FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MATER BRICKELL PREPARATORY ACADEMY

District Name: Dade

Principal: Robert Blanch/Sheila Gonzalez

SAC Chair: Vivian del Valle

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvhalo

Date of School Board Approval: PENDING

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012



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	Sheila Caleo	Early Childhood Ed. B.A. Elementary Ed. B.A. ESOL Endorsement Educational Leadership M.A.	2	2	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A B CHANGE TO AMO High Standards – Rdg 76% 91% 91% 87% 84% High Standards – Math 78% 93% 91% 77% 81% High Standards - Writing 100% 88% 60% 92% 86% High Standards-Science 64% 80% 60% 34% 53% Learning Gains – Reading 83% 81% 60% 80% 65% Learning Gains – Math 93% 84% 60 % 50% 68% Lowest 25% -Reading 83% 83% 60% 84% 40% Lowest 25% - Math 93% 93% 60% 55% 57%

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)
N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A

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	Professional Development	Principal	On going through 2012- 2013 school year	
2	Common planning time	Principal	On going through 2012- 2013 school year	
3	Provide new teachers with mentors	Principal	August 20, 2012	

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
31%(1)	Teacher is on a waiver for ESOL. She will take courses within the allotted time.

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 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers		% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
8	37.5%(3)	37.5%(3)	25.0%(2)	0.0%(0)	25.0%(2)	87.5%(7)	12.5%(1)	12.5%(1)	87.5%(7)

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	Rationale	Planned Mentoring
	Assigned	for Pairing	Activities
		Ms. Del Valle is paired with	The mentor and mentee

Vivian Del Valle	Stephanie Perez	the following teacher because she has extensive knowledge in the core subject areas.	are meeting weekly to discuss monthly best practices and evidence based strategies for each domain. Time is given for the feedback, coaching and planning.
Elizabeth Toledo	Jacqueline Baez	Ms. Toledo is paired with the following teacher because she has extensive knowledge in the core subject areas.	The mentor and mentee are meeting weekly to discuss monthly best practices and evidence based strategies for each domain. Time is given for the feedback, coaching and planning.
Jennifer Gonzalez	Nicole Kanaar	Ms. Gonzalez is paired with the following teacher because she has extensive knowledge in the core subject areas	The mentor and mentee are meeting weekly to discuss monthly best practices and evidence based strategies for each domain. Time is given for the feedback, coaching and planning.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

programs, roughly programs, roughly additional outside and tools and tools and tools and tools are programs, and approaches
Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs

Head Start	
Adult Education	
Career and Technical Education	
Job Training	
Other	

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The Mater MTSS/RtI Team is comprised of administration, faculty, and staff.

Principal: The principal will provide a common vision for the use of the data based decision making. The principal will ensure that the school based team is implementing RtI, provide support and schedule professional development to support RtI. The principal will also communicate with parents regarding RtI plans and activities.

General Education Teachers: Participate in student data collection and employ intervention strategies.

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 MTSS/RTI team will meet monthly to discuss, review, and analyze data. They will also discuss how data driven instruction is impacting the performance of the students at the school. The team will discuss interventions being implemented by the teachers as well as strategies being used to strengthen weak content clusters.

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?

Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The MTSS/RtI leadership team will meet with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team will discuss goals, areas of need and align procedure.

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.

Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)

Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Scores from district stated averages

Interim Assessment Test

Edusoft data

Behavior: Teachers keep anecdotal records of student behavior

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI leadership team will provide professional development through best practices during common teacher planning times, grade level meetings, and monthly faculty meetings. In addition, teachers will be provided with professional development to correspond with the subject area they are teaching.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS Team at Mater Grove will be supported through the effective and actively involved leadership that provides connections between the MTSS Framework with District/School Mission Statements to ensure alignment and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels. The MTSS will have ongoing facilitation to support planning, implementation, and evaluating effectiveness of services through the use of problem-solving process. The MTSS will collaboratively form partnerships with all stakeholders who would benefit with increases in student outcomes. The MTSS will use data from state and district assessments to support decision making. The school will provide coaching support to assist school and staff problem solving efforts and provide professional development to assist teachers in aligning student goals and staff needs. The MTSS will communicate outcomes and celebrate successes frequently.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The LLT will be comprised of the principal (Sheila Caleo-Gonzalez), ESE Liason (Natalie Lara) and Lead Teacher (Vivian del Valle).

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

The LLT will meet monthly to review data and make program decisions. Reading teachers will model effective strategies, provide professional development and assist with monitoring progress and differentiated instruction. The principal will meet with the LLT regularly to discuss and plan professional development as well as district and state reading requirements.

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

The LLT will focus on utilizing the PMRN to determine accommodations in order to best impact student achievement. Data from interim assessments and FAIR will be utilized to address areas of need and guide instructional and intervention planning.

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.

Mater Grove will ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student by implementing reading instructions and applying reading strategies through all content areas. Teachers of all subject areas will attend professional development on incorporating reading into their subject area. Administration will monitor implementation.

*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?

Postsecondary	Transition	
Note: Required for	High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.	
Describe strategie Feedback Report	s for improving student readiness for the public postseco	ndary level based on annual analysis of the High School

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.

Reading Goal #1a:

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 40%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

40%(25)

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	1A.1. 1.1 The area of deficiency in Grade 3, as noted on the 2012administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting category 2-Reading Application	appropriate texts that	1A.1. MTSS/RTI Team	!	1A.1. 1.1. Formative: FAIR computer assisted Program, CAP reports generated from FCAT Explorer, FCAT Test Maker Pro Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment .

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.
Reading Goal #1b:

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

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.

Based on the results of the 2012FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment, 35% of our students achieved levels 4 and 5 Proficiency.

Cour goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 36%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

36% (23)

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	2A.1. 2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting category 2-Reading Application.	2A.1. 2.1. Use grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining or explaining. The author's perspective should be recognizable in text. Students should focus on what the author thinks and feels. Main idea may be stated or implied. Students should be able to identify causal relationships imbedded in text. Students must be familiar with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Provide practice in identifying topics and themes within texts. Students will also use FCAT Explorer and FCAT Task	2A.1. 2.1. Principal, Department Chair	2A.1. 2.1. Review students' formative biweekly assessment data reports from assessments which include FCAT Explorer, Interim Assessments, and teacher created tests to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	2A.1. 2.1. Formative: FAIR, FCAT Explorer, and Achieve 3000. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment

cards. Sixth grade teachers will differentiate reading instruction using Achieve 3000.		
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

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 Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring 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: Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment, 83% of our students made learning gains. 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains to 88%. Reading Goal #3a: Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 83% (19) 88% (20) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy 3A.1. 3A.1. 3A.1. 3A.1. 3A.1. The area of deficiency 3.1. MTSS/RTI Team Review formative 3.1. Formative: as noted on the 2012 Use grade-level biweekly assessment FAIR FCAT Explorer, and admin of the FCAT appropriate texts that data reports to ensure Reading test was include identifiable progress is being made Success Maker, Reading Plus, FCAT Reporting category 2author's purpose for and adjust instruction Reading Application. writing, including as needed. Test Maker Pro. informing, telling a story, conveying a particular Summative: Results from 2013 mood, entertaining or explaining. The author's FCAT Reading perspective should be Assessment

recognizable in text.

	Students should focus on	
	what the author thinks	
	and feels. Main idea may	
	be stated or implied.	
	Students should be able	
	to identify causal	
	relationships imbedded in	
	text. Students must be	
	familiar with text	
1	structures such as	
	cause/effect,	
	compare/contrast, and	
	chronological order.	
	Provide practice in	
	identifying topics and	
	themes within texts.	
	Supplemental instruction	
	will be provided through	
	Success Maker daily for	
	30 minutes based on tier.	
	Students	
	will also use FCAT	
	Explorer and FCAT Task	
	cards. Sixth grade	
	teachers will differentiate	
	reading instruction using	
	Achieve 3000. Teachers	
	will use FCAT Test Maker	
	Pro passages and Time	
	for Kids magazine to	
	boost achievement in this	
	area.	

Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the following the followin		ta, and refer	ence to "Gi	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in need
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.					
Reading Goal #3b:					
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Ехр	ected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		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:

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains to 88%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

4A.1. 4.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting category 2- Reading Application. 1	03%	(n<30)				88% (n<	30)			
Anticipated Barrier Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responsible for Monitoring 4A.1. 4A.1. 4A.1. Utilize grade level appropriate texts that include identifiable authors purpose for writing including including and/or explaining using differentiated instruction. Supplemental intervention will be differed through Success Maker computer based program daily for 30 minutes. Voyager and Reading Eggs will be used in grades K-2. Reading Plus will be used in grades K-2. Reading Research Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Baseline data 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2016 improvement for the following subgroup: Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Gulding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Gulding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Gulding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Gulding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Gulding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Gulding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Gulding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup:			P	roblem-Sol	ving Process	to Increase	Student	Achievem	ent	
## A.1. Tream The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the ECAT Reading fest was Reporting category 2. Reading Application. Reading Application. ### Application of the 2012 administration of the ECAT Reading fest was Reporting category 2. Reading Application. ### Application of the ECAT Reading fest was Reporting category 2. Reading Application. ### Application of the ECAT Reading fest was Reporting category 2. Reading Application. ### Application of the ECAT Reading Fest was Reporting at the ECAT Reading Language and administration of the ECAT Reading Language and administration of the ECAT Reading Language and administration will be offered through Success Maker computer based program daily for 30 minutes. Voyager and Reading Eggs will be used in grades 3-6. Teachers will implement literacy activities from Florida Center for Reading Research #### Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Season of the analysis of student achievement gap by 50%. ### Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: ### Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: ### Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: ### Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: #### Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: #### Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area of improvement for the following subgroup: #### Based on the		Anticipate	ed Barrier	Stı	rategy	Position Responsib	on ole for	Dete Effectiv	ermine veness of	Evaluatio
SA. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Baseline data 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2010-2011 Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas 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:	1	4.1. The area of do as noted on the administration FCAT Reading Reporting cate	he 2012 n of the g test was egory 2-	Utilize grad appropriate include idea author's puwriting incluinforming, convey a particular rentertaining explaining udifferentiat Supplemen intervention offered the Maker comprogram daminutes. Ver Reading Egin grades Kelus will be grades 3-6 implement activities from Center for	e texts that ntifiable urpose for uding telling a story mood, g, and/or using ted instruction tal n will be rough Success ally for 30 oyager and gs will be use (-2. Reading a used in Teachers will literacy for Florida	4a.1. 4.1. MTSS/I Team	2 RTI 2 F k c	4a.1. 4.1. Review form biweekly as: data reports brogress is l and adjust i	native sessment s to ensure peing made	
School will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Baseline data 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2010-2011 Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas 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:	5A. A	Ambitious but A	achievable A	ınnual	1		Os), AMO)-2, Readin	g and Math Pe	erformance
Baseline data 2010-2011 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2010-2011 Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas 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:	111/1000	ol will reduce th								
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:	schoo	170.			I5A :I					
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:	by 50	eline data	1-2012	2012-2013		4 20)14-2015	20	015-2016	2016-2
Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	by 50	eline data	1-2012 :	2012-2013		4 20)14-2015	20	015-2016	2016-2
2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:	Base	eline data 0-2011 201 d on the analys	sis of studer	nt achieveme	2013-20					
	Base of im 5B. S Hisp satis	d on the analys provement for to Student subgroanic, Asian, Ar	sis of studer the following oups by eth merican In- ess in read	nt achieveme g subgroup: hnicity (Wh	2013-20 ent data, and nite, Black,					
	Base 201 Base of im 5B. S Hisp satis Reac	d on the analyst provement for the Student subgroanic, Asian, Artifactory progressing Goal #5B:	sis of studer the following oups by eth merican In- ess in read	nt achieveme g subgroup: hnicity (Wh adian) not m	2013-20 ent data, and nite, Black,	reference to "	Guiding (Questions",	identify and	

school will red by 50%.	uce their achie	vement gap	5A :			▽		
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
	analysis of stud		ent data, and refere	nce to "Guiding Ques	tions", identify and	define areas in need		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:								
2012 Current	Level of Perf	ormance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
		Problem-Sol	ving Process to In	crease Student Ach	ilevement			

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		lata, and refer	ence to "G	fulding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in nee
5C. English Language L satisfactory progress i		aking			
Reading Goal #5C:					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		lata, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need
5D. Students with Disal satisfactory progress in		king			
Reading Goal #5D:					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		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:

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		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
Common Core State Standards	K-6	FLDOE	Leadership Team	June 25-28, 2012	Follow up assignment	Principal
Melissa Forney Workshop	K-6	Angie Ramos	Reading/Language Arts Teachers	August 14-15, 2012	Follow up assignment, implementation of strategies learned at workshop	Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s))/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.1	Time for Kids	FTE	\$1,278.00
3.1, 4.1, 5.1	Florida Ready	FTE	\$1,600.00
			Subtotal: \$2,878.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
3.1	Achieve 3000	FTE	\$2,000.00
3.1	Success Maker	FTE	\$6,000.00
4.1	Reading Eggs	FTE	\$677.18
4.1	Reading Plus	FTE	\$4,000.00
1.1, 3.1	Test Maker Pro	FTE	\$832.00
		-	Subtotal: \$13,509.18
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
4.1, 5.1	After School Tutoring	FTE	\$4,800.00
			Subtotal: \$4,800.00
			Grand Total: \$21 187 18

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. Based on the results of the 2012 CELLA 46% of our students are proficient in Listening/Speaking. CELLA Goal #1: 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: 46%(23) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy 1.1. MTSS/RTI 1.1. Students have 1.1.Reviw CELLA score 1.1. Increase student 1.1. limited opportunities to opportunities for Formative: reports practice listening/speaking by Classroom listening/speaking including ESOL Assessments English at home. strategies such as Language Experience Approach, Repetition, Summative: CELLA and Role playing.

Stude	Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. Based on the results of the 2012 CELLA 34% of our students are proficient in reading.					A 34% of our	
2012	Current Percent of Stu	idents Proficient in read	ding:			
34%	(17)					
	Prol	blem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	2.1. Students have limited vocabulary due	2.1. Improve reading skills by incorporating a	2.1. MTSS/RTI	2.1. Review CELLA score reports, Interim	2.1. Formative:	

	to limited English	variety of ESOL	assessment score	Classroom
	Proficiency.	strategies such as	reports, weekly	Assessments
1		activating prior	benchmark assessment	
		knowledge, picture	results. Adjust	
		walks,	instruction as needed.	Summative:
		predictions, QAR's,		CELLA
		using task cards.		

Stude	Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. St	3. Students scoring proficient in writing.					
CELL	A Goal #3:					
2012	Current Percent of Stu	dents Proficient in writ	ing:			
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	3.1 Students have poor command of language due to limited English proficiency. Students show a weakness in sentence structure and organization of ideas.	3.1. Use personal journals, reader's response journals, and shared writing.	3.1. MTSS/RTI	3.1. Analyze monthly writing prompt results. Adjust instruction as needed.	3.1. Formative: Monthly writing prompts. Summative: CELLA	

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program	n(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 Developme	nt		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

	on the analysis of st provement for the follo		achievement data, and group:	refer	ence to "Gu	iding	Questions", identify	and c	define areas in need
math	CAT2.0: Students so ematics. ematics Goal #1a:	oring	g at Achievement Level	3 in	Assessmen 3 Proficiend Our goal fo	t ind cy. r the	erage of the 2012 FCA licate that 28, % of si e 2012-2013 school ye ency by 4 percentage	tuder ear is	its achieved a Level to increase Level 3
2012	Current Level of Pe	rform	nance:				d Level of Performar		
28%(28%(10)			32% (11)					
		Pro	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease Sti	uder	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barri	ier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible Monitoring	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1			y	.1. SS/RTI Tear	m	1A.1. Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensur progress and adjust curriculum focus bason data reports. Provide time during department grade leve meetings to share be practices and reflect additional needs.	ed /el est	1A.1. FCAT Test Maker Pro Bi-weekly assessment results, district interim reports, IXL reports. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT	
	on the analysis of st provement for the follo		: achievement data, and group:	refer	ence to "Gu	iding	Questions", identify	and c	define areas in need
	lorida Alternate Ass ents scoring at Leve		nent: 5, and 6 in mathematio	CS.					
Math	ematics Goal #1b:								
2012	2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expe	ectec	d Level of Performar	nce:	
		Dre	oblom Solving Process	+0.1	neroace St.	udo:	nt Achievement		
		Pr(oblem-Solving Process			uuer	n achievement		
Antic	cipated Barrier S	Strate	egy F f	Posit Resp for	onsible	Dete Effe	cess Used to ermine ectiveness of etegy	Eval	uation 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: The district average of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Assessment indicate that 28, % of students achieved a Level Level 4 in mathematics. 3 Proficiency. Mathematics Goal #2a: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage point to 30%. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 28% (9) 30% (11) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy 2.A.1. 2.A.1. 2.A.1. Students 2.A.1. MTSS/RTI Team demonstrate a weakness The student will Conduct bi-weekly Formative: FCAT in the Reporting Category participate in assessments and Test Maker Pro Biof Geometry and mathematical exploration review data to ensure weekly assessment results, Measurement. using Gizmo's. Grade 6 progress and adjust will use Holt McDougal curriculum focus based district interim Enrichment Resources. on data reports. reports. Conduct bi-weekly Summative: Provide time during assessments on targeted department grade level Results from 2013 FCAT benchmarks that include meetings to share best practices and reflect on Mathematics questions of higher additional needs. complexity, through test Assessment generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro. 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 Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Responsible Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring

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:

No Data Submitted

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			The district average of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 68, % of students achieved a Level 3 Proficiency.			
Math	Mathematics Goal #3a:			e 2012-2013 school year is ving learning gains by 5 pe		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:			
68% (68% (24)					
	Pr	roblem-Solving Process	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	3A.1. Students demonstrate a weakness in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement.	3A.1. Manipulatives will be used to provide opportunities for exploration and investigation of geometry and measurement concepts reinforce math concepts. Provide skill maintenance and reinforcement through IXL, a web based program. Conduct biweekly assessments on targeted benchmarks through test generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro. The student will participate in mathematical exploration using Gizmo's. Grade 6 will use Holt McDougal Enrichment Resources. Conduct bi-weekly assessments on targeted benchmarks that include questions of higher complexity, through test generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro.	3A.1. MTSS/RTI Team	3A.1. Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs.	3A.1. Formative: Biweekly assessments, district interim reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment	
	I on the analysis of studen provement for the following	t achievement data, and reg group:	eference to "Guidino	g Questions", identify and	define areas in need	
	lorida Alternate Assessn entage of students makir					
	ematics.	-				
Math	ematics Goal #3b:					
2012	Current Level of Perforn	mance:	2013 Expected	d 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: Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test, 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% 66% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. making learning gains in mathematics. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the Mathematics Goal #4: lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 66% (23) 71% (25) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy 4A.1. Students 4A.1. 4A.1 4A.1. 4A.1. demonstrate a weakness Students will be MTSS/RTI Team Conduct bi-weekly Formative: identified for intervention in the Reporting Category assessments and Biweekly of Geometry and based on data from review data to ensure assessments, Measurement. baseline assessments and progress and adjust district interim early intervention will be curriculum focus based reports, IXL made available after on data reports. reports. school twice a week for 1 Provide time during Summative: hour using Common Core department grade level Results from 2013 Coach. Provide meetings to share best **FCAT** interventions through IXL practices and reflect on Mathematics 3 times a week for 20 additional needs. Assessment minutes.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Our goal is to increase the proportion of students scoring _ Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year at levels 3 and above and to reduce the proportion of school will reduce their achievement gap students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years by 50%. 5A (by 2016-2017) using 2010-2011 as the baseline year.. Baseline data 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2017 2010-2011 73 78 76 81 83

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:

No Data Submitted Responsible for the following subgroup: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible for the following subgroup: No Data Submitted Person or Position Responsible for the following subgroup: No Data Submitted Person or Position Responsible for the following subgroup: No Data Submitted Person or Position Responsible for the following subgroup: No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Responsible for the following subgroup: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Person or Position Responsible for the following subgroup: 2014 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Determine Evaluation Too Det	2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	mance:
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible for Submitted Responsible for Submitted Responsible for Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Responsible for Submitted Person or Position Responsible for Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Responsible for Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible for Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible for Strategy Responsible for Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy Responsible Submitted Responsible Submitted Person or Position Responsible Submitted Person or Position Responsible Submitted Person or Position Responsible Submitted Responsible Submitted Submit						
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible for Submitted Responsible for Submitted Responsible for Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Responsible for Submitted Person or Position Responsible for Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Responsible for Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible for Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible for Strategy Responsible for Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy Responsible Submitted Responsible Submitted Person or Position Responsible Submitted Person or Position Responsible Submitted Person or Position Responsible Submitted Responsible Submitted Submit		Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Responsible frectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible frectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible frectiveness of Strategy Responsible frectiveness of Strategy Responsible frectiveness of Strategy Responsible for Str		Troblem-solving	, 1100033 10 1	Tici case c	rtadent Acmevement	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Wathematics Goal #5C: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Wathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Too Determine Too Det	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Positi Resp for	tion oonsible	Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
of improvement for the following subgroup: SC. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: 2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Fractiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Fractiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Evaluation Toc Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Evaluation Toc Evaluation Toc Evaluation Toc Guiding Process Used Toc Evaluation Toc Evaluat			No Data	Submitted		
of improvement for the following subgroup: 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Frectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Person or Position Responsible Person or Position Responsible Frectiveness of Evaluation Toc Evaluation To						
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Pased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Wathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Process Used to Determine Entertaine Evaluation Too Strategy Process Used to Determine Evaluation Too Strategy Process Used to Determine Evaluation Too Experimence Strategy Person or Process Used to Determine Evaluation Too Experimence Evaluation Too Evaluation Too Experimence Evaluation Too Experimence Evaluation Too Evaluation			data, and refer	rence to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in n
2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Wathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Evaluation Toc Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Evaluation Toc Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Strategy			aking			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Process Used to Determine and the process of Evaluation Too Strategy Person or Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Too Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Too Strategy Person or Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Too Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Too Strategy	Mathematics Goal #50	ii				
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Too	2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforr	mance:
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Process Used to Determine Evaluation Too						
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Too						
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Date of Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Strategy Evaluation Toc Date of Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Date of Strategy Evaluation Toc Date of Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toc Date of Strategy		Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	itudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Strategy No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Responsible Responsible Reflectiveness of Evaluation Toology Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toology Evaluation Toology Evaluation Toology Evaluation Toology Evaluation Toology Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Toology Evaluatio					Process Used to	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Responsible Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Too	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp for	onsible	Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
of improvement for the following subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Fifectiveness of Evaluation Tool			No Data	Submitted		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Process Used to Determine Responsible Effectiveness of Evaluation Too	1					
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Mathematics Goal #5D: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Person or Position Responsible Responsible Person or Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Evaluation Too			data, and refer	rence to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in n
2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Process Used to Determine Responsible Effectiveness of Evaluation Too			king			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Process Used to Determine Responsible Effectiveness of Evaluation Too	Mathematics Goal #5D):				
Person or Position Process Used to Determine Evaluation Too	2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforr	mance:
Person or Position Process Used to Determine Evaluation Too						
Person or Position Process Used to Determine Evaluation Too		Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responsible Process Used to Determine Evaluation Too			·		1	
for Strategy	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	tion oonsible	Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted						

Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, llowing subgroup:	and refer	ence to "Gı	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Ехр	ected Level of Performa	ince:
	Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Posi Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for		for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.

The district average of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 28, % of students achieved a Level 3 Proficiency.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage point to 32 %.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

28%(10)

28%(11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

		3			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Students demonstrate a weakness in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement.	·		1A.1. Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs.	1A.1. FCAT Test Maker Pro Bi-weekly assessment results, district interim reports, IXL reports. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment

		Test Maker Pro.						
	on the analysis of s rovement for the fol	tudent achievement d lowing group:	ata, and ref	ference to "Gi	uiding (Questions", identif	y and c	define areas in need
1b. Fl	orida Alternate As	sessment:						
Stude	ents scoring at Lev	els 4, 5, and 6 in ma	thematics.					
Mathe	ematics Goal #1b:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Ехр	ected I	Level of Perform	ance:	
		Problem-Solving	Process to	Increase St	tudent	Achievement		
Antic	ipated Barrier	Strategy	Pos Res for	rson or sition sponsible nitoring	Deter	tiveness of	Eval	uation Tool
			No Dat	a Submitted				

benchmarks through test generated with FCAT

of improvement for the following group:

Measurement.

	2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.			The district average of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 28, % of students achieved a Leve 3 Proficiency.				
Mathematics Goal #2a:				Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage point to 30%.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expected	Level of Performance:			
28% (9)				30% (11)				
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process t	to I i	ncrease Studer	nt Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Re	Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	2.A.1. Students demonstrate a weakness in the Reporting Category of Geometry and		2.A MT	1. SS/RTI Team	2.A.1. Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure	2.A.1. Formative: FCAT Test Maker Pro Bi- weekly assessment		

progress and adjust

Provide time during

on data reports.

additional needs.

curriculum focus based

department grade level

meetings to share best

practices and reflect on

results, district interim

reports.

FCAT

Summative:

Mathematics

Assessment

Results from 2013

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

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:

using Gizmo's. Grade 6

will use Holt McDougal

Enrichment Resources.

assessments on targeted

benchmarks that include

complexity, through test

Conduct bi-weekly

questions of higher

generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro.

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-Solvi	ing Process to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No Data S	Submitted			

	I on the analysis of studen provement for the following	t achievement data, and reg group:	eference to "Guiding	g Questions", identify and	define areas in need		
	CAT 2.0: Percentage of s s in mathematics.	tudents making learning		The district average of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 68, % of students achieved a Level 3 Proficiency.			
Math	ematics Goal #3a:			e 2012-2013 school year is ring learning gains by 5 pe			
2012	Current Level of Perforn	nance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:			
68%	(24)		73% (25)				
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process t	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Ro		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	3A.1. Students 3A.1. 3A.		3A.1. MTSS/RTI	Team 3A.1. Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs.	3A.1. Formative: Biweekly assessments, district interim reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment		

	assessments on targeted benchmarks that include questions of higher complexity, through test generated with FCAT Test Maker Pro.		
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

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

Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test, 66% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to71%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Person or Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		4A.1. Students will be identified for intervention based on data from baseline assessments and early intervention will be made available after school twice a week for 1 hour using Common Core Coach. Provide interventions through IXL 3 times a week for 20 minutes.		progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide time during department grade level meetings to share best	4A.1. Formative: Biweekly assessments, district interim reports, IXL reports. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six school will reduce their achievement gby 50%. Baseline data 2011-2012 2012-2	year ap 5A	at levels students	is to s 3 an scori	o increa nd above ing at l	se the present and to r		a+udo		
Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six school will reduce their achievement g by 50%. Baseline data 2011-2012 2012-2	5A 013	at levels students (by 2016-	s 3 an scori	nd above ing at l	and to r		a+11da		
2010-2011 2011-2012 2012-2		2013-2014			is to increase the proportion of students scoring 3 and above and to reduce the proportion of scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years 2017) using 2010-2011 as the baseline year.				
73 76			4	2014	-2015	2015-2016)	2016-2017	
		78		81		83			
Based on the analysis of student achie of improvement for the following subgr		data, and re	eferenc	ce to "Gu	iding Ques	tions", identify	and de	efine areas in need	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) i satisfactory progress in mathemat	not maki								
Mathematics Goal #5B:									
2012 Current Level of Performance	:		20	013 Exp∈	ected Leve	l of Performar	nce:		
Problem	ı-Solvinç	g Process to	o I ncr	rease Sti	udent Ach	ievement			
Anticipated Barrier Strategy	nticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp for			ion Determine Effectiveness of		е	Evaluation Tool		
		No Da	ata Sub	omitted					
Based on the analysis of student achie of improvement for the following subgr		data, and re	eferenc	ce to "Gu	iding Ques	tions", identify	and de	efine areas in need	
5C. English Language Learners (ELI satisfactory progress in mathemat		aking							
Mathematics Goal #5C:									
2012 Current Level of Performance	:		20	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
Problem	n-Solvinç	g Process to	o Incr	rease Sti	udent Ach	ievement			
Anticipated Barrier Strategy		Po Re for	erson o osition espons or onitori	n sible	Process U Determin Effectiver Strategy	е	Evalu	uation Tool	
		No Da	ata Sub	omitted					

5D. Students with Disa	abilities (SWD) not mak	ing			
satisfactory progress		-			
Mathematics Goal #5[D:				
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S ⁻	tudent Achievement	
		Perso Posit		Process Used to	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp for	onsible toring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
			Submitted	1	
Based on the analysis o	of student achievement da	ata, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in ne
	idvantaged students no	ot making			
satisfactory progress	in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #5	E:				
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:
	Droblem Solving	Drocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
	Froblem-Solving	FIOCESS TO I	rici ease 3	tudent Achievement	
		Perso Posit		Process Used to	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp for	onsible	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		•
				Food of	Middle School Mathematics (
				Elia Ol	Middle School Mathematics
Igebra End-of-Co	urse (EOC) Goals				
* When using percentages	s, include the number of stud	dents the perce	entage repre	esents (e.g., 70% (35)).	
	of student achievement da	ata, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in ne
of improvement for the		n Algobro			
 Students scoring at Algebra Goal #1: 	t Achievement Level 3 i	n Aigebra.			

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated Barrier	S	trategy		for		Process U Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eval	uation Tool
			No	Data S	Submitted				
Based on the analysis of improvement for the			ent data, and	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and o	define areas in need
2. Students scoring a and 5 in Algebra.	nt or a	above Achieve	ement Level	s 4					
Algebra Goal #2:									
2012 Current Level o	f Per	formance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated Barrier	nticipated Barrier Strategy Posi Resp			Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of		е	Evaluation Tool		
			No		Submitted	1			
Based on Ambitious bu	t Ach	ievable Annual	Measurable (Objecti	ives (AMOs), AMO-2, I	Reading and Ma	ath Pe	rformance Target
3A. Ambitious but Achi Measurable Objectives school will reduce their by 50%.	(AMC	Os). In six year	Algebra Goa	II #					_
Baseline data 2010-2011	2012	2012-2013	2013-2	014	2014	4-2015	2015-2016	5	2016-2017
Based on the analysis of improvement for the			ent data, and	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and o	define areas in nee
3B. Student subgrou Hispanic, Asian, Ame satisfactory progress	rican	Indian) not m							
Algebra Goal #3B:									
2012 Current Level o	f Per	formance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	

	Problem-Solvi	ng Process to Increase S	tudent 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	of student achievemen	t data, and reference to "G	uiding Questions", ider	ntify and define areas in need			

satisfactory progress i	n Algebra.				
Algebra Goal #3C:					
2012 Current Level of I	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforr	mance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Perso Positi Anticipated Barrier Strategy Respo for Monit		ion Determine Effectiveness of		Evaluation Tool	
		No Data S	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the for		ata, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need
3D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress i		king			
Algebra Goal #3D:					
2012 Current Level of I	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

Monitoring

No Data Submitted

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.

of improvement for the following subgroup:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making

Algebra Goal #3E:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	mance:
Problem-Solving Process to				Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
					Fnd of Algebra FOC Goa

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:							
1. Students scoring at	Achievement Level 3 in						
Geometry.							
Geometry Goal #1:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	No	Data S	Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group:	eference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas				
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels4 and 5 in Geometry.Geometry Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

Based on Ambition Target	us but Achievable	e Annual Measurab	ole Ob	jectives (A	MOs), i	AMO-2, Reading a	and Math Performance	
3A. Ambitious but Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six yea reduce their achie 50%.	e Objectives ar school will	Geometry Goal #					<u>*</u>	
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014		2014-20	15	2015-2016	2016-2017	
Based on the anal			and r	reference to	g "Guid	ing Questions", id	lentify and define areas	
3B. Student subg Hispanic, Asian, a satisfactory prog Geometry Goal #	American India gress in Geome	_	k,					
2012 Current Lev	vel of Performa	nce:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problen	n-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent	Achievement		
Anticipated Barr	ier Strategy		Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Determine Effectiveness of		Evaluation Tool	
		No	Data	Submitted				
Based on the anal in need of improve	ysis of student a ement for the fol	achievement data, lowing subgroup:	and r	reference to	"Guid	ing Questions", id	entify and define areas	
3C. English Lang satisfactory prog Geometry Goal #	gress in Geome	(ELL) not making try.	J					
2012 Current Lev	vel of Performa	nce:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

	f student achievement data, for the following subgroup:	and r	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", ic	lentify and define areas
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 Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent 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 n 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 Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade	and/or PLC	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 State Standards	K-6	FLDOE	Leadership Team	June 25-28, 2012	Follow up assignment	Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
2.1	Holt McDougal Course 1	FTE	\$2,457.00
3.1, 4.1	Florida Ready	Internal Account	\$1,600.00
			Subtotal: \$4,057.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
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
3.1	After School Tutoring	FTE	\$4,800.00
<u> </u>			Subtotal: \$4,800.00
			Grand Total: \$8,857.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: On the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment, 56% of students achieved a Level 3. For the 2012-2013 school year, the expected level of 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement performance is 58% achieving proficiency. Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a: Our goal for 2011-2012 school year is to increase the percentage of students is achieving proficiency by 4 percentage points by decreasing the number of students who scored level 1 and 2. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 56% (10) 58% (10) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. 1.1. Based on district data analysis students demonstrated a lack of prior knowledge and exposure to Reporting Category: Earth and Space Sciences	weekly science		1a.1. 1.1. Analyze results of bi-weekly assessments and meet in grade levels to adjust instruction.	1a.1. 1.1. FORMATIVE: Baseline and Interim assessments, science projects, teacher made tests. SUMMATIVE: 2013 FCAT

	of student achievement day vement for the following g		I reference	to "Guiding Question	ns", ident	ify and define	
1b. Florida Alternate Students scoring at L	Assessment: evels 4, 5, and 6 in scie	ence.					
Science Goal #1b:							
2012 Current Level of	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perf	formance	e:	
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievemer	nt		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evalu	uation Tool	
	Ν	No Data S	Submitted				
	of student achievement da vement for the following g		l reference	to "Guiding Question	ns", ident	ify and define	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.			On the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment, 13% of students achieved a Level 4 or 5.				
Science Goal #2a:			For the 2012-2013 school year, the expected goal is 13% of students achieving levels 4 and 5				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
13% (2)			13% (2)				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	On the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment, 13% of students achieved a Level 4 or 5. For the 2012-2013 school year, the expected goal is 13% of students achieving levels 4 and 5				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
13% (2)	13% (2)				

	Prob	lem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	ent Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	demonstrated a lack of	Students will write their observations and	2a.1 2.1. MTSS/RTI Team	2a.1 2.1. Analyze results of bi-weekly assessments and meet in grade levels to adjust instruction.	2a.1 2.1. Summative: Baseline and Interim assessments, science projects, teacher made tests. Formative: 2013 FCAT

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 Proc	cess to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemer	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	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
Common Core State Standards	K-6	FLDOE	Leadership Team	June 25-28, 2012	follow up assignment	Principal
Gizmo's	3-6	Explore Learning Facilitator	Grades 3-6 Science Teachers	August 14, 2012	Follow-up Assignment, Implementation	Principal, Grade Level Chair

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(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 Developm	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:								
3.0 a	CAT 2.0: Students scor nd higher in writing. ng Goal #1a:	ing at Achievement Le	students achie to maintain thi	The 2012 FCAT Writing Assessment indicates 96% of our students achieved a level 4 or higher. The school expects to maintain this level of performance during the 2012-2013 school year.				
2012	Current Level of Perfo	rmance:	2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
96%(24)		96%(24)	96%(24)				
	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	1a.1. 1.1. Students demonstrated a weakness on focus and elaboration in their Writing Process.	1a.1. Students should use a graphic organizer to write a draft organized with a logical sequence of beginning, middle, end and use supporting details to develop focus and elaboration using strategies from Zelda Glazer Writing Institute	1a.1. 1.1. MTSS/RTI Team	1a.1. 1.1. Administer and score students' monthly writing prompts to monitor students progress and to adjust focus as needed.	1a.1. 1.1. Summative: Baseline data. Monthly writing assessments. Formative: 2013 FCAT			

			monthly writing prompts.						
		·		·		·			
	on the analysis of ed of improvement		nt achievement data, a following group:	and r	eference to	o "Gui	iding Questions", id	entify	and define areas
at 4 o	r higher in writin		ment: Students scori	ing					
VVIIIII	ng Goal #1b:								
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Ехр	ected	d Level of Perform	ance	: :	
		Prob	lem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease S	tuder	nt Achievement		
Antic	ipated Barrier	Strate	egy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Dete Effe	ess Used to ermine ctiveness of tegy	Eval	uation Tool
	No Data Submitted								

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

Implement school wide

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
Melissa Forney	K = 6		K-6 Language Arts	August 14-15, 2012	Implementation of	Principal, Grade Level Chairperson
Common Core State Standards	K-6	FLDOE	Leadership Team	June 25-28, 2012	Follow up assignment	Principal

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

* When using percentages	, include the number of studen	ts the	percentage	represents (e.g., 70% (35))).	
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	f student achievement data, for the following group:	and r	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", id	dentify and define areas	
1. Students scoring at	Achievement Level 3 in C	Civics.				
Civics Goal #1:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforn	nance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	f student achievement data, for the following group:	and r	reference to	o "Guiding Questions", ic	dentify and define areas	
2. Students scoring at 4 and 5 in Civics.	or above Achievement Le	evels				
Civics Goal #2:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforn	nance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	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		
	No Data Submitted							

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	m(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 Developme	ent		
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)

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

Mater Grove Academy's Level of Attendance was 96.64%. Our goal this year is to raise our Level of Attendance to a minimum of 97.14%.

In addition, our goal for this year is to reduce the number of students with excessive absences. In the 2011-2012 school year, there were 27students with excessive absences. In 2012-2013, we expect our excessive absences to decrease to at least 26 students.

1. Attendance

Attendance Goal #1:

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

			number of stude 2012 school ye excessive tard	our goal for this year is dents with excessive tal ear, there were3 ies. In 2012-2013, we do ies to decrease to at le	rdies. In the 2011- 6 students with expect our	
2012	2 Current Attendance Ra	ate:	2013 Expecte	ed Attendance Rate:		
96.64	4% (126)		97.14% (126)	97.14% (126)		
	2 Current Number of Stuences (10 or more)	udents with Excessive	2013 Expecte Absences (10	ed Number of Students or more)	s with Excessive	
27			26			
1	2 Current Number of Stu ies (10 or more)	udents with Excessive		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		
36			34	34		
	Prol	blem-Solving Process	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	1.1. Parents plan extended out of town trips during the school year.	Analyze attendance reports and conduct monthly perfect attendance contests. Reward classes with perfect attendance for the month with No Homework Coupons.	1.1. Principal and registrar.	1.1. Review attendance monthly.	1.1. Attendance reports.	
		Homework Coupons. Conduct quarterly perfect attendance				

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

ceremonies.

((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							

Evidence-based Progra	am(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 Developm	nent		
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)

 $^{^{\}star}$ When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference of improvement:	to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need
Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	In the 2011-2012 school year, Mater Grove Academy had 0 indoor and 0 outdoor suspensions. The school's goal is to maintain its current level of suspension for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
N/A	N/A
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In- School
N/A	N/A
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
N/A	N/A
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School
N/A	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
	1.1.	1.1	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.			
1	1.1. Parents and students are unfamiliar with student code of conduct.	1.1. Workshops to make parents familiar with the student code of conduct Implement school wide character education and anti-bullying program.	1.1. Administrative team	1.1. Monitor suspension reports.	1.1. COGNOS reports. ISIS reports. Logs			

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
		Ν	lo Data Submitte	d		

Suspension Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incentives	Perfect attendance certificates and medals.	Internal Account	\$200.00
		•	Subtotal: \$200.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developr	nent		
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: \$200.00

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

	d on the analysis of pare ed of improvement:	nt involvement data, and	d reference to "Gui	ding Questions", identify	and define areas	
1. Pa	1. Parent I nvolvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.				Our goal is to increase the percent of parents involved in school activities to 80%.		
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Expecte	ed Level of Parent Invo	Ivement:	
70% (105)			80% (212)	80% (212)		
	Prol	blem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		1.1. Principal	1.1. Review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school or community events.	1.1. Sign in sheets.		

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		

			<u> </u>
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developmen	nt		
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	d on the analysis of school	ol data, identify and defir	ne areas in need of	improvement:			
			STEM Goal #1:				
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:			5% of students Science Fair.	s will participate in the M	iami-Dade County		
	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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
1	There is a need for professionals prepared for careers in science, technology, engineering and math.	This initiative is being supported by fostering scientific thinking throughout the year and culminating in the students participating in the Miami-Dade science fair. Conduct weekly science labs. Students will also use Gizmo to participate in virtual inquiry based activities. Teachers will implement activities from AIMS curriculum.	Science Fair Committee	Number of participating students in Miami-Dade Science Fair			

(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
Gizmo's		Explore Learning Facilitator	Grade 3-6 Science Teachers			Principal, Grade Level Chair

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(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 Developm	nent		
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, ident	ify and define areas in	n need of improvement:			
1. CTE						
CTE Goal #1:						
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsibl for Monitoring	Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
		No Data Submit	ted			

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
		Ν	lo Data Submitte	d		

CTE Budget:

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 Developm	nent		
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 Pro	ogram(s)/Material(s)			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	1.1	Time for Kids	FTE	\$1,278.00
Reading	3.1, 4.1, 5.1	Florida Ready	FTE	\$1,600.00
Mathematics	2.1	Holt McDougal Course 1	FTE	\$2,457.00
Mathematics	3.1, 4.1	Florida Ready	Internal Account	\$1,600.00
Suspension	Incentives	Perfect attendance certificates and medals.	Internal Account	\$200.00
				Subtotal: \$7,135.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	3.1	Achieve 3000	FTE	\$2,000.00
Reading	3.1	Success Maker	FTE	\$6,000.00
Reading	4.1	Reading Eggs	FTE	\$677.18
Reading	4.1	Reading Plus	FTE	\$4,000.00
Reading	1.1, 3.1	Test Maker Pro	FTE	\$832.00
				Subtotal: \$13,509.18
Professional Develo	opment			
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
Reading	4.1, 5.1	After School Tutoring	FTE	\$4,800.00
Mathematics	3.1	After School Tutoring	FTE	\$4,800.00
				Subtotal: \$9,600.00
				Grand Total: \$30,244.18

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority jn Focus	jn Prevent	j ∩ 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.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
FCAT Tutoring	\$500.00

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

The SAC will assist in the development, implementation, and monitoring of the school improvement plan.

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 No Data Found No Data Found