FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: LIFE SKILLS CENTER MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

District Name: Dade

Principal: Dr. Angel Chaisson and Dannie McMillon

SAC Chair: Munriah Daniel

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/31/2012



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 | Angel Chaisson | BS in Liberal Studies from Louisiana State University, MS in English and MS in Education from Nova Southeastern University, Ed.S. in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University and Doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction from Capella University | 2 | 8 | 12 '11 '10 '09 '08 '07 School Grade n/a A F A A A AYP Y N Y N Y High Standards Rdg. 5 79 24 45 51 76 High Standards Math 30 83 15 88 83 86 Lrng Gains-Rdg. n/a 71 45 54 57 69 Lrng Gains-Math n/a 79 35 85 70 83 Gains-Rdg-25% n/a 72 45 51 61 68 Gains-Math-25% n/a 79 41 87 73 78 |

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) |
|--------------|------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | B.A. in Elementary Ed. | | | 12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A D A A AYP Y N Y N High Standards Rdg. 56 79 35 45 51 |
| Reading | | and Reading Endorsement, ESOL | 1 | 2 | High Standards Math 79 83 43 88 83 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 75 71 53 54 57 Lrng Gains-Ndath 73 79 64 85 70 Gains-Rdg-25% 73 72 62 51 61 Gains-Math-25% 83 79 57 87 73 |

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 | Utilize MDCPS human resources tracking system. | Principal | October1, 2012 | |
| 2 | Soliciting referrals from current HQT employees | Principal | October 1, 2012 | |
| 3 | Solicit resumes through careerbuilders.com, jobing.com, and local university/college career centers. | Principal | August 25, 2012 | |
| 4 | Partnering new teachers with veteran teachers | Principal | September 1, 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 |
|---|---|
| 2 (Teachers are pending wavier for gifted and talented) | The teachers are taking college courses and professional development. The teachers will be assigned a mentor from one of our sister schools, in gifted. |

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 |
|--|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
| 10 | 10.0%(1) | 70.0%(7) | 20.0%(2) | 0.0%(0) | 60.0%(6) | 80.0%(8) | 20.0%(2) | 0.0%(0) | 20.0%(2) |

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 |
| No data submitted | | | |

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

| Title I, Part A | |
|---|--|
| N/A | |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant | |
| N/A | |
| Title I, Part D | |
| N/A | |
| Title II | |
| N/A | |
| Title III | |
| n/a | |
| Title X- Homeless | |
| n/a | |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) | |
| n/A | |
| Violence Prevention Programs | |
| N/A | |
| Nutrition Programs | |
| N/A | |
| Housing Programs | |
| N/A | |
| Head Start | |
| N/A | |
| Adult Education | |
| N/A | |
| Career and Technical Education | |
| N/A | |

| , | ob Training | |
|---|-------------|--|
| | N/A | |
| (| Other | |
| | N/A | |

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The Principal, will provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RTI, conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. The Intervention Specialist coordinates and facilitates the SST process and SST Intervention Plan. The Intervention Specialist will provide support to the principal to ensure that the instructional personnel successfully implements all Rtl goals as it relates to student achievement, interventions, professional development, and all other school based decisions. The General Education Teacher provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. The Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Coordinator, participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching. The Reading Teacher, provides guidance on 9-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans. The Academic Advisor will provide quality services and expertise to link child- serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success, as well as provide academic guidance to students. The Governing Board President completes the team as board and community stakeholder.

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 Leadership team meets bi-weekly every Wednesday with a focus on student achievement and data analysis. At the meeting, we discuss all areas of curriculum and each delegate reports on the latest progress monitoring statistics for their assigned area. After the delegates complete status reporting, we then discuss progress made or lack thereof, and determine what plan of action should be implemented for maintenance and/or improvement. There is constant monitoring of subgroups and all tier students in order to make necessary adjustments. The team also discusses what instructional support will be needed; what professional development will be provided; and what mentoring activities would be beneficial.

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

The RTI Leadership Team along with EESAC defines, analyzes, implements, monitors, and evaluations the School Improvement Plan, from the beginning. Utilizing the RtI Problem-Solving process, the RtI Leadership Team defines the problem by utilizing data in order to determine the problems the school will face in the upcoming year. Upon determining the Problem, the team will analyze the discrepancies within the data in order to determine the underlining causes. The team is then prepared to develop an intervention plan to implement in the School Improvement Plan. Finally, the RtI Leadership Team monitors the student's response to intervention by reviewing student data and evaluates the effectiveness of the plan. Adjustments to the SIP will be made if necessary to ensure student progress.

-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.

The 2012 Spring FCAT Assessment data and the EOC's will be used to identify students in need of RtI implementation. The following technology programs will be used to address student academic needs: Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Pre-Writing Test, Fall IARM, Fall FORF Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation, and EduSoft. In the Midyear: Winter IARM, Winter FORF, and FCAT Writing Test End of year: Spring IARM, Spring FORF, End-of-Year Post-Writing Test, Spring FCAT Frequency of Data Days: once a month for data analysis. Professional Development will be provided as needed throughout the year.

Student behavior needs will be addressed by monitoring the following items: both, the district and school Student Case Management System, detentions, suspensions/expulsions, referrals by student behavior and administrative context. We will also use the student and parent climate surveys, as well as the attendance/retention reports.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the school year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

There will be ongoing facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services by administration and the leadership team. We will create a strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnership with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in the students outcome. Professional development will be provided during teachers' planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the school year.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Dr. Angel Chaisson (Principal), Ms. Roxanne McKay-Chung (ESE Specialist), Ms. Munriah Daniel (Business Teacher), Ms. Nina Nelson (Reading Teacher), Ms Natalie Guerrier (Academic Advisor), Mr. Doreen James (Dean of Discipline), Mr. Ian Buniao (English Teacher), Ms. Jossie Soral (ESE Coordinator / ESOL Coordinator)

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will conduct a needs assessment and analysis of the school data in order to make decisions on how to implement the delivery of instruction to target the student's needs. The LLT will focus its meetings around questions pertaining to the implementation of instruction and intervention strategies. The team will meet on a monthly basis to engage in the following activities: Monitor progress of Level 1 and 2 students in Intensive Reading classes. Monitor the implementation of the Comprehensive Reading Plan throughout the Intensive Reading classes, regular curriculum classes, and developmental ELL classes. Develop and monitor the FCAT tutoring that will be offered to all Level 1, Level 2, ELL, and SWD students. Review progress of all students using Reading Plus, E2020 and Florida Focus, as a supplement to the instruction. Use data from in-house Interim Assessments to determine mastery of benchmarks for all students in Reading. Ensure that the FCAT reading benchmarks will be taught across the curriculum by all teachers throughout the school year. The use of instructional delivery strategies such as; the Socratic Method, reciprocal teaching, teacher model, fluency instruction, reading across the content area curriculum, differentiated instruction and concept mapping are evident within the teacher's lesson plans as well as throughout the professional development calendar. Based on all of the information gathered above, the Literacy Leadership team will determine the professional development and resources needed to optimize instruction and intervention. The Literacy Leadership will focus on the revised goals for writing across the curriculum.

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

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

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment

*Elementary Title | Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*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.

Teaching across the curriculum will be implemented in our school and monitored by administration by conducting classrooms walkthroughs. The Reading Coach and the school's administration will meet with teachers during scheduled department meetings to discuss lesson plan development, data talks, and student's portfolios. By utilizing these tools, all teachers in math, science, and social studies will be able to show evidence of instruction, assessment, and differentiation to address individual student's reading and literacy needs.

*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?

Stellar Leadership Academy offers students a variety of integrated elective courses in the area of business, technology as well as vocational studies which lead to industry certifications and possible internships. Using the 9th grade E-PEP updated information and individualized meetings, the Academic Advisor and/or Employability Specialist and students chose courses that are pertinent to their future career choices; however, the Academic Advisor and Employability Specialist works in the capacity of a CAP advisor, working closely with the students to give them a better understanding of the requirements and needs related to certain career choices.

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

The school utilizes the FLDOE major areas of interest to promote a connection between student, course selection, and future career planning. Students also participate in a job readiness program to assist them preparing and maintaining employment. Using the 9th grade E-PEP updated information and individualized meetings, counselors and students chose courses that are pertinent to their future career choices; however, the Academic Advisor and Employability Specialist works in the capacity of a CAP advisor, working closely with the students to give them a better understanding of the requirements and needs related to certain career choices.

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

In an effort to increase the percentage of students attending post secondary education, the graduation team (Principal, Academic Advisor, Intervention Specialist, and Employability Specialist) will provide increased assistance with post secondary planning. The graduation team will meet monthly to coordinate their efforts. The team will conduct small group meetings to work on career planning tools (CHOICES), ACT and/or SAT registration, and applying for secondary educational institutions and financial aid. The team will continue the relationship with Miami Dade College in orienting students to post secondary education and administer the College Placement Test. Students are encouraged to prepare and take the ACT and SAT and given information on test preparation assistance options.

This year eight students took the ACT and SAT compared to two students last year. Currently all graduates are working on obtaining degrees at several different colleges.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

| | d on the analysis of student provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | g Questions", identify and o | define areas in need | | | |
|-------|--|--------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| readi | CAT2.0: Students scoring ng. ing Goal #1a: | g at Achievement Level 3 | Our goal for the | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 proficiency in reading by 16 percentage points to 21%. | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 5% (4 | 4) | | 21%(18) | | | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
| 1 | An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. Students demonstrate difficulty explaining how to organize, analyze, and evaluate information from multiple sources and draw conclusions. | | Team and Administration. | Administration and the RTI Leadership Team will review the formative assessments (FAIR, student reading assessments and work, district baseline assessment) on a biweekly basis and make adjustments to instruction as needed. District Interim Data reports will be reviewed by ESSAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed. | Formative: Monitor progress through monthly reading assessments (student work); District Interim Assessments; Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR). Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 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: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | |

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

| | Problem-Solving Proce | ss to Increase St | 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 in need of improvement for the following group: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 0% Level 4 in reading. of students achieved level 4 - 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 4-5 student Reading Goal #2a: proficiency by 7 percentage points to 7%. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 0%(0) 7% (6) 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 As noted on the 2012 Provide explicit RTI Leadership Administration and the Formative: Monitor administration of the instruction and practice Team and RTI Leadership Team will progress through FCAT Reading Test areas with strategies such as Administration. review the formative student work samples; District of deficiency included note-taking and assessments (FAIR, Reporting Category 4, summarization skills using student reading Interim Informational Text/ assessments and work, informational texts to Assessments: Research Process and locate specific details district baseline Florida Assessment Reporting Category 3, from different sources assessment) on a bifor Instruction in Literary Analysis. and draw conclusions weekly basis and make Reading (FAIR). from that information. adjustments to instruction as needed. Summative: 2013 The student will explain FCAT 2.0 Reading how text features aid the Assessment. reader's understanding District Interim Data (charts, maps, diagrams) reports will be reviewed by ESSAC at monthly Provide opportunities for meetings and students to identify and adjustments to strategies interpret elements of made as needed. story structure within a text. Help students understand character development and character point of view.

| 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 Proces | s to Increase St | udent Achievement | |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------|--|-----------------|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Responsible | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No | Data Submitted | | |

| | d on the analysis of studer provement for the following | nt achievement data, and re g group: | ference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and o | define areas in need |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | | | Due to limited e | nrollment, current and exportable and our goal is ba | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Perform | mance: | 2013 Expected | Level of Performance: | |
| 68%(| | rablom Solving Process t | 73% (16) | at Achievement | |
| | P | roblem-Solving Process to | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test, learning gains were not achieved. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students demonstrate difficulty analyzing a variety of text structures / text features and explaining their impact/meaning in text. | Students will be provided with opportunities to analyze a variety of text structures (comparison/contrast, cause/effect/chronological order, etc) and explain their impact/meaning in text. Push out and Pull in support will be provided to the students. | Language Arts Teachers | Administration and the RTI Leadership Team will review the formative assessments (FAIR, student reading assessments and work, district baseline assessment) on a biweekly basis and make adjustments to instruction as needed. (Wilson Books will be utilized to provide intervention) | Formative: Monitor progress through monthly reading assessments (student work); District Interim Assessments; Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR). Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.

Reading Goal #3b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% Due to limited enrollment, current and expected goals for the making learning gains in reading. school are not available and our goal is based on district averages. Reading Goal #4: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 60% (19) 70% (22) 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 As noted on the 2012 The students will use RTI Leadership Administration, Formative: Monitor administration of the context clues to Team and Intervention Specialist progress through determine meanings of Administration FCAT Reading test, and the RTI Leadership student work samples; District learning gains were not unfamiliar words with the Team will review the achieved. use of task cards and formative assessments Interim cognates. (FAIR, student reading Assessments; An area of deficiency as assessments and work, Florida Assessment noted on the 2012 The students will district baseline for Instruction in administration of the establish interactive word assessment, Reading (FAIR). computerized based FCAT Reading Test was walls. Reporting Category 1, silent reading assessment Summative: 2013 The students will charts) on a bi-weekly FCAT 2.0 Reading Vocabulary. maintain vocabulary basis and make Assessment Appropriate and timely notebooks with word adjustments to placement of students in banks. instruction as needed. interventions has been an obstacle, as well as The students will utilize District Interim Data the student's lack of FCAT Explorer and Quick reports will be reviewed Reads to build skills and by ESSAC at monthly practice in vocabulary acquisition. accelerate growth in the meetings and adjustments to strategies following areas; fluency, decoding and vocabulary. made as needed.

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | | a 2011-2017 is to tudents by 50%. | reduce the perce | nt of non- |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 22 | 29 | 36 | 43 | 50 | |

| | on the analysis of studen provement for the following | it achievement data, and reg subgroup: | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and | define areas in need | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Hispa satist | tudent subgroups by ethanic, Asian, American Ind factory progress in readi ing Goal #5B: | dian) not making | 19% of student | The results of the 2012-2013 FCAT Reading indicate that 19% of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 8 percentage points to 27%. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | mance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| White Black: Hispa Asian Ameri | 19% nic: : can Indian: | | White: Black: 27% (19) Hispanic: Asian: American Indiar | 1: | | |
| | Pr | roblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test, learning gains were not achieved. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Appropriate and timely placement of students in interventions has been an obstacle, as well as the student's lack of practice in vocabulary acquisition | Students will utilize useful instructional activities such as: graphic organizers, semantic mapping, and summarization activities, to encourage students to build upon their reading skills and to read from a wide variety of text. Students will utilize a variety of strategies such as; vocabulary word maps; word walls; personal dictionaries; instruction in different levels of content-specific words (shades of meaning); reading from a wide variety of texts; instruction in differences in meaning due to context; and engaging in affix or root words. | | Administration and the RTI Leadership Team will review the formative assessments (FAIR, student reading assessments and work, district baseline assessment) on a biweekly basis and make adjustments to instruction as needed. (Wilson Books will be utilized to provide intervention) | Formative: Monitor progress through student work samples; District Interim Assessments; Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR). Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment | |
| | | | | | | |
| | d on the analysis of studen provement for the following | it achievement data, and reg g subgroup: | eference to "Guiding | g Questions", identify and o | define areas in need | |
| | nglish Language Learne factory progress in read | _ | | | | |
| Read | ing Goal #5C: | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and refer of improvement for the following subgroup: | rence to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | |
| Reading Goal #5C: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |
| | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I | ncrease Student Achievement |

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Responsible | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
|---------------------|----------|-------------|--|-----------------|--|
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation To |
|--|---------------|---|--|----------------------|
| | | No Data Submitted | l | |
| Based on the analysis of improvement for the | | t data, and reference to " | Guiding Questions", iden | tify and define are. |
| 5D. Students with Dis satisfactory progress | | naking | | |
| Reading Goal #5D: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | 2013 Ex | spected Level of Perfor | mance: |
| | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvi | ng Process to Increase | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation To |
| | | No Data Submitted | | |

| | | M | onitoring S1 | rategy | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| | | No Da | ata Submitted | | |
| | | | | | |
| | d on the analysis of studen | | eference to "Guidi | ng Questions", identify a | ınd define areas in need |
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | | | (3) of studen achieved pro | f the 2012-2013 FCAT R ts in the Economically Di ficiency. Our goal is to in 1 22 percentage points t | sadvantaged subgroup acrease student |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Perforr | mance: | 2013 Expect | ed Level of Performan | ce: |
| 5% (| (3) | | 27%(14) | 27%(14) | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Stud | ent Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible fo Monitoring | Process Used to Determine r Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test, learning gains were not achieved. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. | Students will utilize useful instructional activities such as: graphic organizers, semantic mapping, and summarization activities, to encourage students to build upon their reading skills and to read from a wide variety of text. Students will utilize a variety of strategies such | | Administration and the RTI Leadership Team review the formative assessments (FAIR, student reading assessments and word district baseline assessment) on a biweekly basis and makadjustments to instruction as needed (Wilson Books will be utilized to provide | will progress through student work samples; District Interim Assessments; Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR). |

| 1 | placement of students in interventions has been an obstacle, as well as the student's lack of practice in vocabulary acquisition | as; vocabulary word maps; word walls; personal dictionaries; instruction in different levels of content-specific words (shades of meaning); reading from a wide variety of texts; instruction in differences in meaning due to | intervention) | |
|---|---|---|---------------|--|
| | | instruction in differences | | |

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 |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| Lesson Planning | 9-12 | Tri- Star/School- based Facilitator | All teachers | August 19th, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs, analysis of lesson plans | Administrator, Assistant Administrator, Reading Coach |
| Reading Endorsement | 9-12 | MDCPS Facilitator | Teacher who are not reading endorsed | · · | Submission of completion of endorsements | Professional Development Coordinator of Academic Committee |
| ESOL Endorsement | 9-12 | MDCPS Facilitator | Teacher who are not ESOL endorsed | dates Dec. 1, 2012 | Submission of completion of endorsements | Professional Development Coordinator of Academic Committee |
| Reading Across the Curriculum | 9-12 | District | School wide | | Administration classroom walkthroughs, Analysis of Lesson Plans | Administration, Reading Teacher(s) |
| CRISS Strategies | 9-12 | Tri-Star/ School-based Facilitator | School wide | year (Sept 18, November 10, Jan | Administration classroom walkthroughs, Analysis of Lesson Plans | Administration, Reading Teacher(s) |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materi | al(s) | | |
|--|---------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. | E2020 - Online curriculum | Internal Fund | \$1,500.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$1,500.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| The area of deficiency as noted on | | | |

| the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. | Computer and appropriate technical support | Internal Fund | \$2,200.00 |
|--|--|---------------|----------------------|
| | | | Subtotal: \$2,200.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. | In-House Workshop | EESAC | \$300.00 |

| Other | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. | IARM Testing | Internal Fund | \$33.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$33.00 |

End of Reading Goals

Grand Total: \$4,033.00

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

Due to limited enrollment, current and expected goals for the school are not available and our goal is based on district averages.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

45% (4)

CELLA Goal #1:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | area of deficiency was the listening and speaking section. Students do not have the opportunity to speak English and understand spoken | Students participate in the LEA (Language Experience Approach) and teacher lead groups. Students will use illustrations and diagrams to help increase their | | The Intervention Specialist and Administration will monitor and review CELLA scores in listening/speaking; to provide ongoing support in those areas. The intervention | Formative: Mini Teacher Assessment , FAIR Testing Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment. |
| | English at home. | understanding of the English vocabulary and language. | | Specialist will meet bi- weekly to make adjustments to instructions, made as needed. | |

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. Due to limited enrollment, current and expected goals for the school are not available and our goal is based on district averages. CELLA Goal #2: 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: 28% (2) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy As noted on the 2012 Build academic Administration The Intervention Formative: and Intervention Specialist will monitor Teachers' bi-CELLA and FCAT vocabulary in English by direct instruction and review the CELLA weekly Assessments, an area Specialist of deficiency was across the English scores in reading for assessments, reading. improvement. The goal FAIR Testing curriculum. is to achieve Improved Students will use FCAT reading scores Summative: 2013 CELLA and FCAT context clues to and Improved determine the meaning comprehension of Assessments. of unfamiliar words. English content; Students will explain There will be bi-weekly how text features (e.g. classroom assessments charts, maps, diagram, reviewed by the sub-headings, captions administration and illustrations, and Intervention Specialist graphs) aid readers that will be used to understanding. make adjustments to instruction as needed. Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. Due to limited enrollment, current and expected goals for 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. the school are not available and our goal is based on district averages. CELLA Goal #3: 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: 27% (2) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Person or Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy As noted on the 2012 Students will develop Administration There will be bi-weekly Formative: CELLA and FCAT Teachers' biparagraphs and essays and Intervention classroom assessments based on the school Assessments, an area Specialist reviewed by the weekly of deficiency was wide standards for administration and assessments, writing. grammar, structure, Intervention Specialist FAIR Testing that will be used to syntax, semantics, usage, and mechanics make adjustments to Summative: 2013 in writing. instruction as needed. CELLA and FCAT Assessments. Students will develop and compose posters to help with understanding the vocabulary

concepts.

| | Students will work collaboratively with ESOL teacher during planning (tutorials) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|--|--|--|--|--|

CELLA Budget:

| terial(s) | | |
|---|--|--|
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| E2020; Edge Reading Books | Internal fund | \$1,800.00 |
| | | Subtotal: \$1,800.0 |
| | | |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| In house workshop; District professional development workshop | Internal Fund | \$300.00 |
| | - | Subtotal: \$300.0 |
| | | |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| In house workshop; District professional development workshop | Internal fund | \$300.00 |
| | | Subtotal: \$300.0 |
| | | |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| | | Grand Total: \$2,400.0 |
| | Description of Resources In house workshop; District professional development workshop Description of Resources In house workshop; District professional development workshop Description of Resources Description of Resources | Description of Resources E2020; Edge Reading Books Internal fund Description of Resources In house workshop; District professional development workshop Description of Resources Funding Source Internal Fund Description of Resources Funding Source In house workshop; District professional development workshop Description of Resources Funding Source Internal fund |

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| in need of improvement | for the following group: | | | g = | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Florida Alternate As Levels 4, 5, and 6 in m | ssessment: Students scori nathematics. | ng at | | | |
| Mathematics 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 | Positi Resp for | on or tion oonsible toring | 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 | eference to | "Guiding Questions", id | entify and define areas |
| 2. Florida Alternate As | ssessment: Students scori | ng at | | | |
| or above Level 7 in ma | athematics. | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion oonsible toring | 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 | eference to | "Guiding Questions", id | entify and define areas |
| 3. Florida Alternate As | ssessment: Percent of stu | dents | | | |
| making learning gains | in mathematics. | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #3: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | ected Level of Perform | nance: |
| | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | |

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|----------------|------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | Mathematics Goal # | | | | | 4 |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014 | 4-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2 | 2017 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | | | | | |
| 58. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current | Level of Pe | rformance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem-Sol | ving Process to I | ncrease St | tudent Ach | nievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy | | | Posit Resp for | on or tion oonsible toring | Process L Determin Effective Strategy | ie | Evaluation Too | ol |
| | | | No Data | Submitted | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| الحصيما | analizata af - t | and a second control of the control | | | | At 11 | | |

| of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making | | | | | |
| | satisfactory progress in mathematics. | | | | | |
| | Mathematics Goal #5C: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| 2012 Current Level of P | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to I | ncrease St | udent Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion oonsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | No | | Submitted | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the following the following the following the soft improvement for the following the soft improvement for the following the soft improvement for the s | student achievement data, and | ıd refer | ence to "Gu | uiding Questions", identify | and define areas in need | | |
| 5D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress in | oilities (SWD) not making n mathematics. | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Po | | | 2013 Exp | ected Level of Performa | nce: | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to I | ncrease St | udent Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion ponsible Itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | No. | | Submitted | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the following the soft improvement for the following the soft improvement for the following the soft improvement for the soft | student achievement data, and | ıd refer | rence to "Gu | uiding Questions", identify | and define areas in need | | |
| - | antaged students not makir | าg | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal E: | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of P | erformance: | | 2013 Expe | ected Level of Performa | nce: | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to I | ncrease St | rudent Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion ponsible | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | No | o Data | Submitted | | | | |

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) 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: The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicate 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in that 36% (1) of the students scored in the upper third (Levels 3-5). Algebra. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the Algebra Goal #1: percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3-5) by 7 percentage points to 39% (2). 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 36% (1) 39% (2) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring According to the results Provide E2020 online RTI team and Administration and the Formative: of the 2012 Algebra preparation tutorials for Administration RTI Leadership Team Biweekly EOC assessment, the students who will take will meet during teacher assessments and area of greatest the Algebra I EOC. planning bi-weekly District Interim difficulty for students meetings; results of Data Reports, was Reporting Category Provide additional biweekly assessments Mini teacher 3 - Rational, Radicals', practice in solving and will be reviewed to assessments and Quadratics, and graphing quadric ensure progress and E2020 reports. Discrete Mathematics. adjust curriculum focus equations. as needed. Summative: Results from the Use Venn diagrams in a variety of ways to 2013 Algebra I EOC assessment illustrate intersection, null and disjoint sets. Reinforce mathematical concepts in other curricular areas such as science and social studies

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 results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels indicate that 21% (1) of the students scored in the upper third (Levels 4-5). 4 and 5 in Algebra. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the Algebra Goal #2: percentage of students scoring at or above achievement (Level 4-5) by 7 percentage points to 28% (2). 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 21% (1) 28% (2) 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 | According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 3 – Rational, Radicals', Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics. | provided the opportunities to explore and apply the use of a system of equations in | | Administration and the RTI Leadership Team will review the formative assessments on a bi-weekly basis and make adjustments to instruction as needed. | Formative: Biweekly assessments and District Interim Data Reports, Mini teacher assessments and E2020 reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra I EOC assessment |

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

in need of improvement for the following group: The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in indicate that 30% (6) of the students scored in the middle third (Levels 3-5). Geometry. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the Geometry Goal #1: percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3-5) by 5 percentage points to 35% (7). 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 30% (6) 35% (7) 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 According to the results Provide students with Administration Administration and the Formative: of the 2012 Geometry models, both digital and and RTI RTI Leadership Team Biweekly EOC assessment, the tangible, to enable Leadership Team will review the assessments and area of greatest them to visualize and formative assessments District Interim difficulty for students draw cross-sections of (FAIR, student reading Data Reports the structures and of a was Reporting Category on a bi-weekly basis range of geometric and make adjustments Summative: solids. to instruction as Results from the needed. 2013 Geometry Students will be EOC assessment. provided with opportunities to practice using methods of direct and indirect proof to determine

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:

whether a proof is logically valid.

| | 4 and | udents scoring at or ab I 5 in Geometry. netry Goal #2: | ove Achievement Leve | third (Levels 3- Our goal for the percentage of | indicate that 0% (0) of the students scored in the upper third (Levels 3-5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 4-5) by 5 percentage points to 2% (0). | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| | 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expecte | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| (| O% (C |)) | | 2% (1) | 2% (1) | | | |
| | | Prok | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | Increase Student Achievement | | | |
| | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | 1 | EOC assessment, the area of greatest | Provide students with the opportunity to build course-alike learning teams that will build the | | Administration and the RTI Leadership Team will review the formative assessments on a bi-weekly basis and make adjustments to instruction as needed. | Formative: Biweekly assessments and District Interim Data Reports, Edusoft reports Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC assessment. | | |

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

polygons.

| 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 |
|--|------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| Edusoft to enable teachers to analyze data and set progress | 9-12 | District Personnel | School Wide | September 10, 2012 | Administrative classroom walkthrough | Math Teacher/Administration |
| Implementing technology in the classroom | 9-12 | District Personnel | Math and Science department | October 15, 2012 | Classroom walkthrough | Math teachers/Administration |
| Differentiated Instruction | 9-12 | Tri-Star Leadership/School- based facilitator | Math department | September 18, 2012 | Mathematics small-group schedule | Math teachers/Administrators |
| Lesson Planning | 9-12 | Tri-Star Leadership/School- based facilitator | All teachers | August 19th, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs, analysis of lesson plans | Administrator, Assistant Administrator, Reading Coach |
| ESOL Endorsement | 9-12 | MDCPS Trainer | Teachers who are not ESOL endorsed | On-going | Submission of completion of endorsements | Professional Development Coordinator of Academic Committee |
| | | | | August 15- | | |

| Florida Continuous Improvement Model | 9-12 Tri-Star Leadership/School based facilitato | - staff and wo | additional Walkthroughs, orkshops analysis of | Administrator, Assistan Administrator, Reading Coach |
|---|--|----------------|---|--|
|---|--|----------------|---|--|

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Ma | terial(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 |
| 1.1(Level 3) & 2.1Level 4&5) | Computer and appropriate technical support | Internal Fund | \$1,600.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,600.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 1.1 (Level 3) & 2.1 (Level 4&5) | Hold In-House Workshop on Geometry & Algebra Strategies (contracted support) | Internal Fund | \$300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$300.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$1,900.00 |

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------|
| 1. Florida Alternate A at Levels 4, 5, and 6 i | ssessment: Students sco n science. | | | | |
| Science Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process | s to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi for | | on or tion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| 2. Florida Alternate A at or above Level 7 in | ssessment: Students sco science. | ring | | | | |
| Science Goal #2: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I r | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi for | | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | No Data Submitted | | | | | |

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. | The results of the 2012 Biology EOC Test indicate that 29% (5) of our students placed in the second level and 6% (1) placed in the top level. | | | | |
| Biology Goal #1: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase proficiency in the top level by 5 percentage points to 34% (6). | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 29% (5) | 34% (6) | | | | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| The area of deficiency according to the data is reporting category; classification, heredity | laboratory activities that allow for comparison, contrast, | RTI Leadership Team and Administration | Direct instruction based assessment. Off- line laboratory | District Interim Assessment/Biology EOC assessment test. |
| molecular/cellular Biology; populations | analysis, and interpretation of the various scientific concepts. | | projects. Periodic (bi-weekly) Data - Chats. | Formative: Biweekly assessments and |
| A barrier is the students | Use of blended model instruction method. | | Mini assessments. | District Interim Data Reports |
| underdeveloped higher order thinking ability | Provide EOC | | During teacher planning meetings, | Summative: Results from the 2013 |

| 1 | preparatory lessons Provide opportunity for student participation in scientific competitions and fairs. | results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed by the RTI Leadership Team to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed. | Biology EOC assessment |
|---|--|---|---------------------------|
| | | District Interim Data reports will be reviewed by ESSAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed. | |

| | 1 | , | ' | | | |
|------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | dent achievement data, a | | Guiding Questions", ide | ntify and define | |
| Leve | udents scoring at or a ls 4 and 5 in Biology. ogy Goal #2: | bove Achievement | 6% of our students of the percentage | The results of the 2012 Biology EOC Test indicate that 6% of our students placed in the upper third level. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 4-5) by 2 percentage points to 8%(1). | | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Perf | ormance: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performan | ce: | |
| 6% (| 1) | | 8% (1) | | | |
| | 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 | The area of deficiency according to the data is classification, heredity and evolution; molecular/cellular Biology; populations and ecosystems. A barrier is the students underdeveloped higher order thinking ability | Provide classroom and after-school opportunities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and discussion of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, models, and various investigative methods scientists use, (i.e., Science Fair, SECME, Fairchild Challenge). Provide EOC preparatory lessons Provide opportunity for student participation in scientific competitions and fairs. | and RTI team | Direct instruction based assessment. Off- line laboratory projects. Periodic (bi-weekly) Data - Chats. Mini assessments. During teacher planning meetings, results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed. District Interim Data reports will be reviewed by ESSAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed. | Formative: Biweekly assessments and District Interim Data Reports Summative: Results from the 2013 Biology EOC assessment | |

L

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 |
|---|------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Blended model training | 9-12 | Tri-Star | All teachers and staff | 8/-16, 8/-17/2012 | Evaluation and lesson plan analysis | Administration |
| Physics modeling Chemistry modeling Human Growth & Develop. Science made simple | 9-12 | MDCPS Trainer | Science teachers | 9/17,9/26,10/26,11/6/2012 1/8,2/1,3/22,5/20,6/7/2012 | Interim assessment; Biology EOC; Monthly student progress | Science teachers & administration |
| Differentiating instruction using technology | 9-12 | MDCPS Instructor | Science teachers | 9/17,9/26,10/26,11/6/2012 1/8,2/1,3/22,5/20,6/7/2012 | Interim assessment; Biology EOC; Monthly student progress | Science teachers & administration |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Ma | terial(s) | | |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 1.1 & 2.1 The area of deficiency according to the data has been Scientific Thinking; and Biology. | E2020 – Online curriculum | Internal Fund | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 1.1 & 2.1 The area of deficiency according to the data has been Scientific Thinking; and Biology. | Provide projects or mini labs | Internal Funds | \$100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$100.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$1,100.00 |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| in ne | ed of improvement for the | e following group: | | | | |
|-------|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| 3.0 a | 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level3.0 and higher in writing.Writing Goal #1a: | | | The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 33% of the students scored in 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher from 33% to 40%. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performance | e: | |
| 33% | (22) | | 40% (27) | | | |
| | 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 | |
| 1 | The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT Writing Assessment was a lack of a structured system (including a simple guide, models for prewriting) and lack of emphasis on prewriting and basic writing skills. The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT Writing Assessment also reported the writing application and conventions as an area | journals and generate ideas from various sources followed by teacher emphasis on planning for writing. Students will develop a prewriting plan to organize their ideas in a logical manner by using graphic organizers and outlining skills. Students will practice and review grammar and conventions three | RTI Leadership Team and Administration | Administration and the RTI Leadership Team will review the formative assessments (FAIR, student reading assessments and work, district baseline assessment) on a biweekly basis and make adjustments to instruction as needed. | Formative: Rubrics (state or teacher generated) focused just on prewriting skills, District baseline and interim assessments, Pre released FCAT writing prompts. Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment. | |
| 2 | of deficiency. Students confusing the Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL) supplemental resource and its methods for prewriting versus the E20/20 curriculum writing methodology. | Students will develop and maintain a writers Notebook, Journal and/or Portfolio which contains brainstorming in a variety of ways: using graphic organizers, drawing, generating and grouping ideas, listing, formulating questions, outlining, free writing, group discussions, and printed material. The implementation of supplemental resources will be used by students to reinforce prewriting and drafting parts leading up to the outline. | RTI Leadership Team and Administration | Administration and the RTI Leadership Team will review the formative assessments (FAIR, student reading assessments and work, district baseline assessment) on a biweekly basis and make adjustments to instruction as needed. | Formative: Rubrics (state or teacher generated) District baseline and interim assessments, Pre released FCAT writing prompts. Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment | |

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

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perforn | nance: |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Prod | cess to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| Courses, workshops focusing on the steps of writing at the secondary level. Ideas and current research of best practices | 9-12 | | English and Reading Teachers | December 1, 2012 | Sharing of information with Reading and other English teachers | Administration. |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount | | | |
| 1.1. The area of deficiency is evaluating the draft for development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sentence variation. | E2020- Online curriculum | Internal Fund | \$1,000.00 | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 | | | |
| Technology | | | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount | | | |
| 1.1 The area of deficiency is evaluating the draft for development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sentence variation. Students lack the necessary skills to revise for clarity of context organization and word choice. | Computer and appropriate technical support | Internal Fund | \$3,600.00 | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: \$3,600.00 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | | | | |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|----------------|-------------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 1.1 The area of deficiency is evaluating the draft for development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sentence variation. Students lack the necessary skills to revise for clarity of context organization and word choice. | Novels and supplemental Resources for pre-writing and drafting. | ESSAC | \$200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$200.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$4,800.00 |

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: The results of the 2012 US History EOC baseline 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. assessment indicate that 0% (0) of the students scored History. in the upper third (Levels 3-5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase proficiency by 10 U.S. History Goal #1: percentage points to 10%. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 0% (0) 10% (2) 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 The areas of deficiency Students will be Administration and the Formative: RTI Leadership Team are lack of student Administration provided with Teacher made research and writing opportunities to and RTI will review bi-weekly writing prompts, Leadership Team skills. Evaluating strengthen their reading and writing rubrics, baseline research information for abilities to read and assignments to ensure testing. development of ideas interpret graphs, progress is being made charts, maps, timelines, Summative: 2013 and content, logical and adjust the organization (Historical political cartoons, and instruction as needed. District U.S. Essays, Biographies other graphic history EOC etc.) representations. Writing assignments will Spring be evaluated using Assessment. Student will complete FCAT writing rubric. The students have weekly reading and limited understanding writing assignments and knowledge of the And respond to writing US Constitution. prompts related to U.S. History content via Social Studies Journal. Students will

participate in the research-based program, "We the

People."

| 2 | research and writing skills. Evaluating research information for development of ideas and content, logical | provided with activities to help them develop an understanding of the | and RTI Leadership Team | RTI Leadership Team will review bi-weekly reading and writing assignments to ensure progress is being made and adjust the instruction as needed. Writing assignments will | Formative: Teacher made writing prompts, rubrics, baseline testing. Summative: 2013 District U.S. history EOC Spring 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: | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels4 and 5 in U.S. History.U.S. History Goal #2: | | | | The results of the 2012 US History EOC baseline assessment indicate that 0% (0) of the students scored in the upper third (Levels 3-5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase proficiency by 10 percentage points to 10%. | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2 | 2013 Expecte | d Level of Performance | | |
| 0% (0) | | | | 10% (2) | | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | to In | crease Stude | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Res | Person or Position sponsible for Vonitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Students have a limited understanding and knowledge on the United States domestic and foreign policy benchmarks | understand how to use higher order thinking | | ninistration | Results of the bi-weekly assessments and data reports will be reviewed by teachers and administration to ensure progress is being made by students in order to make adjustments to instruction as needed. Teachers will provide students with follow-up activities dependent on data gathered from the monthly benchmark assessments. Data analysis of assessments, and compare the benchmarks tested to the evaluations. | Baseline Assessment Interim | |

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD 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 |
|--|------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Intensive Study Cohort- Teaching American History | 9-12 | Miami-Dade County Public schools | Social Studies teacher | Early Release September 2012 | Reporting to administration and collaborating with social studies teachers | Administrator, Lead Teacher |
| Florida Continuous Improvement model | 9-12 | Tri-Star leadership | All teachers, school-support staff and administrators | August 16, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs, analysis of lesson plans | Administrator, Lead Teacher |
| CRISS Strategies | 9-12 | Tri-Star leadership or Administration | All teachers | August 15, 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs, analysis of lesson plans | Administrator, Lead Teacher |

U.S. History Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/M | laterial(s) | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| CRISS Strategies | In-House Workshop/Materials and Books | Internal Funds | \$300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$300.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Novel reading with Historical Concepts and Vocabulary | Historical Novels | Internal Funds | \$200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$200.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$500.00 |

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1. Attendance | During the 2012 2012 ceheel year we will increase the | | | |
| Attendance Goal #1: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the attendance rate by 3 percentage points to 59.09% | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| 56.09% (294) | 59.09% (310) | | | |

| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|-----|---|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 457 | | | 434 | | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |
| 223 | | | | 212 | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | D | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | |

| | | <u> </u> | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lack of transportation access for students to commute to school | Provide monthly bus passes to students who have achieved at least 80% monthly seat attendance. Provide bus passes in a two shift manner. Award Monthly bus passes to students missing 4 or less days and tardy 4 or fewer days in the month; instead of, the weekly and daily bus cards. Provide students, with perfect attendance with a student of the month breakfast. | Administration and Attendance Review Team | Administration and the Attendance Review Team will review the attendance bulletins daily and track the absent students for the 3/5 day policy on a weekly basis. Weekly updates after 3 day/5 day procedure will be discussed in the Leadership Team Meeting and follow through by the Attendance Review Team with Letters, Conference and home visits. This will be monitored, reviewed and adjusted as needed. | Attendance rosters, attendance bulletin, and attendance intervention list |
| 2 | Incorrect student information prevents parent/student contact to advise student of attendance issues | Provide consistent updating of student information so that student data will reflect correct contact information. Send alert messages when students are absent and when tardiness become excessive throughout the year. Faculty members must react as soon as possible when students are absent in efforts to start an attendance intervention. | LMS, Registrar, Academic Advisor, Attendance Review Committee | attendance intervention | Attendance rosters, update alert-now |
| 3 | Lack of incentive programs to encourage prompt attendance | Monthly attendance reward bulletin and lunch gift cards attendance but improved throughout the nine weeks. | Administration, faculty, support staff | I | Attendance roster and incentives issued to students |

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 |
|---|------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| School Year Opening | 9-12 | MDCPS Trainer | $\Delta CARPMIC \Delta AVVISOR X_i$ | September 19, 2012 | New guidelines to be put into effect during 2012-2013 school year. | LMS Coordinator, Enrollment Specialist& Administrator |
| Effective Advisory Programs | 9-12 | Advisory Program Chair | All teacher and school-support staff | August 18, 2012 | Bi-weekly analysis of completed advisory folders | Advisory Program Chair |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Ma | iterial(s) | | |
|---|---|----------------|-----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Student of the month incentive programs | Breakfast ceremony for student of the month | ESSAC | \$200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$200.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$200.00 |

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Suspension Suspension Goal #1: | During the 2012-2013 school year, we will decrease the number of in-school suspensions by 3 and decrease the number of out-of-school suspensions by 4. | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions | | | |
| 29 | 26 | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In- School | | | |
| 18 | 16 | | | |

| 1 | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 2012 | 2 Number of Out-of-Sch | nool Suspensions | 2013 Expecte Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | |
| 41 | | | 37 | | | |
| 2012 Scho | | ents Suspended Out-of- | - 2013 Expecte of-School | ed Number of Students | Suspended Out- | |
| 25 | | | 23 | | | |
| | Pro | 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 | There are not enough opportunities to educate students in positive behavior | Provide incentives for compliance through the use of recognition based student behavioral incentive program, students will be recognized on a monthly bases through a formal recognition ceremony promoting positive behavior. Utilize the Positive Behavior School Model to provide students with incentives (such as certificates of recognition) for compliance with the Student Code of Conduct (e.g. arriving to school on time, no Discipline Violation Forms (DVFs), etc.) Bullying and prevention programs will be discussed and presented to students | Administration, Dean of Discipline / | suspensions, etc) via the District portal and the school's Grade Book system on a weekly basis and make adjustments to the | Formative: Behavioral log entries in the Grade Book monitoring system; Reports from monthly | |

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 | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | release) and | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|----------------|--|--------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | August 19, | | |

| The Student Code of Conduct | 9-12/School- wide | Administration | | mandatory PD | Monitoring of class discipline referrals/log entries in Power School system. | Administration |
|--|----------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|---|----------------|
| Effective Classroom Management Strategies | 9-12/School- wide | Administration | School-wide | | Utilize classroom walk through-through and observation form to monitor teacher's implementation of effective classroom management strategies delivered during PD. | Administration |

Suspension Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--|---|----------------|----------------------|
| Increase staff knowledge on student learning based on discovery of the hidden rules of economic class. | Framework For Understanding Poverty (1998) by Ruby Payne | EESAC | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$500.0 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 1.1 Implement MDCPS Bully Prevention Program where positive behavioral interventions will take place through various strategies. Also, parents will be provided with training on an understanding of the Miami-Dade Code of Student Conduct | Duplication of Materials | Internal Fund | \$300.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$300.0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$800.0 |

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1. Dropout Prevention | The dropout rate for the 2011-2012 school year was 36.19%. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to | | | |
| Dropout Prevention Goal #1: | decrease the percentage points to 34.38%. | | | |
| *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year. | The graduation rate for the 2011-2012 school year was 4.3% and our goal for 2012-2013 school year is to increase that number to 6.3%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Dropout Rate: | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate: | | | |
| | | | | |

| 36.19 | %(190) | | 34.38%(180) | | | |
|-------|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 2012 | Current Graduation Ra | ite: | 2013 Expecte | d Graduation Rate: | | |
| 4.3% | (11) | | 6.3% (22) | 6.3% (22) | | |
| | 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 | |
| 1 | Students are unfamiliar with the opportunities available with achievement of a high school diploma. | Educate students on the opportunities that are available to students who have a high school diploma through field trips to colleges, vocational technical schools and other post-secondary opportunities. | Administration and the RTI Leadership Team | Administration and the RTI Leadership Team will continuously monitor the number of credit completion by all students and review the credit analysis after each semester to see progression of student (s) and make adjustments as needed. | Formative: Progress tracking charts; Course completion logs, student graduation plans. Summative: District Dropout Report | |
| 2 | Our school has a high population of transient students. | Identify at risk student and develop progression plan. | | Identify and monitor students at risk using enrollment log. | Enrollment log. | |

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 | Facilitator | 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 |
|---|------------------------|-------------|---|--|--|--|
| Dropout Prevention School Connect | 9-12 | Services | Staff, Teachers, Parents | Ongoing | Professional Development Plan | Administration/Attendance |

Dropout Prevention Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Field Trips | Buses | School Based Funding | \$300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$300.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developmer | nt | | |
| | · | | Available |

| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| | | - | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$300.00 |

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1. Pa | arent Involvement | | | | | |
| Pare | nt Involvement Goal#1 | 1: | | nvolvement for the 2011- | | |
| partio | ase refer to the percenta cipated in school activitie plicated. | 0 1 | | our goal for 2012-2013 so number to 22%. | chool year is to | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Parer | nt I nvolvement: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Parent Invol | lvement: | |
| 12% | (29) | | 22% (54) | | | |
| | Prol | olem-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 | Parents work during school hours and after school hours. | Offer several parent involvement workshops and events at various times of the day utilizing our flexible scheduling, Parent Link's, and email to increase notifications. | Administration and Leadership Team | Administration and the Leadership Team will track the number of parents at each event. | Formative: Parent sign-in sheets; Telephone Log Summative: School Climate Survey | |
| 2 | Parents rely on effective aggressive communication channels of the school (website, mass e-mails) or "word of mouth" to receive most information regarding school matters. | Publish and actively advertise all school events in the school calendar website. Send invitations/reminders to parents via mass emails. | Leadership Team Student Services Department, IT Department | Administration and the Leadership Team will re-visit, at the end of each month, the events of the following month and make the needed adjustments. Parents will be surveyed about the effectiveness, quality, and practical value of the training/event they attended. | Events attendance logs, survey data, and | |

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 |
|---|------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| Student Data | 9-12 | Reading Coach | Parents | | Review sign-in | School Administration / Reading Coach |

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Mat | eriar(s) | | Available |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 1.1 Family members, students and teachers are invited to participate in workshops to learn how the school uses assessment results to improve student achievement | Duplication of Materials | Internal Funds | \$300.00 |
| | | • | Subtotal: \$300.0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$300.0 |

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)).

| Base | d on the analysis of scho | ol data, identify and defi | ne areas in need of | improvement: | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|-----------------|--|--|
| 1. STEM STEM Goal #1: | | | Stellar Leaders and science ed limited to prov of scientific and knowledge of d | In alignment with Florida's STEM Education Initiative, Stellar Leadership Academy's goal is to strengthen math and science education. This would include, but is not limited to providing students with a basic understanding of scientific and mathematical principles, a working knowledge of computer hardware and software, and/or problem solving skills developed by STEM coursework. | | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process | to Increase Stude | nt Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | Students need | Develop a plan that | Administration | Administration will | Formative: | | |

| I | increased exposure to a curriculum that fosters project-based learning and connects STEM principle with the inclusion of science, math, and technology in coursework and/or instruction. | supports the implementation of a quality program Identify, select the needs of the school and resources available to support STEM Structure instructional plans with STEM attributes/standards to promote student use of STEM | Instructional Support Staff Leadership Team | | STEM implementation plan |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 2 | Limited understanding of STEM standards/attributes and rubric for implementation | Assess staff knowledge and understanding of STEM Provide targeted training on strategies that support the implementation of STEM, such as training on how to use C-PALMS which is an online standards-based resource system helps educators not only find peer- and expert-reviewed resources for exhibits, camps, teacher professional development and other initiatives, but also share their own resources for review and distribution worldwide. Ensure teachers incorporate and utilize STEM rubrics for monitoring of implementation | Instructional Support Staff Leadership Team | Collaborative planning time between math and science teachers to learn the steps necessary for a quality program. Classroom walkthroughs monitor use of STEM strategies and implementation rubrics Monitor lesson plans and collaborative planning sessions | implementation Rubric Classroom assessments |

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) | release) and | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|---|---|--------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| C-PALMS | 9-12 | District and/or Instructional Support | All Teachers | | | Administration and Instructional Support |

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

| Base | Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1. CTE CTE Goal #1: | | | | Implement Career Pathway structure including student enrollment in CTE courses. | | | |
| | Pro | 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 | Curriculum not aligned to career theme across all disciplines. | Provide opportunities for CTE and academic teachers to develop and implement integrated curriculum. Schedule career pathway students in cohorts with common academic and CTE instructors. Plan activities schoolwide during CTE Month (February 2013). OJT/ Business Classes and Informational Technology | Administration and CTE Teachers. | Monitor the curriculum development opportunities of CTE teachers with common planning, professional development, etc. Monitor and review student schedules to ensure enrollment in CTE courses | Formative: Lesson plans incorporating CTE/career themes; school instructional focus calendar; student schedules; CTE calendar of events for the month of February and throughout the year. | | |

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 |
|---|------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| CTE Curriculum Training | 9-12 | MDCPS Trainer | CTE Teachers | 2012 | Administration classroom walkthroughs, Analysis of Lesson Plans | Administrator |

CTE 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 CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Graduation Goal:

| Based on the analysis o in need of improvement | f student achievement data for the following group: | , and | reference t | to "Guiding Questions", id | dentify and define areas | |
|--|---|--|----------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| | | Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the graduation rate by 2 percentage points | | | | |
| 2012 Current level: | | | 2013 Expected level: | | | |
| 3.2%(6) | | | 5.2% (10) | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

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

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

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

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 Developn | 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 Graduation Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

| | Description of | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Strategy | Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process. | E2020 - Online curriculum | Internal Fund | \$1,500.00 |
| Promote school wide standards for grammar, structure, syntax, semantics, usage, and mechanics in writing. | E2020; Edge Reading Books | Internal fund | \$1,800.00 |
| 1.1 & 2.1 The area of deficiency according to the data has been Scientific Thinking; and Biology. | E2020 – Online curriculum | Internal Fund | \$1,000.00 |
| 1.1. The area of deficiency is evaluating the draft for development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sentence variation. | E2020- Online curriculum | Internal Fund | \$1,000.00 |
| CRISS Strategies | In-House Workshop/Materials and Books | Internal Funds | \$300.00 |
| Increase staff knowledge on student learning based on discovery of the hidden rules of economic class. | Framework For Understanding Poverty (1998) by Ruby Payne | EESAC | \$500.00 |
| Field Trips | Buses | School Based Funding | \$300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$6,400.00 |
| | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011- 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. | Computer and appropriate technical support | Internal Fund | \$2,200.00 |
| Promote school wide standards for grammar, structure, syntax, semantics, usage, and mechanics in writing. | In house workshop; District professional development workshop | Internal Fund | \$300.00 |
| 1.1(Level 3) & 2.1Level 4&5) | Computer and appropriate technical support | Internal Fund | \$1,600.00 |
| 1.1 The area of deficiency is evaluating the draft for development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sentence variation. Students lack the necessary skills to revise for clarity of | Computer and appropriate technical support | Internal Fund | \$3,600.00 |
| | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. Promote school wide standards for grammar, structure, syntax, semantics, usage, and mechanics in writing. 1.1 & 2.1 The area of deficiency according to the data has been Scientific Thinking; and Biology. 1.1. The area of deficiency is evaluating the draft for development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sentence variation. CRISS Strategies Increase staff knowledge on student learning based on discovery of the hidden rules of economic class. Field Trips Strategy The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. Promote school wide standards for grammar, structure, syntax, semantics, usage, and mechanics in writing. 1.1 (Level 3) & 2.1Level 4&5) 1.1 The area of deficiency as noted on the joical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sendents lack the draft for development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and students lack the necessary skills to | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. Promote school wide standards for grammar, structure, syntax, semantics, usage, and mechanics in writing. 1.1 & 2.1 The area of deficiency according to the data has been Scientific Thinking; and Blology. 1.1. The area of deficiency is evaluating the draft for development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sentence variation. CRISS Strategies Increase staff knowledge on student learning based on discovery of the hidden rules of economic class. Field Trips Buses Increase staff knowledge on student learning based on discovery of the hidden rules of economic class. Field Trips Buses Strategy Description of Resources The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. Promote school wide standards for grammar, structure, syntax, semantics, usage, and mechanics in writing. 1.1 The area of deficiency as development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sentence variation. Students lack the necessary skills to | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. Promote school wide standards for grammar, structure, syntax, semantics, usage, and mechanics in writing. 1.1 & 2.1 The area of deficiency according to the data has been Scientific Thinking; and Biology. 1.1. The area of deficiency is evaluating the draft for development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sentence variation. CRISS Strategies Increase staff knowledge on student learning based on discovery of the hidden rules of economic class. Field Trips In-House Workshop/Materials and Books Increase staff knowledge on student learning based on discovery of the hidden rules of economic class. Field Trips Buses School Based Funding Internal Fund Internal Fund Internal Fund Internal Fund Internal Fund C2020 - Online curriculum Internal Fund Internal Fund Internal Fund Description of Resources Framework For Understanding Poverty (1998) by Ruby Payne Understanding Poverty (1998) by Ruby Payne EESAC Computer and appropriate technical support Internal Fund Internal Fund |

| Goal | Strategy | Description of | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|----------------------------|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| Reading | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process. | In-House Workshop | EESAC | \$300.00 |
| CELLA | Promote school wide standards for grammar, structure, syntax, semantics, usage, and mechanics in writing. | In house workshop; District professional development workshop | Internal fund | \$300.00 |
| Mathematics | 1.1 (Level 3) & 2.1 (Level 4&5) | Hold In-House Workshop on Geometry & Algebra Strategies (contracted support) | Internal Fund | \$300.00 |
| Suspension | 1.1 Implement MDCPS Bully Prevention Program where positive behavioral interventions will take place through various strategies. Also, parents will be provided with training on an understanding of the Miami-Dade Code of Student Conduct | Duplication of Materials | Internal Fund | \$300.00 |
| Parent Involvement | 1.1 Family members, students and teachers are invited to participate in workshops to learn how the school uses assessment results to improve student achievement | Duplication of Materials | Internal Funds | \$300.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$1,500.0 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| Reading | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011- 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. | IARM Testing | Internal Fund | \$33.00 |
| Science | 1.1 & 2.1 The area of deficiency according to the data has been Scientific Thinking; and Biology. | Provide projects or mini labs | Internal Funds | \$100.00 |
| Writing | 1.1 The area of deficiency is evaluating the draft for development of ideas and content, logical organization, voice, point of view, word choice, and sentence variation. Students lack the necessary skills to | Novels and supplemental Resources for prewriting and drafting. | ESSAC | \$200.00 |
| | revise for clarity of context organization and word choice. | | | |
| U.S. History | revise for clarity of context organization and word choice. Novel reading with Historical Concepts and Vocabulary | Historical Novels | Internal Funds | \$200.00 |
| U.S. History Attendance | revise for clarity of context organization and word choice. Novel reading with Historical Concepts and | Historical Novels Breakfast ceremony for student of the month | Internal Funds ESSAC | \$200.00 \$200.00 |

Grand Total: \$16,333.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| jn Priority | jn Focus | jn Prevent | j n NA |
|-------------|----------|------------|---------------|
|-------------|----------|------------|---------------|

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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



Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|--|----------|
| Provide additional novels for the increase in reading and Literacy Across the Curriculum | \$300.00 |
| Student Incentives to increase attendance and reduce suspensions. | \$500.00 |
| Writing resources to increase student achievement | \$200.00 |
| Student breakfast as an incentive for attendance | \$200.00 |

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

Review and monitors the School Improvement Plan Sponsor Positive Behavior Incentives Resources to support academic achievement

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