

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: SOMERSET ACADEMY MIDDLE (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 82% Learning Gains: 69% Math Mastery: 88% Learning Gains: 82% 2009-2010: Somerset Miramar Academy Grade A Reading : Learning Gains: 75% Lowest 25%: 78% AYP : No Mathematics : Learning Gains: 79% Lowest 25%: 78% AYP: NO: Science: 46% 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	Teach in Florida web-site to advertise openings	Principal and Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
2	Professional Learning Communities	Principal and Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches	Ongoing	
3	Merit Award Pay	Principal and Assistant Principal, Reading	Ongoing	

		Coaches		
4	New Educator Support System (NESS)	Tensy Rothman	Ongoing	
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
Nicole Jones	Tawana Daniel	By Subject Area and Teaching expertise	Observation, Walkthroughs, Bi-Weekly meetings, Professional Development, Data Chats, and Mentee Observations
Keturah Somoza	Meera Mahabir	By Subject Area and Teaching expertise	Observation, Walkthroughs, Bi-Weekly meetings, Professional Development, Data Chats, and Mentee Observations
Ingrid Campbell	Vanusa Rodrigues	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.

Title I, Part A

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. 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.

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 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.

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:

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.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

The Reading Coach and the school's administration will meet with teachers during scheduled department meetings to discuss lesson plan development, data chats, and students' portfolios. By utilizing these tools, all teachers in math, science, and social studies will be able to show evidence of instruction, assessment, differentiation of instruction, and literacy across all content areas.

*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?

Course selections are sent home to review with their parent. Then, students are scheduled to meet one-on-one with the counselors. At these meetings students' FCAT scores, interests, academic grades, and major of interest (EPEP) are reviewed to better meet student needs and interests.

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 68% of the students in Middle school scored at or above a level 3 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. Our goal is to have 72% of our students demonstrate mastery by scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
At Somerset Miramar Middle, 68% of students tested scored at or above a level 3 on the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading assessment.	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 72% of the students in Middle school will score at or above a level 3 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	1.1. Insufficient differentiation of instruction for our non-proficient students; Lack of data analysis on progress monitoring.	1.1 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 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 and Accelerated Reading Data Reports.
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, because	All students who received a low level 3 score in the 2012 FCAT Reading test will be assigned to a reading class of 4 hours weekly, additional to their	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	Formative: Practice tests Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Test

they may be at risk to fall just short of level 3 proficiency.	regular English class. Instruction will cover all reading content areas.	be reviewed every two weeks, and adjustments to the intervention plans will be made if necessary.
--	--	---

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, 38% of the students in Middle school achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test by scoring at or above a level 4. An area of concern was Cause and Effect.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 38% of the students in Middle school achieved high mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test by scoring at or above a level 4.	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 42% of the students in Middle 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 %.	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.

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:

According to the 2012 FCAT Reading test, 70% of middle school students made learning gains.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

According to the 2012 FCAT Reading test, 70% of middle school students made learning gains.

For the 2013, our goal is to improve by 3% which would equal 73% of students would demonstrate learning gains.

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.	Districtinterim assessment(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 the Sunshine Standards, 82% of our middle school students in the lowest 25% demonstrate learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Given instruction based on the Sunshine Standards, 82% of our middle school students within in the lowest 25% demonstrate learning gains in Reading.	The goal for the students within the lowest 25% is for 85% of them to make learning gains according to the 2013 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	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 with the strategies identified in the Instructional Focus Calendar.	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, FOR, FCAT Explorer, Success maker data, and FCAT Reading Spec Item assessments. Accelerated Reading Data Reports.

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

Reading Goal #

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

5A :

Our goal for the next 6 school years is to increase our AMO percentage by 3 percentage points in each year.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	68	78	81	84	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:

Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 67% of Black students in Middle school scored at or above a level 3 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.

Our goal is to have 73% of our Black students demonstrate mastery by scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Given instruction based on the Sunshine Standards, only 67% of African American students in middle school demonstrated mastery.

Our goal is to have 73% of our Black students demonstrate mastery by scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading 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
No Data Submitted				

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5C:

The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 32% of students are making progress.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 68% of students are not making progress.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the percentage of students not achieving to 30%.

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 made sufficient AMO progress
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
SWD made sufficient AMO progress	SWD made sufficient AMO progress

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:	At least 95% of teachers teaching reading will demonstrate proficiency in implementation of intervention programs by 50% of intervention group showing learning gains with the Ec. Dis. Group in Reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
FRL Students made sufficient AMO Progress	FRL Students made sufficient AMO Progress

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 4% for those students failing to meet AYP.	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.	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. 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
Common Core Training	Reading 6-8	Reading Coach	Reading Teachers 6-8	Early Release, teacher planning	Classroom walkthroughs, PD follow ups	Administration, reading coach
Rtl Strategies	Reading 6-8	Reading Coach	Reading Teachers 6-8	Early Release, teacher planning	Classroom walkthroughs, PD follow ups	Administration, reading coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring Interventions	FCAT Coach	Parental Fundraising	\$3,100.00
			Subtotal: \$3,100.00
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: \$3,100.00

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:

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				

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

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:	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 84% of the students in Middle school achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test. The areas of concern are Algebra and Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 84% of the students in Middle school achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 88% of the students in Middle school will demonstrate mastery on the 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 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.

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 6-8, 44% of students scored Level 4 or above on the 2012 FCAT mathematics Assessment. The Algebra strand was the main area of concern.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 44% out of 390 students in Middle school achieved high mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Test.	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 46% of the students in Middle school will achieve 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

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:	According to the administration of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics assessment, 89% of students made learning gains.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics assessment, 89% of middle school students demonstrated learning gains.	On the 2013 FCAT assessment in mathematics, 91% of students will demonstrate learning gains.

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	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. Data Reports and Carnegie Student Reports.

	individualized instruction for all students. These lesson plans are aligned with the strategies identified in the Instructional Focus Calendar.		
--	---	--	--

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 2012 FCAT Mathematics test 93% of students made learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test 93% of students made learning gains.	Our goal for the 2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation in order to allow for 95% of students in the lowest 25 percent making learning gains.

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	On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics administration it was noted that students had deficiencies in Geometry and Data Analysis.	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 and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments; District BAT 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%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # Our goal is to improve our target AMO progress by 3 percentage points each school year for the next 6 years.					
Baseline data 2010-2011		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
		84	83	86	89	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:	Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.	Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	-	-	-	-	-

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.	Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.

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.	Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in
---	---

Mathematics Goal #5D:	all sub groups.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.	Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.

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:	Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.	Please be advised that we made adequate AMO progress in all sub groups.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	Based on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC 48% (11) students scored in the top 3rd.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC 48% (11) students scored in the top 3rd.	Our goal is to have 52% of our students score in the top 3rd on the 2013 Algebra EOC.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Based on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC 48% (11) students scored in the top 3rd.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC 48% (11) students scored in the top 3rd.	Our goal for the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC is to have 52% of our students score in the top 3rd.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal #					
	3A : <input style="width: 100%; height: 40px;" type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
---	--

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

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:	Based on the 2012 Geometry EOC 74% of students scored at a level 3 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Geometry EOC 74% of students scored at a level 3 or higher.	Our goal for the 2013 Geometry EOC is to have 77% of students score at a level of 3 or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	Based on the 2012 Geometry EOC 29% of students scored at a level 4.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Geometry EOC 29% of students scored at a level 4.	Our goal for the 2013 Geometry EOC is for 35% of students to score at a level 4.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Geometry Goal # 3A : <input type="text"/>			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
Differentiated instruction	Math grades 6-8	Math Coach	Math teachers grades 6-8	Early Release, Teacher Planning days	Classroom Walkthroughs, PD follow ups	Administration and Math Coach
Common Core Training	Math grades 6-8	Math Coach	Math teachers grades 6-8	Early Release, Teacher Planning days	Classroom Walkthroughs, PD follow ups	Administration and Math Coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring Interventions	FCAT Coach	Parental Fundraising	\$3,100.00
			Subtotal: \$3,100.00
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: \$3,100.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Science Contact will collaborate with teams to embed effective science instructional strategies for the 2012-2013 school year. Based on FCAT the 2012 data our students scored 51% level 3. Our goal is to have our students achieve a 64% proficiency on the 2011-2012 FCAT Science test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 51% of our students in Middle school achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test.	Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 55% of the students in Middle school will achieve mastery on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science 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 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	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:

Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards, 15% out of students in elementary school achieved high mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Science by scoring a level 4 or 5.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards, 15% out of students in elementary school achieved high mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test by scoring a level 4 or 5.

Given instruction based on the FCAT Standards 20% of the students in elementary school achieved high mastery on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Test.

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
Tutoring Interventions	FCAT Coach	Parental Fundraising	\$3,100.00
			Subtotal: \$3,100.00
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: \$3,100.00

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.		Based on the 2011 data analysis from the FCAT Florida Writes, our eighth grade students scored 99%.			
Writing Goal #1a:		Our anticipation is that our students show an increase of 1% on meeting high standards			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
99% of students tested received a 3.5 or above according to the 2010-2011 Florida Write.		100% of students will obtain a 3.5 or better on the 201-2012 FCAT Writes.			
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 applicational practices of the Four Square Model curriculum for our under achieving students.	Increase the application process of the Four Square Model, Provide coaching to all new teachers.	Reading Coach, Writing Teachers, Administration.	Student writing assessments ,Stop Drop and test data and Formal observation on best practices will be reviewed randomly by the Reading Coach.	Pre-Post Test Writing Samples, Mini 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 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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	Our attendance rate was 97.5% for the 2012 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
98.02%	Increase the school attendance rate by 1%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
51 students out of 395 students were noted as having excessive absences.	Our 2013 goal will be centered around decreasing our excessive absences by 1%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
58 students were considered to have excessive tardies at Somerset Miramar	Decrease of 1% in excessive tardies.
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	Increase the attendance rate by incorporating an Attendance Review Committee	Random attendance monitoring by attendance clerk.	Attendance Clerk and Administration.	Attendance Data	Annual attendance 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						

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

1. Suspension

Suspension Goal # 1:	Based on the data Warehouse information Somerset Miramar had 12 students on In-door Suspension.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
12 Students out of 395 students.	Decrease of 1% in Middle School.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
12 Students out of 395 students.	Decrease of 1% in Middle School.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
11 students were placed on Out of School Suspension.	Decrease of 1% of Middle school students will be placed on Out-of-School Suspension.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
11 students were placed on Out of School Suspension.	Decrease of 1% of Middle school students will be placed on Out-of-School Suspension.

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	Infuse a new progressive Disciplinary Plan for Middle school students.	Conduct meetings with the Discipline Committee once a month to review student behavioral issues.	Administration	Annual Disciplinary meetings with committee members	Disciplinary 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:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		Based on collection data, an average of 38% of our parents participated in Parent Universities at Somerset Miramar.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
Based on collection data, an average percentage of 38% of our parents participated in Parent Universities at Somerset.		We are expecting an increase in Parent Universities participation by 20%.			
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	Demanding job requirements for our parents.	Provide Parent Universities on the weekends.	Administration	Parent Sign- Ins	Parent Surveys

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 progress.	Formative: School site biweekly assessments. Summative: 2012 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)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. CTE				
CTE Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

No Data Submitted

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Tutoring Interventions	FCAT Coach	Parental Fundraising	\$3,100.00
Mathematics	Tutoring Interventions	FCAT Coach	Parental Fundraising	\$3,100.00
Science	Tutoring Interventions	FCAT Coach	Parental Fundraising	\$3,100.00
				Subtotal: \$9,300.00
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: \$9,300.00

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

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The major activities will include parent universities to help bridge resources and knowledge between school and home as well as actively monitoring the SIP to ensure success of interventions and progress.

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 MIDDLE (MI RAMAR CAMPUS) 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	82%	88%	97%	62%	329	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	69%	82%			151	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	73% (YES)	89% (YES)			162	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					642	
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 MIDDLE (MI RAMAR CAMPUS) 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	76%	96%	46%	295	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	75%	79%			154	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	78% (YES)	78% (YES)			156	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					605	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested