in-house Interim Assessments to determine mastery of benchmarks for all students in Reading. Ensure that the FCAT reading benchmarks will be taught across the curriculum by all teachers throughout the school year. Ensure that the Grade A Strategies Benchmark calendar is evident within the teacher's lesson plans. The use of instructional delivery strategies such as; the Socratic Method, reciprocal teaching, teacher model, fluency instruction, reading across the content area curriculum, differentiated instruction and concept mapping are evident within the teacher's lesson plans as well as throughout the professional development calendar. Based on all of the information gathered above, the Literacy Leadership team will determine the professional development and resources needed to optimize instruction and intervention. The Literacy Leadership will focus on the revised goals for writing in across the curriculum.

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

The major initiative for the 2012-2013 school year would be increase literacy across all curriculums. Increase understanding of differentiated instruction and continue to apply best practices. Teachers will implement internal assessments to identify student's strengths and areas of growth in order to tailor instruction.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Somerset Miramar School offers orientation to parents of future Kindergarten students where information is disbursed about the school's policies and procedures. In addition, students are provided with the opportunity to meet their Kindergarten teacher in August during the school's Open House before school begins to alleviate first day jitters for Kindergarten students, as well as making the process of going to school every day less scary. The Florida Kindergarten Readiness Survey (FLKRS) is also administered to the students during their first month in school to identify areas of weakness. Results are shared with parents promptly. Utilizing the FAIR (Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading) assessments, a baseline for students' print/letter knowledge and phonological awareness will be determined, as well as instructions planned utilizing the resulting data. The FAIR assessment will be utilized at the beginning, middle, and end of year, in accordance with the District and State guidelines, and recorded on the Progress Monitoring Reading Network. Social Skills instruction can be also planned in part by using the FLKRS.

*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.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:		Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 86% of the students in elementary school achieved proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading test by scoring at or above level 3. Our goal is to have 86% of our students obtain mastery by scoring at or above a level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Reading test.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
At Somerset Academy Miramar Elementary 86% of students tested received level of 3 or above.		Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 88% of the students in elementary school will achieve mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.			
Problem-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. Insufficient differentiation of instruction for our non proficient students; Lack of data analysis on progress monitoring.	1.1 Every student who did not demonstrate proficiency will be required to take an Enrichment Reading Course. Structured pull-out sessions by the Reading Coach will be scheduled by the Reading Coach. Teachers will meet weekly for grade level meetings to review curriculum pacing guides, benchmarks, and focus calendars. They will also meet monthly during the scheduled Professional Learning Communities to share best practices. Lesson plans will be created for differentiated instruction to provide individualized instruction for all students. These lesson plans are aligned with the strategies identified in the Instructional Focus Calendars.	1.1. Administration, Teachers, Department Chair and Reading Coach	Effectiveness will be determined through data collected during CWT; Students will be provided with monthly benchmark test to evaluate progress; Data Chats will be conducted to disseminate student's progress.	Focused Classroom Walk-through will be conducted to determine frequency of higher order questions, FCAT Explorer, Success maker data, FCAT Reading Spec Item assessments, Accelerated Reading Data Reports, benchmark assessments, and mini-BATs.
2	2 Students who pass one year's FCAT Reading test with a low level 3 score will receive additional reading instruction and support during the year due to a higher risk level of not meeting proficiency.	All students who received a low level 3 score in the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading test will be assigned to a reading class of 4 hours weekly, additional to their regular English class. Instruction will cover all reading content areas.	Administration	Regular full-length FCAT or FCAT-like practice tests will be used to monitor the performance of the students in all reading content areas. Assessment data will be reviewed every two weeks, and adjustments to the intervention plans will be made if necessary.	Formative: Practice tests Summative: 2011 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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards, 54% of the students in Elementary school achieved high mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards, 54% of the students in Elementary school achieved high mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 57% of the students in elementary school will achieve high mastery on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.

Problem-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	Increase differentiated instruction for high achievers by 3 %.	Increase differentiated instruction for high achievers by 3 %. 2.1. High achieving students will participate in differentiated curriculum using enrichment materials and activities. Students who exceed mastery levels can participate in the school's Gifted Program.	2.1. Administration Department Chair and Reading Coach	Effectiveness will be determined through data collected during CWT. Students and parents will be provided with periodic progress data through Pinnacle and our required teacher parent conferences. Benchmark Assessments Data will be closely monitored by all stakeholders and discussed during the Literacy Committee meetings.	District interim assessment and results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2	As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test, the percent of students making leaning gains increased by 5 percentage points as compared to the 2011	Students will meet with leadership team to discuss and analyze their individual FCAT score reports and after every district assessment. Students will develop individual goals for	Reading and RtI Leadership teams	Reports will be analyzed at dada Chats with the students and the Leadership teams.	District BAT Test 1 and results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.

FCAT Reading Test. Student's limited understanding of FCAT and data may prevent our school from meeting our 2012-2013 goal.	improvement.			
--	--------------	--	--	--

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:	Our goal for the 2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation, and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 4 percentage points to 83%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on FCAT 2.0 standards our students made gains of 79%.	Our goal for the 2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation, and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 4 percentage points to 83%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Insufficient Differentiation of Instruction; Lack of data analysis on progress monitoring.	3.1. Analyze the effectiveness of the Reading, IFC calendars, mini-lessons, mini assessments, maintenance, tutorials, and enrichments to determine any necessary revisions. Every student will be required to take a Reading course.	Reading and RtI Leadership teams	Reports will be analyzed at data Chats with the students and the Leadership teams.	District Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) and results of the 2013 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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
 Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.
 Reading Goal #3b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.
 Reading Goal #4:

Given instruction based on FCAT 2.0 Standards, 82% of our elementary school students showed learning gains in the lowest 25%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Given instruction based on FCAT 2.0 Standards 82% of the lowest 25% elementary school students showed learning gains in Reading.

Given instruction based on FCAT 2.0 Standards Standards, 86% of our elementary school students will show significant learning gains in the Lowest 25% category.

Problem-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	Insufficient differentiation of instruction for Level 1 and Level 2. These students will be closely monitored to increase their mastery level by 3%.	Increase school-wide culture of reading. Every student will be required to take an Enrichment Reading Course. Provide structured Pull Out sessions by the Reading Coach. Teachers will meet weekly for grade level meetings to review curriculum pacing guides, benchmarks, and focus calendars. They will also meet monthly during the scheduled Professional Learning Communities to share best practices. Lesson plans will be created for differentiated instruction to provide individualized instruction for all students. These lesson plans are aligned	Reading Coach, Teachers, Department Chair and Administration.	Effectiveness will be determined through data collected during CWT; Students will be provided with monthly benchmark test to evaluate progress	Focused Classroom walk-throughs to determine frequency of higher order questions, FORF, FCAT Explorer, Success maker data, and FCAT Reading Spec Item assessments. Accelerated Reading Data Reports.

	with the strategies identified in the Instructional Focus Calendar.		
--	---	--	--

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 #					
	Based on data from targets on the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 FCAT our 2013 AMO target is 77% for all students. The goal beyond 2013 will be to increase our AMO by 4 percentage points each following school year.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	73	77	81	85	89	

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:	Based on the 2012 Target AMO of 75% the subgroup of black did failed to reach that goal by 5 percentage points by scoring at a level of 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Target AMO of 75% the subgroup of black did failed to reach that goal by 5 percentage points	Students in the black subgroup will score at 78% on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading test.

Problem-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	Teachers may be unaware of these target students as identified by their previous years FCAT scores	Use a strategic data plan that begins by correctly identifying those students most in need and monitoring their progress as a subgroup by teacher through various forms of assessments (BAT, mini benchmark)	Curriculum coaches and classroom teachers	Assessment gains on BAT and mini benchmark assessments by subgroup	BAT and mini benchmark assessments

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:	ELL Subgroup met AMO target
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
ELL Subgroup met AMO target	ELL Subgroup met AMO target

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	SWD Subgroup met AMO target
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
SWD Subgroup met AMO target	SWD Subgroup met AMO target

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Of our economically disadvantaged students, 83% of them scored at or above level 3 according to the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading test
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Of our economically disadvantaged students, 83% of them scored at or above level 3 according to the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading test	Our goal is to improve in this area by 3%, raising our percent proficient to 86% on the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test.

Problem-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	Our goal is to increase by 8% for those students failing to meet the target AMO.	Increase school-wide culture of reading. Every student will be required to take an Enrichment Reading Course. Provide structured Pull Out sessions by the Reading Coach. Teachers will meet weekly for grade level meetings to review curriculum pacing guides, benchmarks, and focus calendars. They will also meet monthly during the	1. Administration, Reading Resource Specialist, & Leadership Team	1. Leadership Team will review student achievement records in student data folders during CWT. Effectiveness will be determined through data collected during CWT; Students will be provided with monthly benchmark test to evaluate progress.	1. Formal Observation and Informal observation. Focused Classroom walk-throughs to determine frequency of higher order questions ,FORF,FCAT Explorer, Success maker data, and FCAT Reading Spec Item assessments.

		scheduled Professional Learning Communities to share best practices. Lesson plans will be created for differentiated instruction to provide individualized instruction for all students. These lesson plans are aligned with the strategies identified in the Instructional Focus Calendar.		Accelerated Reading Data Reports.
--	--	---	--	-----------------------------------

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
RtI Interventions	Reading grades 3-5	Reading Coach	Reading teachers grades 3-5	Early release days, teacher planning days	Classroom Walkthroughs, PD follow up activities	Administration and reading coach
Common Core Trainig	Reading Grade K-5	Reading Coach, Curriculum Team	Reading Teachers K-5	Early Release, Teacher Planning Days	Classroom Walkthroughs, PD follow up activities	Administration Curriculum Team and Reading Coach
Differentiated Instruction Strategies	Reading grades 3-5	Reading Coach	Reading teachers grades 3-5	Early Re: ease days, teacher planning days	Classroom Walkthroughs, PD follow up activities	Administration and reading coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring Interventions	FCAT Coach	Parental Fundraising	\$3,400.00
			Subtotal: \$3,400.00
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
RtI Strategies, Differentiated Instruction	In house Reading coach	No funding necessary	\$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: \$3,400.00

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal # 1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-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				

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:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
Problem-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				

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal # 3:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:				

Problem-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				

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 80% of the students in elementary school achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards, 80% of the students in elementary school achieved mastery on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 84% of the students in Middle school will achieve mastery on the 2012-2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.

Problem-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	Insufficient differentiation of instruction: Lack of data analysis on progress monitoring for our high level 2 students who had the opportunity to increase to mastery.	Identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment. Increase school-wide culture of reading. Every student will be required to take an Enrichment Reading Course. Provide structured Pull Out sessions by the Reading Coach. Teachers will meet weekly for grade level meetings to review curriculum pacing guides, benchmarks, and focus calendars. They will also meet monthly during the scheduled Professional Learning Communities to share best practices. Lesson plans will be created for differentiated instruction to provide individualized instruction for all students. These lesson plans are aligned with the strategies identified in the Instructional Focus Calendar.	Grade Chairperson, Teachers, Administration and Reading Coach.	Review on-going student assessments and grouping charts frequently to ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students. Effectiveness will be determined through data collected during CWT; Students will be provided with monthly benchmark test to evaluate progress.	Mastery progress of students. Focused Classroom walk-throughs to determine frequency of higher order questions, FCAT Explorer, Success maker Data, and FCAT Math Spec Item assessments. Spring Board Data Reports and Carnegie Student Reports.
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 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:	In grades 3-5, 47% of students scored Level 4 or above on the 2012 FCAT mathematics Assessment. The Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics strand was the main area of concern.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards, 47% out of students in elementary school achieved high mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Test by scoring a level 4 or 5.	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 54% of the students in elementary school achieved high mastery on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Differentiated instruction for the high achieving students during the teacher's direct instruction. Increasing the high achieving students percentage by 3%.	Identify students in the core curriculum needing enrichment and providing more assessments that will enable those students to critique and problem solve. Increase school-wide culture of reading. Every student will be required to take an Enrichment Mathematics course. Provide structured Pull Out sessions by the Math Coach. Teachers will meet weekly for grade level meetings to review curriculum pacing guides, benchmarks, and focus calendars. They will also meet monthly during the scheduled Professional Learning Communities to share best practices. Lesson plans will be created for differentiated instruction to provide individualized instruction for all students. These lesson plans are aligned with the strategies identified in the Instructional Focus Calendar.	Grade Chair, Administration, Teachers, and Math Coach	Review on-going student assessments and grouping charts frequently to ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students. Effectiveness will be determined through data collected during CWT; Students will be provided with monthly benchmark test to evaluate progress	Mastery progress of students. Focused Classroom walk-throughs to determine frequency of higher order questions ,FCAT Explorer, Success maker data, and FCAT Mathematics Spec Item assessments, Carnegie Student Reports and Spring Assessments

2		Id		
---	--	----	--	--

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:	In grades 3-5, 67% of students made learning gains in mathematics according to the 2012 FCAT mathematics Assessment. Geometry and Measurement was the area of concern.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 67% of students made learning gains in mathematics according to the 2012 FCAT mathematics Assessment. Geometry and Measurement was the area of concern.	In grades 3-5, 71% of students made learning gains in mathematics according to the 2013 FCAT mathematics Assessment.

Problem-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					
	Insufficient differentiation of instruction: Lack of data analysis on progress monitoring for our high level 2 students who had the opportunity to increase to mastery.	Identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment. Increase school-wide culture of reading. Every student will be required to take an Enrichment Reading Course. Provide structured Pull Out sessions by the Reading Coach. Teachers will meet weekly for grade level meetings to review	Grade Chairperson, Teachers, Administration and Reading Coach.	Review on-going student assessments and grouping charts frequently to ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students. Effectiveness will be determined through data collected during CWT; Students will be provided with monthly benchmark test to evaluate	Mastery progress of students. Focused Classroom walk-throughs to determine frequency of higher order questions, FCAT Explorer, Success maker Data, and FCAT Math Spec Item assessments. Spring Board Data Reports and

2	curriculum pacing guides, benchmarks, and focus calendars. They will also meet monthly during the scheduled Professional Learning Communities to share best practices. Lesson plans will be created for differentiated instruction to provide individualized instruction for all students. These lesson plans are aligned with the strategies identified in the Instructional Focus Calendar.	progress.	Carnegie Student Reports.
---	---	-----------	---------------------------

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	On the 2012FCAT Mathematics test, 87% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation in order to increase the percent of students in the lowest 25% to 90%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
According to the 2012 FCAT Math test, 87% of elementary students in the 25% made learning gains.	Our goal is to increase the percentile of students within the lowest 25% by 3 percent. Thus having 90% as our 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
	On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics administration is was noted that students had	Identify the lowest performing students and provide tutoring sessions after school.	RTI Team	Review of formative bi-weekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District BAT

1	deficiencies Numbers: Operations, Problems, and Statistics		and adjust instruction as needed.	reports; Student authentic work. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment
---	--	--	-----------------------------------	--

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal # Our goal for each of the next 6 schools years is to increase our AMO percentage by 3 percentage points starting with our target AMO of 72% for the 2013 FCAT Administration.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	80	72	75	78	81	

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:		All subgroups met AMO			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
All subgroups met AMO		All subgroups met AMO			
Problem-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					

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:		All subgroups met AMO			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
All subgroups met AMO		All subgroups met AMO			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	All subgroups met AMO
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
All subgroups met AMO	All subgroups met AMO

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	All subgroups met AMO
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
All subgroups met AMO	All subgroups met AMO

Problem-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				

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Training	Math Grades K-5	Math Coach, Curriculum Team	Math Teachers Grades K-5	Early Release Days, Teacher Planning Days	Classroom Walkthroughs, PD Followu ups	Administration, Math Coach, Curriculum Team
RtI Training	Math grades 3-5	Math Coach	Math teachers Grades 3-5	Early Release Days, Teacher Planning Days	Classroom Walkthroughs, PD Followu ups	Administration, Math Coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring Interventions	FCAT Coach	Parental Fundraising	\$3,400.00
			Subtotal: \$3,400.00
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: \$3,400.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		At least 65% of the fifth grade students will score level 3 or above on the Science FCAT for the 2013 school year.			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Our data indicated that 61% of our students scored mastery on the 2012 FCAT.		65% of Somerset Miramar students will score Level or above.			
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	Increase the lack of Science Learning Communities for our students not scoring mastery.	Increase Science effective practices and differentiating instruction. Conduct diagnostic pre and post test to evaluate learning gains. Instructor will determine student's achievement of cognitive skill building through project based learning.	Administration, Teachers, Department Chair and Science Coach	Analyzing Pre and Post tests FCAT Practice tests Mini-benchmark assessment tests Harcourt practice tests	CWT, formal observations and Benchmark Assessment Science Data.
2					
3	Students lack of utilizing supplemental curriculum materials to increase Scientific Thinking.	Teachers will utilize the usage of technology such as FCAT Explorer and FCAT Coach that will promote the application of Scientific Thinking.	Leadership Team	Focused walkthrough by administration to ensure that teachers are using the technology programs.	Formative: Self-generated reports and quizzes from the programs. Summative: FCAT 2013

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.

Science Goal #1b:

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:

In grade 5, 16% of students scored Level 4 or above on the 2012 FCAT Science Assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In grade 5, 16% of students scored Level 4 or above on the 2012 FCAT Science Assessment.

On the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science test, we expect our level of performance to improve to 19%.

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	Lack of teachers integration in regards to hands-on science lessons as required in the FOSS Science Kits.	Integrating science into the curriculum	Science and Math Coach Department Chair Administration	Pre and Post tests FCAT Practice tests Mini-benchmark assessment tests Harcourt practice tests	CWT and Formal Evaluations

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:		Based on the 2012 data analysis from the FCAT Florida Writes, our fourth grade students scored 97% proficiency by scoring at or above a level 3.5. Our goal is to increase this percentage by 3% for the upcoming 2013 FCAT Florida Writing exam.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Students demonstrated 97% proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Florida Writes.		Students will demonstrate 100% proficiency according to the 2013 Florida Writing Assessment.			
Problem-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	Increase the application process of the Four Square Model	Increase the writing strategies across the curriculum.	Administration and Reading Coach	CWT, Effectiveness will be determined through data collected during CWT; Students will be provided with monthly writing benchmark test to evaluate progress.	Writing Samples, Stop Drop and Test Data

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

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

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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 attendance rate was 98.02% for the 2012 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
98.02%	Students at Somerset Miramar will have 99% attendance rate for the 2013 school year.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
16% of our students were noted as having excessive absences.	Increase of .98%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
20% of our students were noted as having excessive tardies.	Our 2012-2013 goal will be centered around decreasing our excessive absences by 1%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increase the attendance rate by incorporating an Attendance Review Committee.	Establish a school wide attendance Review committee	Committee members and the Attendance Clerk	Daily attendance reports	Attendance Records

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension		Based on Data Warehouse information, Somerset Miramar had 3% of students had In-school suspension.			
Suspension Goal # 1:					
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
Out of our elementary population, 3% had in-school suspension.		Decrease of 1% in elementary school in-school suspension rate.			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
Out of our elementary population, 3% had in-school suspension		Decrease of 1% in elementary school in-school suspension rate.			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
Out of our elementary population, 2% had out-of-school suspension.		Decrease of 1% in elementary school out-of-school suspension rate.			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
Out of our elementary population, 2% had out-of-school suspension.		Decrease of 1% in elementary school out-of-school suspension rate.			
Problem-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	We will infuse a progressive disciplinary plan for our students.	Problem solving counseling sessions will be conducted by the	Administration and Guidance Counselor	Review disciplinary reports periodically.	Discipline Reports

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>During the 2011-2012 school year, parent participation in school wide activities was 55%.</p>

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
During the 2011-2012 school year, parent participation in school wide activities was 55%.	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase parent participation by five percentage points to 60%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents rely mainly on the effective and aggressive communication channels of the school (website, mass e-mails) or "word of mouth" to receive most of information regarding school's matters, and less on face-to-face meetings.	Publish and actively advertise all school events in the school calendar on the website. Send invitations/reminders to parents via mass-emails. In addition, arrange so in every parents' meeting there is a workshop component to train and educate the parents in various topics.	Administration, Guidance Counselor, IT Department	Administration will be re-visiting at the end of each month the events of the following month, and make sure that there is enough advertisement and notice given to the parents. Parents will be surveyed about the effectiveness, quality, and practical value of the training they attended.	Events attendance logs and survey data and workshop attendance records.

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM		50 % of our Students will experience a rich integrated curriculum aligned and focused towards STEM disciplines.			
STEM Goal #1:					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Nature of Science needs the most improvement, with less than 50% correct.	Our faculty will deliver inquiry-based instruction challenging students to solve real world problems and develop critical thinking skills	Science Team leader, Curriculum Coach and Administration	Administration team will review the results of school site assessment data to monitor student progre	Formative: School site biweekly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Tutoring Interventions	FCAT Coach	Parental Fundraising	\$3,400.00
Mathematics	Tutoring Interventions	FCAT Coach	Parental Fundraising	\$3,400.00
				Subtotal: \$6,800.00
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
Reading	RTI Strategies, Differentiated Instruction	In house Reading coach	No funding necessary	\$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: \$6,800.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

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

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount

No data submitted

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

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District SOMERSET ACADEMY ELEMENTARY (MI RAMAR CAMPUS) 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	86%	85%	96%	53%	320	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	76%	60%			136	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?	74% (YES)	63% (YES)			137	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					593	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District SOMERSET ACADEMY ELEMENTARY (MI RAMAR CAMPUS) 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	81%	81%	94%	59%	315	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	73%	64%			137	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?	65% (YES)	62% (YES)			127	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					579	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested