Florida Department of Education



Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| School Name: Excelsior Language Academy of Hialeah | District Name: Miami-Dade |
|--|--|
| Principal: Claudia Trilles | Superintendent: Mr. Alberto Carvalho |
| SAC Chair: Ms. Krystal Alegret | Date of School Board Approval: Pending |

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Effective Administrators

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

List your school's highly effective 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) | Number of Years at Current School | Number 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 | Brenda Cruz | Degree(s): Bachelors in Special Education and Elementary Education K- 6, Masters in Varying Exceptionality, Certifications: Educational Leadership K-12 Special Education | 2 Years | 10 Years | School Grade High Standards Rdg High Standards Math Lrng Gains-Rdg. Lrng Gains-Math Gains-Rdg-25% Gains-Math-25% | '12 B 50% 52% 58% 80% 70% 74% | '11 A 55% 84% 61% 84% 55% 81% | '10 A 48% 79% 58% 80% 61% 73% | '09 A 48% 81% 62% 84% 59% 79% | '08 C 40% 69% 49% 77% 48% 77% |
| Assistant Principal | Elizabeth Poveda | Degree(s): Bachelors in Science in Elementary Education (K-6) with ESOL Endorsement; Masters of Science in Educational Leadership | 2 years | 1 year | School Grade High Standards Rdg High Standards Math Lrng Gains-Rdg. Lrng Gains-Math Gains-Rdg-25% Gains-Math-25% | '12 B 50% 52% 58% 80% 70% 74% | '11 A 91% 88% 78% 62% 75% 66% | '10 A 85% 87% 75% 67% 78% 80% | '09 B 86% 86% 80% 63% 76% 49% | 79% 76% 74% |

Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly effective 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 | Name | Degree(s)/ | Number of | Number of Years as | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ |
|---------|------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|--|
| Area | | Certification(s) | Years at | an | Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, |
| | | | Current School | Instructional Coach | Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated |
| | | | | | school year) |

| N/A | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

| Des | scription of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date |
|-----|--|--|---------------------------|
| 1. | Partnering new teachers with experienced teachers. | Assistant Principal and Lead Teacher | June 2013 |
| 2. | Meeting with new teachers with principal, lead teachers and grade level chairs | Principal, Assistant Principal and Lead Teacher | June 2013 |
| 3. | Job Fairs | Assistant Principal and Lead Teacher | May 2013 |
| 4. | Referrals from current employees | Principal | June 2013 |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and 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 instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only). | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|--|---|
| 3 Teachers are out-of-field on waivers 0 Teachers received a less than effective rating | Teachers that are teaching out-of-field have been given a waiver and are completing course work and/ or certification requirements in order to be highly qualified educators. |

Staff Demographics

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 100% (36) | 19% (7) | 53% (19) | 28% (10) | 0 | 27% (10) | 92% (33) | 5% (2) | 0% | 54% (20) |

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Joanna Porro | Kindergarten and First Grade Teachers | Ms. Porro is paired with the Kindergarten | The mentor and mentees are meeting |
| | | and First Grade teachers because she has | weekly to discuss monthly best |
| | | extensive knowledge in the core subject | practices and evidence-based strategies |
| | | areas. Her students show significant gains | for each domain. Time is given for the |
| | | in their FAIR Assessment scores. | feedback, coaching and planning. |
| Vanessa Goolsby | Second Grade Teachers | Ms. Goolsby is paired with the Second | The mentor and mentees are meeting |
| | | Grade teachers because her students have | weekly to discuss monthly best |
| | | shown improvement by scoring at high | practices and evidence-based strategies |
| | | performance levels on the SAT's in the | for each domain. Time is given for the |
| | | areas of Reading and Mathematics. | feedback, coaching and planning. |
| Danielle Corrales | Third Grade Teachers | Ms. Corrales is paired with the Third | The mentor and mentees are meeting |
| | | Grade teachers because she has extensive | weekly to discuss monthly best |
| | | knowledge in the core subject areas. Her | practices and evidence-based strategies |
| | | students show improvement by scoring | for each domain. Time is given for the |
| | | at high performance levels on the FCAT, | feedback, coaching and planning. |
| | | FAIR and Interim Assessments. | |
| Madeline Piedra | Fourth Grade Teachers | Ms. Piedra is paired with the Fourth Grade | The mentor and mentees are meeting |
| | | teachers because her students have made | weekly to discuss monthly best |
| | | significant learning gains in the areas of | practices and evidence-based strategies |
| | | Reading, Writing and Mathematics state | for each domain. Time is given for the |
| | | and district assessments. | feedback, coaching and planning. |

| Melissa Sabatier | Fifth Grade Teachers | Ms. Sabatier is paired with the Fifth Grade | The mentor and mentees are meeting |
|------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| | | teachers because she has shown great | weekly to discuss monthly best |
| | | knowledge in the areas of Science and | practices and evidence-based strategies |
| | | Mathematics. She is also the school's | for each domain. Time is given for the |
| | | Math and Science liaison. In addition, | feedback, coaching and planning. |
| | | she incorporates weekly scientific | |
| | | investigations and integrates it within the | |
| | | core curriculum program. | |

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities (after-school tutoring programs, Saturday Academy or summer school). The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to the schools, students, and families. School based, Title I funded Community Involvement Specialists (CIS), serve as bridge between the home and school through home visits, telephone calls, school site and community parenting activities. The CIS schedules meetings and activities, encourage parents to support their child's education, provide materials, and encourage parental participation in the decision making processes at the school site. Administrative team develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Parents participate in the design of their school's Parent Involvement Plan (PIP), the school improvement process and the life of the school and the annual Title I Annual Parent Meeting at the beginning of the school year. The annual M-DCPS Title I Parent/Family Involvement Survey is intended to be used toward the end of the school year to measure the parent program over the course of the year and to facilitate an evaluation of the parent involvement program to inform planning for the following year. An all out effort is made to inform parents of the importance of this survey via CIS, Title I and Board meetings, Newsletters for Parents, and Title I Quarterly Parent Bulletins, This survey, available in English and Spanish will be available online and via hard copy for parents to complete. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and delinquent students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met. There are no Migrant students at Excelsior Language Academy of Hialeah.

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach Program. Services are coordinated with district drop-out prevention programs.

Title II

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

- training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
- training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL
- training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaison (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.

Title III

Title III funds are used to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learner (ELL) and Recently Arrived Immigrant Children and Youth by providing funds to implement and/or provide:

- tutorial programs (K-8)
- parent outreach activities (K-8) through the Bilingual Parent Outreach Program (The Parent Academy)
- professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers
- coaching and mentoring for ESOL and content area teachers(K-8)
- reading and supplementary instructional materials(K-8)
- purchase of supplemental hardware and software for the development of language and literacy skills in reading, mathematics and science, as well as, thematic cultural lessons is purchased for selected schools to be used by ELL students and recently arrived immigrant students (K-8)

Title X- Homeless

- The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.
- Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assists schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students. All schools are eligible to receive services and will do so upon identification and classification of a student as homeless.
- The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and are provided with all entitlements.
- Project Upstart provides a homeless sensitivity, awareness campaign to all the schools each school is provided a video and curriculum manual, and a contest is sponsored by the homeless trust-a community organization.
- Project Upstart provides tutoring and counseling to twelve homeless shelters in the community.
- The District Homeless Student Liaison continues to participate in community organization meetings and task forces as it relates to homeless children and youth.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

This school will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation. SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers. SAI funds will used to expand the summer program to all Level 2 students.

Violence Prevention Programs

- The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program addresses violence and drug prevention and intervention services for students through curriculum implemented by classroom teachers, elementary counselors, and/or TRUST Specialists.
- Training and technical assistance for elementary, middle, and senior high school teachers, administrators, counselors, and/or TRUST Specialists is also a component of this program.
- TRUST Specialists focus on counseling students to solve problems related to drugs and alcohol, stress, suicide, isolation, family violence, and other crises.

Nutrition Programs

The school adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy. Nutrition education, as per state statue, is taught through physical education. The School Food Service Program, school breakfast and school lunch follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the Districts' Wellness Policy.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

The school offers a Career Choices Class and a Computer Class that focus on technology and career goals for the future. The courses implements computer training and college research for the students.

Job Training

N/A

Other

Title I Statement for 2012-2013

Parental

Involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extend an open invitation to our school's parent resource center or parent area in order to inform parents regarding available programs, their rights under No Child Left Behind and other referral services. Increase parental engagement/involvement through developing (with ongoing parental input) ourschool's Title I School-Parent Compact; our school's Title I Parental Involvement Plan; scheduling the Title I Annual Meeting; and other documents/ activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements. Conduct informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents, and schedule workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents' schedules. This impacts ourgoal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement. Complete Title I Administration Parental Involvement Monthly School Reports (FM-6914 Rev. 06-08) and the Title I Parental Involvement Monthly Activities Report (FM-6913 03-07), and submit to Title I Administration by the 5th of each month as documentation of compliance with NCLB Section 1118. Additionally, the M-DCPS Title I Parent/Family Survey, distributed to schools by Title I Administration, is to be completed by parents/families annually in May. The Survey's results are to be used to assist with revising our Title I parental documents for the approaching school year.

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS/RtI, conducts assessment of MTSS/RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS/RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities.

Lead Teachers: Develop, lead, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Select General Education Teachers: Grade Level Chairpersons provide information about core instruction to corresponding grade level teachers, participates in student data collection for the school, 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 above mentioned team members were selected based on their knowledge and commitment to the core subject areas in which they teach. In addition, they have attended professional development workshops and shared the fundamental material learned within their grade groups.

Technology Specialist: Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teacher: the SPED coordinator for Excelsior Language Academy participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as bi-weekly lesson planning and consultations to review accommodations on the students' IEP.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Student Services Personnel: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

The school's Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as: special education personnel, advisory group members, and community stakeholders.

MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. MTSS/RtI uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.

- The first level of support is the **core** instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for **all** students in the general curriculum.
- The second level of support consists of **supplemental** instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support.
- The third level of support consists of **intensive** instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instructionand the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally.

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data.

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 functions of the MTSS/RtI team are the following: evaluate the progress of the school's goals by monitoring academic data, provide and assess instruction, provide feedback on instructional intervention, administer enrichment opportunities, arrange teacher requested workshop. The following steps will be considered by the school's Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the MTSS/RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring. The Leadership Team will:

- 1. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following important questions:
- What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
- How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments)
- How will we respond when students have not learned? (Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
- How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (enrichmentopportunities)
- 2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
- 3. Hold weekly and monthly team meetings. Utilize the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success.
- 4. Gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM
- 5. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating themon procedures and progress.
- 6. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, andevaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
- 7. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting inexamining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
- 8. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within theexpectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

The MTSS/RtI Team will assure the successful implementation of the Goals set in the SIP by: analyzing and gathering data to monitor and adjust the school's academic success, assess delivery of instruction, support intervention programs geared towards student's individual needs. The MTSS/RtI team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data and consider data at the end of the year for Tier 1 problem solving.

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.

- 1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:
 - adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
 - adjust the delivery of behavior management system
 - adjust the allocation of school-based resources
 - drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
 - create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions
- 2. Managed data will include:

Academic

- FAIR assessment (Broad Screening, Progress Monitoring, Targeted Diagnostic Indicators, Broad Diagnostic Indicators, Ongoing Progress Monitoring Tools, Phonics Screening Inventory
- Oral Reading Fluency Measures
- Voyager Checkpoints
- Voyager Benchmark Assessments
- Baseline Benchmark Assessments
- Interim assessments
- State/Local Math and Science assessments
- FCAT
- Student grades
- School site specific assessments

Behavior

- Student Case Management System
- Detentions
- Suspensions/expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
- Office referrals per day per month
- Team climate surveys
- Attendance
- Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development and support will include training for all of the MTSS/RtI Leadership team in the MTSS/RtI problem solving and data analysis process and provide support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures. In addition, the MTSS/RTI Leadership team will provide professional development through best practices during common teacher planning times, weekly grade level meetings, and monthly faculty meetings. Furthermore, teachers will be provided with added professional development to correspond with the subject area being taught.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/Rtl Leadership team will support staff by ensuring that each teacher complete the Introduction to Problem Solving and Response to Intervention Course in order to indicate in depth knowledge of the Multi-Tiered Problem Solving Process. Ongoing support will include the MTSS/Rtl Leadership Team to meet with teachers on a monthly basis to review Tiers and student progress as well as performance data.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) consists of Brenda Cruz, Principal, Elizabeth Poveda, Assistant Principal, and Patricia Tellechea, Lead Teacher.

The Literacy Leadership Team will provide professional development through best practices during common teacher planning times, weekly grade level meetings, and monthly faculty meetings. For instance, the LLT will support and provide ongoing professional development to teachers on the major reading components based on student performance data, administration and data interpretation of instructional assessments, and differentiated instruction techniques.

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

The purpose of the LLT is to generate instructional tools and interventions to gain reading knowledge within the school. In order to increase student's knowledge in this area the main focus is to build literacy skills in all content areas throughout the school.

Grade Level/Department Chairs: Provides guidance on elementary and middle grade reading plans; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; and supports the implementation of intervention plans.

Principal: Brenda Cruz will promote the LLT as an integral part of the school literacy reform to promote a culture of reading by offering professional growth opportunities for team members, create a collaborative environment that fosters sharing and learning of ideas, developing a school wide organizational model that supports literacy instruction in all classes, and encourage the use of data to improve teaching and student achievement.

Assistant Principal and Lead Teacher: Elizabeth Poveda and Patricia Tellechea identify systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

The Literacy Leadership Team will meet on a monthly basis to discuss the implementation of the different intervention plans that were placed throughout the school year. During these meetings the LLT will also evaluate and modify areas that are stagnant in order to improve the intervention plans to benefit the needs students.

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

The initiative for the LLT this year is to model effective instructional strategies for teachers, facilitate study groups, train teachers in interpreting data charts, meet with teachers to ensure that research based reading programs and strategies are implemented. In addition, the LLT will help to increase instructional density to meet the needs of all students, increase teachers' knowledge base in best practices in reading instruction and intervention strategies.

Public School Choice

• Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

All students entering Excelsior Language Academy of Hialeah's kindergarten program will be evaluated several ways. Students will be administered an OLPS to determine ESOL placement. Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) will be utilized to assess the readiness of each child for kindergarten. It will be administered during the first 30 school days of each school year. Early Childhood Observation System (ECHOS) is designed to guide effective instruction and appropriate intervention to prepare a child to succeed in school. ECHOS is a whole child-oriented measure based on national standards for seven domains: Language and Literacy, Mathematics, Social and Personal Skills, Science, Social Studies, Physical Development and Fitness, and Creative Arts. In addition, the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) is used to measure the growth of students classified as English Language Learners (ELL) in mastering the skills in English they will need to succeed in school. Furthermore, incoming Kindergarten students will be assessed in the areas of social/emotional development. A questionnaire will be sent home to parents to complete by the third week of school. The questionnaire result will provide useful information regarding student's need for instruction/intervention regarding behavior, self-regulation, self-concept, and self-efficacy.

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

Screening data will be gathered and aggregated prior to September 9th, 2012. Data will be utilized to plan daily academic and social/emotion instruction for groups of students or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instructions. Social instruction will be modeled throughout the day by the instructor. Moreover, the teacher will spend 20 minutes per day educating students on the fundamentals of social norms.

The instructional intervention program will be assessed by administering a screening tool in mid year and during the last semester of the school year. Data from the assessment will be used to determine positive and negative factors in the program.

*Grades 6-12 OnlySec. 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.

Grade 6-8 content area teachers will be provided with workshops on how to incorporate reading strategies into the content area instruction. Trainings will include CRISS strategies. The administrative team, including the Lead Teachers and Department Heads, will ensure that lessons are being conducted properly through the evidence of lesson plans and walk-thurs/observations.

*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?

N/A

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?

Grades 6-8: The Guidance Counselor will inform the students of their academic course selections together with future career planning options that will allow students to choose their course of study.

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS Reading Goals

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

| Reading Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieve ment | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| 1 ECAE * 0 | 11 - 1 | 11 - 1 | 1- 1 | l ₁₋₁ | 1-1 | T | |
|------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| 1a.FCAT 2.0: | la.1. | 1a.1. Students will | 1a.1. The Literacy | la.1. Results of the bi- | la.1. Formative: | | |
| Students scoring | deficiency | | | weekly assessments | Bi-weekly Benchmark | | |
| at Achievement | | locating and | | and data reports | Assessments | | |
| Level 3 in | | verifying | | will be reviewed | F.A.I.R. Assessments | | |
| reading. | administ | details, | | to ensure progress | Baseline Assessments | | |
| | | critically | monitoring the | | Interim Assessments | | |
| | | | | is being made by | | | |
| | | analyzing | implementation | students in order to | FCAT Test Maker | | |
| | | text, and | of the identified | make adjustments to | Reading Plus | | |
| | | synthesizing | strategies that | instruction as needed. | | | |
| | Reporting | details to | students lacked. | | Classroom Walkthroughs | | |
| | | draw correct | | | Summative: | | |
| | | conclusions. | | | 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 | | |
| | | Teachers will | | | | | |
| | | emphasize | | | | | |
| | Process. | instruction | | | | | |
| | | that helps | | | | | |
| | | students | | | | | |
| | | build | | | | | |
| | | stronger | | | | | |
| | | arguments to | | | | | |
| | | support their | | | | | |
| | | answers. In | | | | | |
| | | addition, | | | | | |
| | | students will | | | | | |
| | | explore | | | | | |
| | | shades of | | | | | |
| | | meaning to | | | | | |
| | | better | | | | | |
| | | identify | | | | | |
| | | nuances. | | | | | |
| | | Both students | | | | | |
| | | and teachers | | | | | |
| | | will examine | | | | | |
| | | rubrics and | | | | | |
| | | the | | | | | |
| | | appropriate | | | | | |
| | | benchmarks | | | | | |
| | | to ensure a | | | | | |
| | | complete | | | | | |

| 1 | . 1. | 1 | |
|----------|-----------|---|--|
| under | rstanding | | |
| | e skills | | |
| being | | | |
| assess | sed. | | |
| Usefu | ıl | | |
| | actional | | |
| strates | gies | | |
| includ | de: | | |
| recipr | rocal | | |
| teachi | ing; | | |
| opinio | on | | |
| proofs | S; | | |
| questi | | | |
| and-a | inswer | | |
| relation | onships; | | |
| note-t | taking | | |
| skills; | , | | |
| summ | narizatio | | |
| n skill | ls; | | |
| questi | ioning | | |
| the au | athor; | | |
| and | | | |
| encou | ırage | | |
| studer | nts to | | |
| read f | from a | | |
| wide | variety | | |
| of tex | ats. | | |

| Reading Goal #1a: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 24% (100) of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 proficiency by 7 percentage points to 31% (131). | Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--|
| | 24% (100) | 31% (131) | | | | | |
| | | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | |
| | | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | |
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. | 1b.1. N/A | 1b.1. N/A | 1b.1. N/A | 1b.1. N/A | 1b.1. N/A | | |

| Reading Goal #1b: N/A | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | |
| | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 2a.FCAT | | | 2a.1. | | 2a.1. | |
|------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| 2.0:Students | The area of | Using | Leadership Team | Results of the bi- | Formative: | |
| scoring at | deficiency | | | | Bi-weekly Benchmark | |
| or above | as noted on | documents | | | Assessments | |
| AchievementL | the 2012 | such as how- | | reviewed by teachers | F.A.I.R. Assessments | |
| evels 4 and 5 in | administ | to articles, | | and administration | Baseline Assessments | |
| reading. | ration of | brochures, | | to ensure progress | Interim Assessments | |
| | the FCAT | fliers and | | is being made by | FCAT Test Maker | |
| | Reading | websites use | | students in order to | Reading Plus | |
| | Test was | text features | | make adjustments as | FCAT Explorer | |
| | Reporting | to locate, | | needed. | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | Category 4- | interpret and | | | Summative: | |
| | Informati | organize | | Teachers will provide | 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 | |
| | onal Text/ | information | | the students with | | |
| | Research | for Reference | | enrichment activities | | |
| | Process. | and Research. | | and reinforce | | |
| | | | | mastered benchmarks | | |
| | | | | through tutorials. | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Reading Goal #2a: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 23% (98) of students achieved levels 4 & 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 & 5 proficiency by 3 percentage points to 26% (110) | Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | 23%(98) | 26% (110) | | | | | |
| | | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | |
| | | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | |

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading. | N/A | 2b.1. N/A | 2b.1. N/A | 2b.1. N/A | 2b.1. N/A | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| Reading Goal #2b: N/A | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 2b.2. | 2b2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | |
| | | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| | la . | L . | Ta . | la . | la . | 1 | |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: | 3a.1. | 3a.1. | | 3a.1. | 3a.1. | | |
| Percentage of | As noted | Utilizing | | Results of the bi- | Formative: | | |
| students making | on the | non-fiction | | weekly assessment | F.A.I.R. Assessments | | |
| Learning Gains | 2012 | articles and | Grade-Level Chair | data reports will be | Baseline Assessments | | |
| in reading. | | editorials for | | reviewed by teachers | Interim Assessments | | |
| | on of the | instruction, | | and administration | FCAT Test Maker | | |
| | | two-column | | to ensure progress | Classroom Walkthroughs | | |
| | Reading | notes to list | | is being made by | Summative: | | |
| | Test, the | conclusions | | students in order to | 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 | | |
| | μ | and | | make adjustments as | | | |
| | | supporting | | needed. | | | |
| | making | evidence to | | T 1 '11 | | | |
| | learning | teach and | | Teachers will | | | |
| | gains | develop | | provide the students | | | |
| | | a rotation | | follow-up activities | | | |
| | as | schedule for | | dependent on data | | | |
| | | the computer | | gathered from bi- | | | |
| | | lab in order | | weekly benchmark | | | |
| | FCAT | to optimize | | assessments. | | | |
| | Reading | the use of | | | | | |
| | Test. | computers to | | | | | |
| | | increase the | | | | | |
| | | implementati | | | | | |
| | Information | | | | | | |
| | al Text/ | Reading Plus | | | | | |
| | | and | | | | | |
| | | FCAT | | | | | |
| | where | Explorer. | | | | | |
| | students | | | | | | |
| | struggled | | | | | | |
| | to make | | | | | | |
| | learning | | | | | | |
| | gains. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | | | |

| Reading Goal #3a: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 58% (187) made leaning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 10 percentage points to 68% (219 | Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | 58%(187) | 68% (219) | | | | | |
| | | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | |
| | | 3a.3. | 3a.3. | 3a.3. | 3a3. | 3a.3. | |

| Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. | N/A | N/A | 3b.1. N/A | 3b.1. N/A | 3b.1. N/A | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| Reading Goal #3b: N/A | ILevel of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | |
| | | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 4 ECAE | 4a.1. | 4a.1. | 4a.1. | 4a.1. | 4a.1. | |
|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|
| 4a. FCAT | | After school | Leadership Team | Assistant Principal | Formative: | |
| 2.0:Percentage | | tutoring | MTSS/RtI Team | and Lead Teacher | F.A.I.R. Assessments | |
| or statements in | | will be | Grade-Level Chair | | Baseline Assessments | |
| Lowest 25% | | implemented | | reports and after- | Interim Assessments | |
| making learning | | | | | FCAT Test Maker | |
| gains in reading. | | to as a | | school tutoring | | |
| | | structured | | attendance rosters | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | | tutoring tool | | to ensure progress | Summative: | |
| | | implemented | | is being made and | 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 | |
| | | with fidelity. | | adjust interventions | | |
| | | Our after- | | as needed. | | |
| | 1 | school | | | | |
| | | tutoring | | | | |
| | | program | | | | |
| | | will include | | | | |
| | | supplemental | | | | |
| | | materials sucl | 1 | | | |
| | | as FL Ready | | | | |
| | | Reading that | | | | |
| | | target specific | | | | |
| | | strategies | | | | |
| | | and concepts | | | | |
| | | that students | | | | |
| | | lacked. | | | | |
| | Category 2- | | | | | |
| | | Weekly raffle | | | | |
| | Application | | | | | |
| | | will motivate | | | | |
| | | students | | | | |
| | | to attend | | | | |
| | to make | tutoring. | | | | |
| | gains. | | | | | |
| | | After-school | | | | |
| | | and in-house | | | | |
| | | tutoring | | | | |
| | | programs | | | | |
| | that | with a focus | | | | |
| | students not | on: | | | | |
| | | analyzing a | | | | |
| | growth | variety of text | t | | | |

| | ., 1 | <u> </u> | | | · |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------|--|---|
| | | structures | | | |
| | | such as | | | |
| to | receive | comparison/ | | | |
| ren | mediation | contrast, | | | |
| and | nd d | cause/effect, | | | |
| | tervention | chronological | | | |
| wit | ithin a | order, | | | |
| | | argument/ | | | |
| | | support | | | |
| | | and text | | | |
| pro | ogram. | and text | | | |
| | | features (main | | | |
| | ļ | headings with | | | |
| | | subheadings) | | | |
| | ŀ | and explain | | | |
| | [1 | their impact | | | |
| | Į | meaning in | | | |
| | | text | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #4a: 201 | 12 Current | 2013Expected | | | |
| Reading Goal #4a: 201 Lev | evel of | Level of | | | |
| The results of Per | rformance:* | Performance:* | | | |
| the 2012 FCAT | | | | | |
| 2.0 Reading Test | | | | | |
| indicate that 70% | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| (58) of students | | | | | |
| in the lowest 25% | | | | | |
| made learning | | | | | |
| gains. | | | | | |
| Our goal for the | | | | | |
| 2012-2013 school | | | | | |
| year is to increase | | | | | |
| by 5 percentage | | | | | |
| points to 75% | | | | | |
| (62). | | | | | |
| (02). | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | 70% (58) | 75% (62) | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--|
| | | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | |
| | | 4a.3 | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | |
| Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | N/A | N/A | 4b.1. N/A | 4b.1. N/A | 4b.1. N/A | | |
| Reading Goal #4b: N/A | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | |
| | | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010- 2011 53% | 57% | 61% | 65% | 69% | 73% | 77% |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|-----|-----|
| Reading Goal #5A: Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 5B. Student | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | Ι | |
|---|---------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----|--|
| subgroups | | Provide | Leadership Team | MTSS/RtI Leadership | | | |
| | | adequate | MTSS/RtI Team | Team will meet | Voyager Passport | | |
| by commenty | | | | | Reading Plus | | |
| (, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | services using | | | F.A.I.R. Assessments | | |
| riispanio, risian, | 2012 FCAT | | 1 | effectiveness of the | Baseline Assessments | | |
| initerioum maiam) | | daily for 30 | | program delivery | Interim Assessments | | |
| | | minutes for | | using results from | Classroom Walkthroughs | | |
| satisfactory | | all Level 1-2 | | Reading Plus and | Summative: | | |
| P. 08. 000 | | students; and | | Voyager Passport to | 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 | | |
| reading. | | Reading Plus | | determine student | 2013 Redding 1 C/11 2.0 | | |
| | | 30 minutes | | growth. | | | |
| | satisfactory | | | Siowin. | | | |
| | | week. | | | | | |
| | gains in the | | | | | | |
| | | Monitor | | | | | |
| | | progress | | | | | |
| | | consistently | | | | | |
| | Application | | | | | | |
| | | the 2012- | | | | | |
| | | 2013 school | | | | | |
| | I | year by | | | | | |
| | | utilizing | | | | | |
| | | data from | | | | | |
| | provided | Vovager | | | | | |
| | with at least | Reading | | | | | |
| | 30 minutes | Plus and the | | | | | |
| | | Baseline | | | | | |
| | intervention | and Interim | | | | | |
| | | results. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | ! | į. | ! | ļ. | ļ. | |

| #5B: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading test indicate that 50% (209) of Hispanic students in ethnicity subgroups met proficiency. Our goal is to increase proficiency to 63% (263) in the 2012-2013 school year. | Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|--|--|---|---|----------------|--|
| | Black: N/A Hispanic: 50% (209) Asian: N/A American | White: N/A Black: N/A Hispanic: 63% (263) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A | | | |
| | | | | 5B.2. 5B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | | |

| 5C. English | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | |
|----------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Language | As noted | The student | Leadership Team | Teacher and | Formative: | |
| Learners (ELL) | on the | will | | ESOL Liaison will | F.A.I.R. Assessments | |
| not making | administra | | ESOL Liaison | collaborate regarding | Baseline Assessments | |
| satisfactory | tion of the | explicit | | | Interim Assessments | |
| progress in | 2012 FCAT | ideas and | | and make adjustments | FCAT Test Maker | |
| reading. | 2.0 Reading | information | | where necessary. | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| 8 | | in grade- | | | Summative: | |
| | the ELL | level text, | | • | 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 | |
| | | including but | | ESOL Strategies in | | |
| | | not limited | | Lesson Plans and | | |
| | | to main idea, | | ESOL Levels in the | | |
| | | relevant | | grade book. | | |
| | gains in the | | | | | |
| | Reporting | | | The Leadership | | |
| | | strongly | | Team will provide | | |
| | of Reading | | | Professional | | |
| | | message and | | Development for | | |
| | | inference, and | | teachers in order | | |
| | | chronological | | to monitor ELL | | |
| | | order of | | student's progress | | |
| | | events by: | | through differentiated | | |
| | | Brainstormin | | instruction activities. | | |
| | | g | | | | |
| | 1 | Activating | | | | |
| | 1 | Prior | | | | |
| | | Knowledge | | | | |
| | 1 | and | | | | |
| | | Summarizing | | | | |

| #5C: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 31% (36) of students in the ELL subgroup met satisfactory progress. Our goal is to increase student proficiency to 47% (54) and decrease the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress. | Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | | 47% (54) 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD)not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal | N/A 2012 Current | N/A 2013 Expected | 5D.1. N/A | 5D.1. N/A | 5D.1. N/A | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| #5D: N/A | Level of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 5D.2. | |
| | | | | | | 5D.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 5E. Economically | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | |
|----------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Disadvantaged | The area of | Utilize grade- | Administration | Data will be gathered | Formative: | |
| students | | level | | by administration | F.A.I.R. Assessments | |
| not making | as noted on | appropriate | | and teachers for | Baseline Assessments | |
| satisfactory | the 2012 | texts that | | | Interim Assessments | |
| progress in | administrati | include | | Assessments. | FCAT Test Maker | |
| reading. | on or the | | | | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| _ | n C/11 2.0 | identifiable | | and teachers will | Summative: | |
| | 8 | author's | | meet to discuss and | 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 | |
| | | purpose for | | determine student | | |
| | Reporting | writing, | | growth. | | |
| | Category | including | | A 1 · · · | | |
| | 2, Reading | informing, | | Administration will | | |
| | Application . Students | telling a | | monitor bi-weekly classroom benchmark | | |
| | . Staatits | story, | | assessments focusing | | |
| | 100011 0110 | conveying a | | on students' | | |
| | | particular | | knowledge of | | |
| | I | r | | Reading Application. | | |
| | | mood, | | reduing rippireution. | | |
| | and | entertaining | | | | |
| | explain | or | | | | |
| | how it | explaining. | | | | |
| | impacts | Students will | | | | |
| | meaning in | be provided | | | | |
| | text. | practice in | | | | |
| | | making | | | | |
| | | inferences | | | | |
| | | and drawing | | | | |
| | | conclusions | | | | |
| | | within and | | | | |
| | | across texts. | | | | |
| | | Students will | | | | |
| | | be able to | | | | |
| | | identify a | | | | |
| | | correct | | | | |
| | | summary | | | | |

| statement. |
|-----------------|
| Students |
| should focus |
| on what the |
| author thinks |
| and feels. |
| Students |
| should be |
| able to |
| identify |
| causal |
| relationships |
| imbedded in |
| text. Students |
| must be |
| familiar with |
| text |
| structures |
| such as cause/ |
| effect, |
| compare/ |
| contrast, and |
| chronological |
| order. |
| Provide Provide |
| practice in |
| identifying |
| topics and |
| themes |
| within and |
| across texts. |
| |

| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 49% (192) of the Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal is to increase student proficiency to 60% (235) in Reading for this subgroup. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|------|------|------|-------|--|
| | H9% (192) | 00% (233) | | | | | |
| | | 5E.2. | | | | 5E.2. | |
| | | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | |

Reading Professional Development

| Professional | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Development | | | |
| (PD) aligned with | | | |
| Strategies through | | | |
| Professional | | | |
| Learning | | | |
| Community (PLC) | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Differentiated Instruction in the Reading Classroom | K-8 Reading | Reading Liaison/ ELL Liaison | K-8 Reading Teachers | August 16, 2012 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| FCAT 2.0 Item Specs | K-8 Reading | NAEP | K-8 Reading Teachers | September 17, 2012 October 2012-January 2013 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| Common Core State Standards Summer Institutes | K-8 Reading | FLDOE | K-8 Reading Teachers Administration | June 2012-July 2012 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | Administrative Leadership Team |
| Reading Plus | K-8 Reading | Reading Liaison | K-8 Reading Teachers | August 16-17, 2012 January 2013 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review student sessions | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| Voyager Training | K-8 Reading | Reading Liaison | K-8 Teachers | August 17, 2012 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | / | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Include only school-based funded | | | |
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | |
| funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |

| In order to increase student performance | Voyager Kits | Title I | \$3000.00 |
|--|--------------|---------|-----------|
| Reporting Category 2- Reading | | | |
| Application teachers will incorporate | | | |
| reading strategies that assist students to: | | | |
| Utilize grade-level appropriate texts that | | | |
| include identifiable author's purpose | | | |
| for writing, including informing, telling | | | |
| a story, conveying a particular mood, | | | |
| entertaining or explaining. Students | | | |
| will be provided practice in making | | | |
| inferences and drawing conclusions | | | |
| within and across texts. Students will | | | |
| be able to identify a correct summary | | | |
| statement. Students should focus | | | |
| on what the author thinks and feels. | | | |
| Students should be able to identify causal | | | |
| relationships imbedded in text. Students | | | |
| must be familiar with text structures such | | | |
| as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and | | | |
| chronological order. Provide practice in | | | |
| identifying topics and themes within and | | | |
| across texts. | | | |
| | | | |
| In addition, in order to increase student | | | |
| performance on Reporting Category 4- | | | |
| Informational Text/Research Process | | | |
| teachers will incorporate reading | | | |
| strategies that assist students to: | | | |
| Use how-to articles, brochures, fliers and | | | |
| other real-world documents to identify text features (subtitles, headings, charts, | | | |
| graphs, diagrams, etc) and to locate, | | | |
| interpret and organize information. Help | | | |
| students recognize the characteristics | | | |
| of reliable and valid information. Use | | | |
| supporting facts within and across texts. | | | |
| | | | |

| Subtotal: \$3000.00 | | | |
|---|--|----------------|-------------|
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Tutoring will be provided for students who performed at a Level 1-2 on the FCAT Reading 2.0 test. Tutoring will be provided Monday/Wednesday for one hour each day beginning in December. In addition, enrichment classes will be offered on Saturdays from 9:00-12:00 | CARS/STARS Reading Program Florida Ready Reading Series FCAT Reading Coach | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| pm for all students who scored a 3-5 on the FCAT Reading 2.0. | | | |
| Subtotal: \$13,000.00 | | | |
| Total: \$13,000.00 | | | |

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| CELLA Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|----------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Students speak in English and | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible | Process Used to | Evaluation Tool | |
| understand spoken English at | | | for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness | | |
| grade level in a manner similar to | | | | of | | |
| non-ELL students. | | | | Strategy | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| 1. Students scoring | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------|---|------------------------|--|
| proficient in Listening/ | According to the results | | | ESOL Liaison along | | |
| Speaking. | of the 2012 CELLA Test, | Listening and Speaking | | | Baseline Assessments | |
| | students lack Listening/ | 1 2 | | | Interim Assessments | |
| | Speaking Skills such as the | subgroups in order | | | FCAT Test Maker | |
| | ability to paraphrase what | to provide ongoing | | frequently in order | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | ' ' ' | support. | | to provide ongoing | Summative: | |
| | they have read, as well as | The Calleraine Listeniae | | | 2013 CELLA | |
| | putting vocabulary words | The following Listening | | services. | | |
| | and concepts into their own | Strategies will be | | EGOT 1 | | |
| | words without leaving out | utilized for ELL | | ESOL Liaison | | |
| | essential information. | Subgroups: | | will ensure that teachers have the | | |
| | | Modeling, Teacher | | | | |
| | | Led Groups, Using | | appropriate ESOL | | |
| | | illustrations/diagrams, | | Strategies to include in Lesson Plans and | | |
| | | using simple and | | ESOL Levels in the | | |
| | | direct language and | | gradebook. | | |
| | | using substitution, | | gradebook. | | |
| | | expansion, paraphrase | | Administration | | |
| | | and repetition. | | will ensure to | | |
| | | The following Speaking Strategies will be | | provide Professional | | |
| | | utilized for ELL | | Development | | |
| | | Subgroups: | | to monitor | | |
| | | Brainstorming, | | ELL student's | | |
| | | Cooperative Learning, | | progress through | | |
| | | Repetition, Role Play, | | differentiated | | |
| | | Teacher-Led groups, | | instruction | | |
| | | Teacher-Student | | activities. | | |
| | | Modeling and Think | | activities. | | |
| | | Alouds. | | | | |
| | | nouus. | | | | |

| CELLA Goal #1: The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Test indicate that 35% (77) of the students tested scored a level of proficiency in the Listening/ Speaking portion of the test. Our goal is to increase student proficiency in Listening/Speaking during the 2012-2013 school year. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|------|
| | 35% (77) | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| 2. Students scoring proficient in Reading. | As noted on the 2012 CELLA Test the lowest category of performance was in Reading. Students lack the Reading Comprehension skills needed to perform at grade level due to their language barrier. | Teachers will provide Listening and Speaking | Leadership Team MTSS/RtI Team ESOL Liaison | assessments. | 2.1. Formative: Baseline Assessments Interim Assessments FCAT Test Maker Classroom Walkthroughs Summative: 2013 CELLA 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 | |
|--|---|--|--|--------------|---|--|
|--|---|--|--|--------------|---|--|

| CELLA Goal #2: The results of the 2012 CELLA Test indicate that 27% (61) of the students tested scored a level of proficiency in the Reading portion of the test. Our goal is to increase student proficiency in Reading during the 2012-2013 school year. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|------|
| | 27% (61) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 22 | 2.2 |
| | | | | | | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| 3. Students scoring proficient in Writing. | As noted on the 2012 CELLA Test students lack Writing Skills such as focus, organization, support and conventions needed to perform at grade level due to their language barrier. | includes a Writer's Notebook centered on prewriting, drafting, | Leadership Team MTSS/RtI Team ESOL Liaison | 3.1. Using the FCIM, we will analyze and adjust writing instruction to focus on student's knowledge of writing skills to ensure progress | 3.1. Formative: Baseline Assessments Interim Assessments FCAT Test Maker Classroom Walkthroughs Summative: 2013 CELLA 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|-------------|
| | | effective writing using mentor text, rubrics, anchor papers and incorporate writing conferences with students. | | is being made. MTSS team will meet monthly with the teachers to review bi-weekly assessment data reports and monthly writing prompts. | | |
| CELLA Goal #3: The results of the 2012 CELLA Test indicate that 31% (70) of the students tested scored a level of proficiency in the Writing portion of the test. Our goal is to increase student proficiency in Writing during the 2012-2013 school year. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: | | | | | |
| | 31% (70). | | | | | |
| | | 3.2. 3.3 | 3.2. 3.3 | 3.2. 3.3 | | 3.2. 3.3 |

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| In-depth writing instruction including model study, writing traits, writing strategies, and applications connected to the units in the Reading and Language Book | Inside Textbooks | Title III | \$5379.63 |
| Extensive practice for reading and language instruction | | | |
| Readings with audio support help students build fluency | | | |
| Interactive software designed for striving readers and English language learners to build their reading power. Students develop reading skills, practice pronunciation and fluency, and acquire academic vocabulary using the software's structured supports. | | | |
| Subtotal: \$5379.63 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Total:\$5379.63 | | | |

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| Elementary Mathematics Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|
| 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: | | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| 1a.FCAT 2.0: | 1a.1. | 1a.1. | 1a.1. | 1a.1. | 1a.1. | |
|--|---------------|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | Students | | Leadership Team will | Formative: | |
| Students scoring at AchievementLevel 3 | | will develop | | ensure that Department | Baseline Assessments | |
| in mathematics. | as noted on | the ability | | Chair/Grade Level's meet | Interim Assessments | |
| | | to describe | | weekly to review and | FCAT Test Maker | |
| | | their physical | | analyze data gathered from | GIZMOS | |
| | Mathematics | | | bi-weekly benchmark | Think Central | |
| | | geometric | | assessments. In addition, | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | Measuremen | | | meetings will be held to | Summative: | |
| | | describe and | | obtain teacher feedback on | 2013 MathematicsFCAT | |
| | | compare | | effectiveness of manipulative | | |
| | | measurable | | usage with students and | | |
| | | attributes; | | provide sufficient training/ | | |
| | | identify, | | help in order to meet the | | |
| | | name, and | | expectations. | | |
| | knowledge | describe | | • | | |
| | in contexts | basic two- | | Teacher's will monitor | | |
| | for | dimensional | | student performance on | | |
| | mathematica | shapes, as | | GIZMO lesson usage, | | |
| | | well as three- | | by printing reports and | | |
| | | dimensional | | conducting data chats with | | |
| | development | shapes; and | | students. Data logs will be | | |
| | | analyze | | monitored by Leadership | | |
| | | shapes | | Team. | | |
| | | and spatial | | | | |
| | | reasoning to | | | | |
| | | model objects | | | | |
| | | in their | | | | |
| | | environment | | | | |
| | J 11 | and to | | | | |
| | | construct | | | | |
| | | more complex | | | | |
| | | shapes. | | | | |
| | engaging | Engage | | | | |
| | opportunities | students in | | | | |
| | | activities | | | | |
| | | to use | | | | |
| | | technology | | | | |
| | | such as | | | | |
| | ļ | Davii ub | | | | |

| #1a: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0Mathematics Test indicate that 30% (127) of students achieved level 3proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 31% (131). | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | Gizmos that includes visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of measurement and students' geometry and spatial sense. 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | 30% (127) | 31% (131) | | | | | |
| | | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | | 1a.2. | |
| | | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | |

| | lb.1. N/A | | 1b.1. N/A | lb.1. N/A | lb.1. N/A | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| #1h: | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | N/A 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | |
| | | | | 1b.3. | | 1b.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 2a.FCAT | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | |
|---------------------|--------------|----------------|-------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| 2.0:Students | Students | Following | | Bi-weekly reviews will be | Formative: | |
| scoring at or above | lack the | the Florida | | conducted by teachers to | Baseline Assessments | |
| AchievementLevels | geometric | Continuous | | review ongoing assessments | Interim Assessments | |
| 4 and 5 in | knowledge | Improvement | | that target application of | FCAT Test Maker | |
| mathematics. | and spatial | Model | | the skills being taught. | GIZMOS | |
| mathematics. | reasoning | (FCIM) | | Administrators will meet with | | |
| | | teachers will | | grade level and department | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | | provide | | chairs monthly to discuss | Summative: | |
| | for | hands-on | | data and modify instruction | 2013 MathematicsFCAT | |
| | understandin | | | where needed. | 2.0 | |
| | | activities and | | | | |
| | area, | technology in | | Teachers will monitor student | | |
| | volume, | order to | | progress on GIZMO lesson | | |
| | | enable | | usage, by printing reports and | | |
| | area; these | students to | | conducting data chats with | | |
| | activities | describe | | students. | | |
| | should | three- | | | | |
| | include the | dimensional | | | | |
| | selection of | shapes and | | | | |
| | | analyze their | | | | |
| | units, | properties, | | | | |
| | strategies, | including | | | | |
| | and tools | volume and | | | | |
| | to solve | surface area; | | | | |
| | problems | identify and | | | | |
| | involving | plot ordered | | | | |
| | these | pairs on the | | | | |
| | measures. | first | | | | |
| | | quadrant; | | | | |
| | | compare, | | | | |
| | | contrast, and | | | | |
| | | convert units | | | | |
| | | of measures | | | | |
| | | within the | | | | |
| | | same | | | | |
| | | dimension to | | | | |
| | | solve | | | | |
| | | problems; | | | | |
| | | solve | | | | |

| | | |
|------------------------|------|--|
| problems | | |
| requiring | | |
| requiring attention to | | |
| approximatio | | |
| ns, selections of | | |
| of | | |
| onproprieto | | |
| appropriate | | |
| tools, and | | |
| precision in | | |
| measurement; | | |
| and derive | | |
| and apply | | |
| formulas for | | |
| area. | | |
| | | |
| Teachers | | |
| will engage | | |
| students in | | |
| activities | | |
| to use | | |
| technology | | |
| technology | | |
| such as | | |
| Gizmos that | | |
| includes | | |
| visual | | |
| stimulus | | |
| to develop | | |
| conceptual | | |
| understanding | | |
| understanding of | | |
| measurement | | |
| and students' | | |
| geometry and | | |
| spatial sense. | | |
| Spatial Soliso. | | |
| Saturday | | |
| Enrichment | | |
| Classes | | |
| Classes will | | |
| be offered | | |
| to students | | |

| | 1 | | 1 | <u> </u> | | 1 | |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------|----------|-------|-------|--|
| | | scoring a level 4- | | | | | |
| | | 5 on the | | | | | |
| | | mathematics | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | portion of | | | | | |
| | | the FCAT | | | | | |
| | | 2.0 to focus | | | | | |
| | | on higher | | | | | |
| | | order thinking | | | | | |
| | | questioning | | | | | |
| | | skills to | | | | | |
| | | maintain | | | | | |
| | | or increase | | | | | |
| | | student | | | | | |
| | | performance. | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current | 2013Expected | | | | | |
| #2a: | Level of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Performance. | Performance. | | | | | |
| The results of | | | | | | | |
| the 2012 FCAT | | | | | | | |
| 2.0Mathematics | | | | | | | |
| Test indicate that | | | | | | | |
| 19% (81) of students | | | | | | | |
| achieved levels 4-5 | | | | | | | |
| proficiency. | | | | | | | |
| Our goal for the | | | | | | | |
| 2012-2013 school | | | | | | | |
| year is to increase by | | | | | | | |
| 1 percentage point to | | | | | | | |
| 20% (85). | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 100/ (00) | 200/ (85) | | | | | |
| | 19% (80) | 20% (85). | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 21 El 11 | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | 2b.1. | | |
| 2b. Florida Alternate | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| Assessment: | | | | | | | |
| Students scoring at | | | | | | | |
| or above Level 7 in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 G | 20125 | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2b: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013Expected Level of | | | | | |
| # <u>20.</u> | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2b.2. | 2b2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | |
|---------------------------|-------------|----------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for | Effectiveness of | | |
| data, and reference to | | | Monitoring | Strategy | | |
| "Guiding Questions", | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | |
| for the following group: | | | | | | |

| 2 ECATION | lo _ 1 | b ₋ 1 | b ₋ 1 | 2 - 1 | b - 1 | |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: | 3a.1. As noted | 3a.1. | 3a.1. Leadership Team | 3a.1. Bi-weekly reviews will be | 3a.1. Formative: | |
| Percentage of | | utilize | 1 | conducted by teachers to | Baseline Assessments | |
| students making | administra | | | review ongoing assessments | Interim Assessments | |
| Learning Gains in | tion of the | daily as well | | | FCAT Test Maker | |
| mathematics. | FCAT 2.0 | | | that target application of | | |
| | | as technology | | the skills being taught. Administrators will meet with | GIZMOS | |
| | Mathematics | | | | | |
| | Test, the | such as | | grade level and department | Intervention Assessments | |
| | percent of | GIZMOS, at | | chairs monthly to discuss | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | students | least 2 times | | data and modify instruction | Summative: | |
| | making | per week in | | where needed. | 2013 Mathematics FCAT | |
| | learning | the computer | | | | |
| | gains was | lab, to | | Teachers will monitor student | | |
| | | provide | | progress on GIZMO lesson | | |
| | However, | grade-level | | usage, by printing reports and | | |
| | | appropriate | | conducting data chats with | | |
| | a gap in | activities that | | students. | | |
| | | promote the | | | | |
| | Category 3- | | | | | |
| | | geometric | | | | |
| | and | knowledge | | | | |
| | Measuremen | 1 1 | | | | |
| | t. | reasoning to | | | | |
| | | develop | | | | |
| | | foundations | | | | |
| | | for | | | | |
| | | understanding | | | | |
| | | perimeter, | | | | |
| | | area, volume, | | | | |
| | | and surface | | | | |
| | | area; these | | | | |
| | | activities | | | | |
| | | should | | | | |
| | | include the | | | | |
| | | selection of | | | | |
| | | appropriate | | | | |
| | | units, | | | | |
| | | strategies, | | | | |
| | | and tools to | | | | |
| | | solve | | | | |

| | | problems | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | problems | | | | | |
| | | involving | | | | | |
| | | these | | | | | |
| | | measures. | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current | 2013Expected | | | | | |
| <u>#3a:</u> | Level of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | r errormance. | r errormance. | | | | | |
| On the 2012 FCAT | | | | | | | |
| 2.0 Mathematics Test | | | | | | | |
| 80% (258) of students | S | | | | | | |
| made learning gains. | | | | | | | |
| Our goal for the | | | | | | | |
| 2012-2013 school | | | | | | | |
| year is to provide | | | | | | | |
| interventions | | | | | | | |
| and remediation | | | | | | | |
| opportunities in | | | | | | | |
| order to increase | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| the percentage of | | | | | | | |
| students making | | | | | | | |
| learning gains to | | | | | | | |
| 85% (274) | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 0.00/ (0.50) | 0.50/ (0.514) | | | | | |
| | 80% (258) | 85% (274) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | 3a.2. | |
| | | | | * *** | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2- 2 | 2 - 2 | 2- 2 | 2- 2 | 2- 2 | |
| | | 3a.3. | 3a.3. | 3a.3. | 3a3. | 3a.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. | 3b.1. N/A | 3b.1. N/A | 3b.1. N/A | 3b.1. N/A | 3b.1. N/A | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| #2h: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | N/A 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | |
| | | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | 3b.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| A DOLE O | T ₄ 1 | l _{4 1} | I _{4 1} | 4 1 | I4 1 | |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 4a.FCAT 2.0: | 4a.1. As noted | 4a.1. | | 4a.1. Teachers will review | 4a.1. Formative: | |
| Percentage of | on the | utilize | | data reports that focus | Baseline Assessments | |
| students in Lowest | administ | | | | Interim Assessments | |
| 25% making | | | | on bi-weekly benchmark | | |
| learning gains in | ration of | daily as well | | assessment. Data will be | FCAT Test Maker | |
| mathematics. | the 2012 | as technology | | utilized to modify instruction | | |
| | FCAT 2.0 | programs | | and differentiated instruction | | |
| | Mathematics | | | groups. | Summative: | |
| | | Reflex Math | | | 2013 Mathematics FCAT | |
| | | and | | Administration will maintain | 2.0 | |
| | | GIZMOS, at | | reports of weekly after- | | |
| | the lowest | least 2 times | | school tutoring activities and | | |
| | 25% making | | | pre/post test assessments | | |
| | | the computer | | to ensure progress is being | | |
| | | lab, to | | made and adjust interventions | | |
| | significant. | provide | | as needed. | | |
| | | grade-level | | | | |
| | The students | | | Attendance rosters will be | | |
| | | activities that | | turned in daily to verify | | |
| | remediation | | | that students are attending | | |
| | and | use | | tutoring on a daily basis. | | |
| | intervention, | | | | | |
| | specifically | | | | | |
| | in geometry | _ <u> </u> | | | | |
| | and | reasoning to | | | | |
| | measure | develop | | | | |
| | | foundations | | | | |
| | receive | for | | | | |
| | intensive | understanding | | | | |
| | tutoring | perimeter, | | | | |
| | | area, volume, | | | | |
| | | and surface | | | | |
| | | area; these | | | | |
| | | activities | | | | |
| | interventions | | | | | |
| | ŀ | include the | | | | |
| | | selection of | | | | |
| | | appropriate | | | | |
| | | units, | | | | |
| | | strategies, | | | | |

| | | and tools to solve problems involving these measures. | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 74% (61) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate tutoring in order to increase | Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest 25% by 5 percentage points to 79% (66). | 7/10/ (61) | 700/ (66) | | | | | |
| | | 79% (66) | | | | | |
| | | 4a.2. | | | | 4a.2. | |
| | | 4a.3 | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | |

| 4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | 4b.1. N/A | 4b.1. N/A | 4b.1. N/A | 4b.1. N/A | 4b.1. N/A | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--|
| Mathematics Goal #4b: N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 4b.2. | |
| | | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |

| but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | 42% | 48% | 53% | 58% | 63% | 69% |
|---|------------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|-----|-----|
| Mathematics Goal #5A: Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | N/A | | | | 5B.1. N/A | | |

| Mail at C 1 | 2012 Cumont | 2013Expected | ı | | I | i | |
|---|------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| #5D: | Level of | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| N/A | Performance.* | Performance.** | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | N/A | 5C.1. N/A | | 5C.1. N/A | 5C.1. N/A | | |
| Mathematics Goal | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |

| | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 5D. Students | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| with Disabilities | | | | MTSS/RtI team will work | Formative: | |
| (SWD)not making | | grade level | | with classroom teachers to | Baseline Assessments | |
| satisfactory progress | | appropriate | | ensure that appropriate ESE | Interim Assessments | |
| in mathematics. | the 2012 | activities that | | strategies are being utilized | FCAT Test Maker | |
| in mathematics. | FCAT 2.0 | promote the | | to raise achievement in this | GIZMOS | |
| | | use geometric | | subgroup. | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | Test was | knowledge | | 2 1 | Summative: | |
| | Reporting | and spatial | | Monitor teachers' use | 2013 Mathematics FCAT | |
| | | reasoning | | of ESE Strategies and | 2.0 | |
| | | to develop | | Accommodations. | | |
| | and | foundations | | | | |
| | Measuremen | for | | Monitor Teacher/ESE | | |
| | t. | understanding | | Liaison collaboration | | |
| | | perimeter, | | regarding student's progress. | | |
| | Students | area, volume, | | | | |
| | lack the | and surface | | | | |
| | | area; these | | | | |
| | | activities | | | | |
| | analyze, | should | | | | |
| | compare, | include the | | | | |
| | _ | selection of | | | | |
| | | appropriate | | | | |
| | | units, | | | | |
| | | strategies, and | l | | | |
| | develop | tools to solve | | | | |
| | | problems | | | | |
| | | involving | | | | |
| | and skills | these | | | | |
| | such as | measures. | | | | |
| | properties of two- | Encore | | | | |
| | | Engage students in | | | | |
| | dimensional | | | | | |
| | shapes/ | to use | | | | |
| | objects. | technology | | | | |
| | objects. | such as | | | | |
| | | Gizmos that | | | | |
| | | includes | | | | |
| | | visual | | | | |
| | | visuai | | | | |

| #5D: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 21% (7) of Students with Disabilities met satisfactory progress. Our goal is to increase student proficiency to 33% (11) and decrease the percentage of SWD not making satisfactory progress. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of measurement and students' geometry and spatial sense. 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | | | | 5D.2. | |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | N/A | | | | 5E.1. N/A | | |
| #5E: N/A | Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 5E.2. 5E.3 | |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Middle | Problem- | | | |
|---------------|------------|--|--|--|
| School | Solving | | | |
| Math | Process to | | | |
| ematics Goals | Increase | | | |
| | Student | | | |
| | Achievem | | | |
| | ent | | | |

| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | |
|------------------------|-------------|----------|--|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for | Effectiveness of | | |
| data, and reference to | | | Monitoring | Strategy | | |
| "Guiding Questions", | | | , and the second | <u> </u> | | |
| identify and define | | | | | | |
| areas in need of | | | | | | |
| improvement for the | | | | | | |
| following group: | | | | | | |

| 1a.FCAT 2.0: | 1a.1. | 1a.1. | 1a.1. | 1a.1. | 1a.1. | |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Students scoring at | | Teachers | Leadership Team | Leadership Team will ensure | Formative: | |
| AchievementLevel | deficiencies | | MTSS/RtI Team | that Department Chair/ | Baseline Assessments | |
| 3 in mathematics. | | instruction | Grade-Level Chair | Grade Level's meet weekly | Interim Assessments | |
| 5 in mathematics. | | to the variety | | to review and analyze data | FCAT Test Maker | |
| | | of learning | | gathered from bi-weekly | GIZMOS | |
| | Mathematics | | | assessments. | Think Central | |
| | | Providing | | | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | | visual | | In addition, monthly | Summative: | |
| | Measuremen | stimulus | | meetings will be held | 2013 Mathematics FCAT | |
| | t. | to develop | | with Leadership Team to | 2.0 | |
| | | students' | | obtain teacher feedback on | | |
| | Students | spatial sense; | | effectiveness of manipulative | | |
| | | opportunities | | usage during classroom | | |
| | ability to | to investigate | | instruction in accordance to | | |
| | solve simple | geometric | | student growth reports. | | |
| | | properties; | | | | |
| | | differentiate | | Teachers will monitor student | | |
| | rates and | instruction | | performance on GIZMO | | |
| | derived | for students; | | lessons by printing reports | | |
| | | investigate | | and conducting data chats | | |
| | | strategies to | | with the students. Data | | |
| | | determine the | | logs will be monitored by | | |
| | | surface area | | Leadership Team. | | |
| | 1 | and volume | | | | |
| | | of selected | | | | |
| | | prisms, | | | | |
| | | pyramids, | | | | |
| | | and cylinders and solve | | | | |
| | | problems | | | | |
| | | involving | | | | |
| | | scale factors, | | | | |
| | | using | | | | |
| | | ratio and | | | | |
| | | proportion. | | | | |
| | | proportion. | | | | |
| | | Engage | | | | |
| | | students in | | | | |
| | | activities | | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| | | to use technology such as Gizmos that includes visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of measurement and students' geometry and spatial sense. 2013Expected | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| #10: | Level of | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0Mathematics Test indicate that 30% (127) of students achieved level 3proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 31% (131). | | 31% (131) | | | | | |
| | 30% (127) | 31% (131) | | | | | |
| | | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | |

| | ı | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | i I |
|--|------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|-----|
| | | 14.5. | 14.5. | 14.5. | 14.5. | 14.5. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 41 171 11 | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | 1b.1. | | |
| 1b. Florida | | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | |
| r ricer mate | 11/1 | 11/7 | 1 V/A | IV/A | 11/11 | | |
| Assessment: | | | | | | | |
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Mathamatica Cast | 2012 Current | 2013Expected | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1b: | Level of | Level of | | | | | |
| #10 <u>.</u> | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| - " | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | 1 1/2 1 | 1 1/2 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | L | | | |
| | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Dagad on the one level | Antigingt- 1 | Ctratagy | Dargan or Dagiti | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for | Effectiveness of | Evaluation 100l | | |
| data, and reference to | | | Monitoring | Strategy | | | |
| "Guiding Questions", identify and define | | | | | | | |
| areas in need of | | | | | | | |
| improvement for the | | | | | | | |
| following group: | | | | | | | |

| 2a.FCAT 2.0: | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Students scoring | Students | | Leadership Team | Bi-weekly reviews will be | Formative: | |
| at or above | lack the | be provided | MTSS/RtI Team | conducted by teachers to | Baseline Assessments | |
| AchievementLevels | | with inquiry | | review ongoing assessments | Interim Assessments | |
| 4 and 5 in | find the | based lessons | Stude Bever chair | that target application of | FCAT Test Maker | |
| mathematics. | perimeters | to promote | | the skills being taught. | GIZMOS | |
| mathematics. | | authentic and | | Administrators will meet with | | |
| | | rigorous | | grade level and department | Summative: | |
| | two- | student | | chairs monthly to discuss | 2013 MathematicsFCAT | |
| | dimensional | | | data and modify instruction | 2.0 | |
| | figures, | such as: | | where needed. | [·· | |
| | including | visual | | Whore modern | | |
| | non- | stimulus to | | Teachers will monitor student | | |
| | 1 | develop | | progress on GIZMO lesson | | |
| | figures | students' | | usage, by printing reports and | | |
| | (such as | spatial sense; | | conducting data chats with | | |
| | | opportunities | | students. | | |
| | | to investigate | | | | |
| | various tools | | | | | |
| | (on-line | properties; | | | | |
| | | differentiate | | | | |
| | manipulativ | instruction | | | | |
| | es) will aid | for students; | | | | |
| | the variety | investigate | | | | |
| | of learning | strategies to | | | | |
| | styles. | determine the | | | | |
| | - | surface area | | | | |
| | | and volume | | | | |
| | | of selected | | | | |
| | | prisms, | | | | |
| | | pyramids, | | | | |
| | | and | | | | |
| | | cylinders; | | | | |
| | | solve | | | | |
| | | problems | | | | |
| | | involving | | | | |
| | | scale factors, | | | | |
| | | using ratio | | | | |
| | | and | | | | |
| | | proportion; | | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| solve simple |
|--|
| problems |
| involving |
| rates and |
| derived |
| measurements |
| for such |
| attributes as |
| velocity and |
| density. |
| |
| Engage |
| students in |
| activities |
| to use |
| technology |
| such as |
| Gizmos that |
| includes |
| visual |
| stimulus |
| to develop |
| conceptual |
| understanding |
| of Signature of the state of th |
| measurement |
| and students' |
| geometry and |
| spatial sense. |

| Mathematics Goal #2a: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0Mathematics Test indicate that 19% (80) of students achieved levels 4-5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 1 percentage point to 20% (85). | Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--|
| | 19% (80) | 20% (85) | | | | | |
| | | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | |
| | | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. | N/A | 2b.1. N/A | 2b.1. N/A | 2b.1. N/A | 2b.1. N/A | | |

| Mathematics Goal #2b: N/A | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 2b.2. | 2b2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | |
| | | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: | 3a.1. | 3a.1. | 3a.1. | 3a.1. | 3a.1. | |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Percentage of | As noted | | Leadership Team | Bi-weekly reviews will be | Formative: | |
| students making | | utilize | MTSS/RtI Team | conducted by teachers to | Baseline Assessments | |
| Learning Gains in | | | | review ongoing assessments | Interim Assessments | |
| mathematics. | tion of the | daily as well | | that target application of | FCAT Test Maker | |
| mathematics. | | as technology | | the skills being taught. | GIZMOS | |
| | Mathematics | | | Administrators will meet with | | |
| | Test, the | such as | | grade level and department | Intervention Assessments | |
| | | GIZMOS, at | | chairs monthly to discuss | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | students | least 2 times | | data and modify instruction | Summative: | |
| | making | per week in | | where needed. | 2013 Mathematics FCAT | |
| | | the computer | | | | |
| | | lab, to | | Teachers will monitor student | | |
| | | provide | | progress on GIZMO lesson | | |
| | | grade-level | | usage, by printing reports and | | |
| | 1 | appropriate | | conducting data chats with | | |
| | | activities that | | students. | | |
| | | promote the | | | | |
| | Category of | | | | | |
| | | geometric | | | | |
| | and | knowledge | | | | |
| | Measuremen | and spatial | | | | |
| | t. | reasoning to | | | | |
| | | develop | | | | |
| | | foundations | | | | |
| | | for | | | | |
| | | understanding | | | | |
| | | perimeter, | | | | |
| | | area, volume, | | | | |
| | | and surface | | | | |
| | | area; these | | | | |
| | | activities | | | | |
| | | should | | | | |
| | | include the | | | | |
| | | selection of | | | | |
| | | appropriate | | | | |
| | | units, | | | | |
| | | strategies, | | | | |
| | | and tools to | | | | |
| | | solve | | | | |

| Mathematics Goal #3a: On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 80% (258) of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide interventions and remediation opportunities in | 2012 Current Level of | problems involving these measures. 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|--|
| the percentage of students making learning gains to 85% (274). | 80% (258) | 85% (274). | | | |
| | | 3a.2. 3a.3. | 3a.2. 3a.3. | 3a.2. 3a.3. | |

| Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. | | | 3b.1. N/A | 3b.1. N/A | 3b.1. N/A | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| Mathematics Goal #3b: N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | 3b.2. | | 3b.2. | |
| | | 3b.3. | | 3b.3. | | 3b.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 4a.FCAT 2.0: | 4a.1. | 4a.1. | 4a.1. | 4a.1. | 4a.1. | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Percentage of | As noted | | Leadership Team | Teachers will review | Formative: | |
| students in Lowest | | | | data reports that focus | Baseline Assessments | |
| 25% making | administ | | | on bi-weekly benchmark | Interim Assessments | |
| learning gains in | ration of | daily as well | | assessment. Data will be | FCAT Test Maker | |
| | | as technology | | utilized to modify instruction | | |
| mathematics. | | programs | | and differentiated instruction | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | Mathematics | | | groups. | Summative: | |
| | | Reflex Math | | groups. | 2013 Mathematics FCAT | |
| | | and | | Administration will maintain | | |
| | | GIZMOS, at | | reports of weekly after- | [| |
| | | least 2 times | | school tutoring activities and | | |
| | 25% making | | | pre/post test assessments | | |
| | | the computer | | to ensure progress is being | | |
| | | lab, to | | made and adjust interventions | | |
| | | provide | | as needed. | | |
| | | grade-level | | | | |
| | The students | | | Attendance rosters will be | | |
| | | activities that | | turned in daily to verify | | |
| | remediation | promote the | | that students are attending | | |
| | and | use | | tutoring on a daily basis. | | |
| | intervention, | geometric | | | | |
| | | knowledge | | | | |
| | in geometry | and spatial | | | | |
| | and | reasoning to | | | | |
| | measure | develop | | | | |
| | ment, will | foundations | | | | |
| | | for | | | | |
| | intensive | understanding | | | | |
| | tutoring | perimeter, | | | | |
| | | area, volume, | | | | |
| | | and surface | | | | |
| | | area; these | | | | |
| | | activities | | | | |
| | interventions | | | | | |
| | ļ. | include the | | | | |
| | | selection of | | | | |
| | | appropriate | | | | |
| | | units, | | | | |
| | | strategies, | | | | |

| | | and tools to solve problems involving these measures. | | | | | |
|--|----------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Mathematics Goal #4a: On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 74% (61) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate tutoring in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest 25% by 5 percentage points to 79% (66). | | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 74% (61) | 79% (66) | | | | | |
| | | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | 4a.2. | |

| | l | 4a.3 | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | 4a.3. | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 4b. Florida | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | 4b.1. | | |
| Alternate | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| Assessment: | 1 1/11 | 1 1/2 1 | 1,71 | | 1 1/11 | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of | | | | | | | |
| students in Lowest | | | | | | | |
| 25% making | | | | | | | |
| learning gains in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current | 2013Expected | | | | | |
| #4b: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013Expected Level of | | | | | |
| # 40. | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | NT/A | NT/A | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 4b.3 | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | 4b.3. | |
| | | 1.0.5 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | <u> </u> | L | | l . | l | | |

| Based on Ambitious | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|---|------------------------|-----------|---|---|-----------------|-----------|-----|
| but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | | |
| but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | 37% | 42% | 48% | 53% | 58% | 63% | 69% |
| Mathematics Goal #5A: Our goal from the 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 5B. Student | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|--|
| | | | | | N/A | | |
| ethnicity (White, | | | | | | | |
| Black, Hispanic, | | | | | | | |
| Asian, American | | | | | | | |
| Indian) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| progress in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | | 2013Expected | | | | | |
| #5B: | | Level of | | | | | |
| | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | IN/A | IN/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |
| | | DD.3. | JD.J. | DB.3. | JB.J. | 56.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of student achievement data, and reference to | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| "Guiding Questions", | | | Womoring | Strategy | | | |
| identify and define | | | | | | | |
| areas in need of | | | | | | | |
| improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | | | | |
| 5C. English | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | | |
| Language Learners | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | | |
| (ELL) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| progress in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |

| Mathematics Goal #5C: N/A | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|----------------|--|
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. 5C.3. | | 5C.2. 5C.3. | | 5C.2. 5C.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 5D. Students | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | |
|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| with Disabilities | The area of | | | MTSS/RtI team will work | Formative: | |
| (SWD) not making | | | Administration | with classroom teachers to | Baseline Assessments | |
| satisfactory | as noted on | | ESE Liaison | ensure that appropriate ESE | Interim Assessments | |
| progress in | | activities that | ESE EMISON | strategies are being utilized | FCAT Test Maker | |
| mathematics. | | promote the | | to raise achievement in this | GIZMOS | |
| mathematics. | | use geometric | | subgroup. | Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | | knowledge | | Suegroup. | Summative: | |
| | | and spatial | | Monitor teachers' use | 2013 Mathematics FCAT | |
| | Category of | | | of ESE Strategies and | 2.0 | |
| | | to develop | | Accommodations. | | |
| | | foundations | | | | |
| | Measuremen | | | Monitor Teacher/ESE | | |
| | | understanding | | Liaison collaboration | | |
| | | perimeter, | | regarding student's progress. | | |
| | Students | area, volume, | | | | |
| | | and surface | | | | |
| | ability to | area; these | | | | |
| | | activities | | | | |
| | | should | | | | |
| | | include the | | | | |
| | classify and | selection of | | | | |
| | build/draw | appropriate | | | | |
| | and analyze | units, | | | | |
| | models to | strategies, and | | | | |
| | develop | tools to solve | | | | |
| | | problems | | | | |
| | | involving | | | | |
| | | these | | | | |
| | | measures. | | | | |
| | properties | | | | | |
| | | Engage | | | | |
| | | students in | | | | |
| | dimensional | | | | | |
| | | to use | | | | |
| | objects. | technology | | | | |
| | | such as | | | | |
| | | Gizmos that | | | | |
| | | includes | | | | |
| | | visual | | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| | | stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of measurement and students' geometry and spatial sense. | | | | | |
|--|---------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| #5D: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 21% (7) of Students with Disabilities met satisfactory progress. Our goal is to increase student proficiency to 33% (11) and decrease the percentage of SWD not making satisfactory progress. | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 21% (7) | 33% (11) | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | | 5E.1. | | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | | |
| 2 15 11 11 11 11 15 11 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| students not | | | | | | | |
| making satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| progress in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013Expected | | | | | |
| #5E: | Level of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 5E.2. | 5E.2 | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | |
| | | DE.2. | SE.2 | DE.Z. | DE.2. | DE.4. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | 5E.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

| sh Scho | ol Mathemat | Problem- | | | |
|---------|-------------|----------|--|--|--|
| _ | | Solving | | | |
| _ | | Process | | | |
| _ | | to | | | |
| | | Increase | | | |

| | Student Achieve ment | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|------|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | N/A | | | 1.1. N/A | 1.1. N/A | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1: N/A | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | | 1.3. | | 1.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|------|--|
| Mathematics Goal #2: N/A | Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. | 3.1. N/A | 3.1. N/A | | | 3.1. N/A | | |

| Mathematics Goal #3: | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|------|--|
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | |
| | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | 4.1. N/A | 4b.1. N/A | 4b.1. N/A | 4b.1. N/A | 4b.1. N/A | | |

| Mathematics Goal #4 N/A | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | |
| | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | |

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| vinen asing percentage | , | | 1 0 | 1 (0) | // | |
|---|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|
| Algebra EOC Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | | | | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| 1. Students scoring at | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Achievement Level 3 in | According | | Administrative Team | | Formative: | |
| Algebra. | | | | meetings, results of bi- | FCAT Test Maker | |
| Aigebi a. | of the 2012 | courses in | | | reports | |
| | | learning teams to | | be reviewed to ensure | Gizmos | |
| | assessment, | build the capacity | | | District and School | |
| | the area | to research, | | | Wide Assessments | |
| | of greatest | discuss, design | | focus as needed. | | |
| | difficulty for | and implement | | | Summative: | |
| | students was | the following | | District Interim Data | 2013 Algebra I EOC | |
| | Reporting | research-based | | reports will be reviewed | Test | |
| | Category 2- | instructional | | monthly during | | |
| | Polynomials. | strategies such | | Faculty Meetings with | | |
| | | as: | | Administration and | | |
| | | Providing all | | adjustments to strategies | | |
| | | students with | | will be made as needed. | | |
| | | more practice | | | | |
| | | in solving real- | | | | |
| | | world problems | | | | |
| | | involving | | | | |
| | | relations and | | | | |
| | | functions; | | | | |
| | | solving multi- | | | | |
| | | step problems | | | | |
| | | with several rate | | | | |
| | | parameters; | | | | |
| | | finding the | | | | |
| | | pattern, writing | | | | |
| | | the rule, and determining the | | | | |
| | | function for a | | | | |
| | | given sequence | | | | |
| | | of numbers; and | | | | |
| | | converting | | | | |
| | | linear measures | | | | |
| | | to cubic | | | | |
| | | measures and | | | | |
| | | non-typical rates | | | | |
| | | to a unit rate in | | | | |
| | | order to | | | | |

| | | i | |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| represent and | | | |
| solve real-world | | | |
| applications that | | | |
| involve | | | |
| functions and | | | |
| relations; | | | |
| inductive | | | |
| reasoning | | | |
| strategies that | | | |
| include | | | |
| discovery | | | |
| learning | | | |
| activities. | | | |
| | | | |
| Engage students | | | |
| in activities to | | | |
| use technology | | | |
| such as Gizmos | | | |
| that includes | | | |
| visual stimulus | | | |
| to develop | | | |
| | | | |
| conceptual | | | |
| understanding | | | |
| of measurement | | | |
| and students' | | | |
| geometry and | | | |
| spatial sense. | | | |

| | <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|------|--|
| | 30% (3) | 31% (3) | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 2 64 | b 1 | 2.1 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or | According | Students will be | Administrative Team | | Formative: | |
| above Achievement Levels | to the results | | | meetings, results of bi- | FCAT Test Maker | |
| | of the 2012 | Saturday tutoring | | weekly assessments will | reports | |
| | | services at the | | be reviewed to ensure | Gizmos | |
| | assessment, | school to enrich | | progress is being made | District/School Wide | |
| | the area | learning. | | and to adjust curriculum | Assessments | |
| | of greatest | In addition | | focus as needed. | 7 155C55IIICIIt5 | |
| | | students | | locus as needed. | Summative | |
| | | will develop | | District Interim Data | 2013 Algebra I EOC | |
| | Reporting | projects based | | reports will be reviewed | Test | |
| | Category 2- | on enrichment | | monthly during | Test | |
| | Polynomials | activities which | | Faculty Meetings with | | |
| | 1 01/1101111415. | will give them | | Administration and | | |
| | | opportunities | | adjustments to strategies | | |
| | | to increase | | will be made as needed. | | |
| | | and enhance | | | | |
| | | understanding | | | | |
| | | of skills in the | | | | |
| | | Mathematics | | | | |
| | | lessons. | | | | |
| | | The school | | | | |
| | | will develop | | | | |
| | | departmental | | | | |
| | | guidelines for all | | | | |
| | | student learning | | | | |
| | | notebooks | | | | |
| | | designed to | | | | |
| | | increase student | | | | |
| | | achievement; | | | | |
| | | provide teachers | | | | |
| | | with training | | | | |
| | | in developing | | | | |
| | | meaning through | | | | |
| | | mathematical | | | | |
| | | problem solving | | | | |
| | | in a real-world | | | | |
| | | context and assist | | | | |
| | | teachers with | | | | |
| | | effective | | | | |

| | | strategies for | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | integrating | | | | | |
| | | technology in | | | | | |
| | | their lesson | | | | | |
| | | designs. | | | | | |
| | | Engage students | | | | | |
| | | in activities to | | | | | |
| | | use technology | | | | | |
| | | such as Gizmos | | | | | |
| | | that includes | | | | | |
| | | visual stimulus | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | to develop | | | | | |
| | | conceptual | | | | | |
| | | understanding | | | | | |
| | | of measurement | | | | | |
| | | and students' | | | | | |
| | | geometry and | | | | | |
| | | spatial sense. | | | | | |
| ringeora Coar :: 2. | 2012 Current | 2013Expected Level | | | | | |
| The results of the 2012 | Level of Performance:* | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| Algebra EOC indicate that | Performance. | | | | | | |
| 60% (6) of students scored a | | | | | | | |
| Level 4-5. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Our goal for the 2012-2013 | | | | | | | |
| school year is to maintain | | | | | | | |
| the percentage of students | | | | | | | |
| achieving a proficiency | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Level 4-5 of 60% (6). | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 60 % (6) | 60 % (6) | | | | | |
| | 00 /0 (0) | 00 /0 (0) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs),Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------|-----------|-----|
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 37% | 42% | 48% | 53% | 58% | 63% | 69% |
| Algebra Goal #3A: Our goal for 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | | | 3B.1. N/A | 3B.1. N/A | 3B.1. N/A | | |
| Algebra Goal #3B: N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not | | 3C.1. N/A | 3C.1. N/A | | 3C.1. N/A | | |
| making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Algebra Goal #3C: | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| N/A | Performance:* | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|--|
| 3D. Students with | 1 | | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | |
| Disabilities (SWD) not | 1 | | , | MTSS/RtI team will | Formative: | |
| making satisfactory | 1 | | · / | work with classroom | GIZMOS | |
| progress in Algebra. | 1 | μ | 1 | teachers bi-weekly to | DistrictAssessments | |
| | | solving and | | ensure that appropriate | School Wide | |
| | | graphing | | ESE strategies are | Assessments | |
| | Examination, | • | | being utilized to raise | | |
| | 1 | equations | | | Summative: | |
| | I | that involve | | subgroup. | 2013 Algebra I EOC | |
| | I | real world | | | Test | |
| | | applications | | SPED Liaison will | | |
| | | through the use | | monitor teachers' use | | |
| | ` | of GIZMOS. | | of ESE strategies/ | | |
| | and Discrete | m 1 '11 | | accommodations. | | |
| | I | Teachers will use | | CDED I : : : :II | | |
| | | Venn diagrams | | SPED Liaison will | | |
| | | in a variety of | | collaborate with regular | | |
| | | ways to illustrate | | education teacher | | |
| | | intersection, | | regarding student's | | |
| | | union, difference, | | progress. | | |
| | 1 | null and disjoint | | | | |
| | 1 | sets and to solve | | | | |
| | | a variety of real world problems. | | | | |
| | | world problems. | | | | |

| Algebra Goal #3D: The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC Test indicate that Students with Disabilities did not make proficiency. Our goal is to increase proficiency within the SWD student population in the 2012-2013 school year. | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | |
| | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 3E. Economically | N/A | N/A | | | 3E.1. N/A | | |
| Algebra Goal #3E: N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| N/A | N | J/A | | | | | |
|-----|----|------|------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | 31 | E.2. | 3E.2 | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 31 | E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals

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

| Geometry EOC Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | 1 5 | | | |
|--|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. | N/A | N/A | 1.1. N/A | 1.1. N/A | 1.1. N/A | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|------|--|
| Geometry Goal #1: N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | N/A 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | 1.3. Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | 1.3. Evaluation Tool | 1.3. | |

| 2. Students scoring at or above AchievementLevels 4 and 5 in Geometry. | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | | |
|---|---|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----|
| Geometry Goal #2: N/A | <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | N/A 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| | Baseline data 2010-2011 N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Geometry Goal #3A: | Ī | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|--|
| - | | | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| achievement data, and reference | Barrier | Strategy | Responsible for | Effectiveness of | Evaluation 1001 | | |
| to "Guiding Questions", | | | Monitoring | Strategy | | | |
| identify and define areas in need of improvement for the | | | | | | | |
| following subgroup: | | | | | | | |
| 3B. Student subgroups | | | | | 3B.1. | | |
| by ethnicity (White, Black, | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| Hispanic, Asian, American | | | | | | | |
| Indian) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress in | | | | | | | |
| Geometry. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3B: | 2012 Current | 2013Expected Level | | | | | |
| • | | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| N/A | Performance:* | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | Anticipated Barrier 3C.1. N/A | | | | Evaluation Tool 3C.1. N/A | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|----------------------------|-------|--|
| Geometry Goal #3C: | | 2013Expected Level | | | | | |
| N/A | Level of Performance:* | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| IVA | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | |
| | | SC.2. | DC.2. | BC.2. | DC.2. | DC.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| | | | | | 3D.1. N/A | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| Geometry Goal #3D: N/A | <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 3D.2. | |
| | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 3E. Economically | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Disadvantaged students | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| not making satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| progress inGeometry. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3E: | 2012 Current | 2013Expected Level | | | | | |
| | Level of | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| N/A | Performance:* | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | NT/A | NT/A | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3E.2. | 3E.2 | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | |
| | | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | 3E.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

| | essioner z e e e op | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| 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. | | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| FCAT 2.0 Item Specs and Rigor and Relevance | K-8 Math | Math Liaison | K-8 Math Teachers | September 17, 2012 October 2012-January 2013 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| Differentiated Instruction in Math | K-8 Math | K-8 Math/ESOL Liaison | K-8 Math Teachers | August 16, 2012 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| GIZMOS | 3-8 Math | GIZMOS Rep./Math Liaison | K-8 Math Teachers | August 16-17, 2012 January 2013 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| Reflex Math | 2-8 Math | Reflex Math Rep. | K-8 Math Teachers | August 17, 2012 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |

Mathematics Budget(Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal:\$0.00 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |

| Professional Development | | | |
|---|--|----------------|----------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Tutoring will be provided for students who performed at a Level 1-2 on the FCAT Mathematics 2.0 test. Tutoring will be provided Tuesday/Thursday for one hour each day beginning in December. In addition, enrichment classes will be offered on Saturdays from 9:00-12:00 pm for all students who scored a 3-5 on the FCAT Mathematics 2.0. | CAMS/STAMS Reading Program Florida Ready Mathematics Series FCAT Mathematics Coach | Title I | \$10,000 |
| Subtotal: \$13,000.00 | | | |
| Total: \$0.00 | | | |

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Elementary and | Problem- | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|--|
| Middle Science | Solving | | | |
| Goals | Process to | | | |
| | Increase | | | |
| | Student | | | |
| | Achieveme | | | |
| | nt | | | |
| | nt | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| achievement data, and reference | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of | | |
| to "Guiding Questions", identify | | | | Strategy | | |
| and define areas in need of | | | | | | |
| improvement for the following | | | | | | |
| group: | | | | | | |

| 1a.FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement 1a.1. 1a.1. 1a.1. 1a.1. 1a.1. 1a.1. The area of Ensure that Administrative Team The Science Chair and Formative Ensure that Formative Ensure that Ens | |
|--|--|
| | |
| Level 3 in science. deficiency instruction Grade Level/ Administration Gizmos | |
| for 5th grade includes Department Chair will review the results of Baseline | |
| students teacher- school-site assessment Assessments | |
| according demonstrated data on a monthly basis to Interim Assessments | |
| to the 2012 as well as monitor student progress | |
| FCAT student- together with the grade <u>Summative</u> : | |
| Science 2.0 centered level science teachers. Science FCAT 2.0 | |
| Test was laboratory | |
| Physical activities Administration will | |
| Science. that apply, complete daily Lesson | |
| analyze, Plan Reviews and | |
| ad explain Classroom | |
| The area of concepts Walkthroughs/ | |
| deficiency related to Observations to ensure | |
| for 8 th grade matter, that Essential Labs are | |
| students energy, force, taking place and that | |
| according and motion. higher order thinking | |
| to the 2012 questions are being asked | |
| FCAT Provide throughout lessons. | |
| Science 2.0 additional | |
| Test was Life practice in | |
| Science. solving and | |
| graphing | |
| quadratic | |
| equations | |
| that involve | |
| real world | |
| applications | |
| through the use of | |
| GIZMOS. | |
| UIZIVIOS. | |
| Provide | |
| classroom | |
| and after- | |
| school | |
| opportunities | |
| for students | |

| | | 1 | 1 | | |
|----------------------------|---------------|----------------|---|--|--|
| | | 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, | | | |
| | | and | | | |
| | | experimental | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | design as it | | | |
| | | pertains to | | | |
| | | the Life and | | | |
| | | Environmenta | | | |
| | | l sciences. | | | |
| Science Goal #1a: | 2012 Current | 2013Expected | | | |
| | Level of | Level of | | | |
| On the 2012 administration | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | |
| of the Science FCAT | | | | | |
| 2.0 27% (35) of students | | | | | |
| achieved proficiency | | | | | |
| (FCAT level 3). | | | | | |
| The expected level of | | | | | |
| performance for 2013 | | | | | |
| is 31% (41) achieving | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| proficiency. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | l | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| | 27% (35) | 31% (41) | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------|-------|---|
| | | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 2 |
| | | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | |
| | N/A | 1b.1. N/A | 1b.1. N/A | 1b.1. N/A | 1b.1. N/A | | |
| | Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | |
| | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 2a. FCAT 2.0:Students | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | |
|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------|----------------------------|------------------|--|
| scoring at or above | | Provide | | | Formative: | |
| scoring at or above | | | | | Gizmos | |
| | | students to | | | Baseline | |
| 5 m science. | | design and | 1 | | Assessments | |
| | | develop | | data on a monthly basis to | | |
| | | science and | | monitor student progress | | |
| | | engineering | | | Summative: | |
| | | projects to | | | Science FCAT 2.0 | |
| | | increase | | | | |
| | Physical | scientific | | Administration will | | |
| | Science. | thinking, and | | complete daily Lesson | | |
| | Students lack | the | | Plan Reviews and | | |
| | the ability | development | | Classroom | | |
| | to complete | and | | Walkthroughs/ | | |
| | | implementati | | Observations to ensure | | |
| | design and | on of inquiry- | | that Essential Labs are | | |
| | 1 | based | | taking place and that | | |
| | | activities that | | higher order thinking | | |
| | | allow for | | questions are being asked | | |
| | | testing of | | throughout lessons. | | |
| | | hypotheses, | | | | |
| | | data analysis, | | | | |
| | | explanation | | | | |
| | | of variables, | | | | |
| | development | | | | | |
| | | experimental | | | | |
| | | design in | | | | |
| | | Physical | | | | |
| | inquiry-based | Science. | | | | |
| | activities | L | | | | |
| | | Provide | | | | |
| | for testing of | | | | | |
| | | practice in | | | | |
| | data analysis, | | | | | |
| | | graphing | | | | |
| | | quadratic | | | | |
| | | equations | | | | |
| | * | that involve | | | | |
| | design in | real world | | | | |

| | | <u> </u> | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------|--|--|
| Physical | applications | | | |
| Science. | through | | | |
| | the use of | | | |
| The area of | GIZMOS. | | | |
| deficiency | | | | |
| for 8th grade | | | | |
| students | Provide | | | |
| | students the | | | |
| | opportunity | | | |
| | to examine | | | |
| | and explore | | | |
| | misconceptio | | | |
| Life Science. | na vaina | | | |
| Students lack | formative | | | |
| Students lack | | | | |
| | assessment | | | |
| | probes | | | |
| | included in | | | |
| | Pacing | | | |
| | Guides and | | | |
| strategies | Learning | | | |
| to increase | Village; life | | | |
| inquiry-based | | | | |
| | environmenta | | | |
| | l science | | | |
| Environmenta | concepts in | | | |
| | real-world | | | |
| | scenarios; | | | |
| | incorporate | | | |
| | and/or | | | |
| | participate in | | | |
| | environmenta | | | |
| | l challenges | | | |
| | and/or | | | |
| | programs | | | |
| | that provide | | | |
| | students the | | | |
| | opportunity | | | |
| | to investigate | | | |
| | and explain | | | |
| | the | | | |
| | uic | | | |

| l | r | | |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| interrelations | | | |
| hips of | | | |
| humans and | | | |
| Earth's | | | |
| systems; | | | |
| 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, | | | |
| and | | | |
| experimental | | | |
| design as it | | | |
| pertains to | | | |
| the Life and | | | |
| Environmenta | | | |
| l sciences. | | | |
| | | | |

| Science Goal #2a: On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT 2.0 12% (16) of students scored above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 & 5). The expected level of performance for 2013 is 14% (18) for above proficiency. | <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--|
| | 12% (16) | 14% (18) | | | | | |
| | | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | 2a.2. | |
| | | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | 2a.3 | |
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | N/A | 2b.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2b.1. N/A | 2b.1. N/A | | |

| Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | |
| | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | 2b.3 | |

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

| High School Science Goals | | | adoms the percentage | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------|--|---|-----------------|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| | | | | 1.1. N/A | 1.1. N/A | | |
|--|------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-----------------|------|--|
| | Level of | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | 1.3. | 1.2. | 1.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 2. Florida Alternate | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| scoring at or above Level 7 | 1 | | | | | | |
| in science. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Science Goal #2: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013Expected Level of | | | | | |
| | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | 11/71 | N/ / A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Biology EOCGoals | Problem- | | | | |
|-------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Solving | | | | |
| | Process to | | | | |
| | Increase | | | | |
| | Student | | | | |
| | Achieveme | | | | |

| | nt | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------|------|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1. Students scoring at | 1.1. | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| remerent bereit in | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| Biology. | | | | | | | |
| Biology Goal #1: N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. | 1. 7/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| N/A Per | erformance:* | | | | | 2.2. 2.3 | |

End of Biology EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| FCAT Item Specs | 5,8 Science | Science Liaison | 5,8 Science Teachers | September 17, 2012 October 2012-January 2013 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| Essential Labs | 5,8 Science | Science Liaison | 5,8 Science Teachers | September 26, 2012 October 2012-January | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| GIZMOS | 5,8 Science | GIZMOS's Rep./Science Liaison | 5,8 Science Teachers | August 16-17, 2012 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |

Science Budget(Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | |
| funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Total: \$0.00 | | | |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

| | l | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| 1a. FCAT: | la.l. | ^{1a.1.} 4 th Grade: | la.1. 4th Grade: | ^{la.l.} 4 th Grade: | la.1. Formative: | |
| | | | Administration | | | |
| reme vement bever | | | | | Baseline Writing | |
| - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | deficiency | | | 2 | Assessment | |
| writing. | as noted on | | Department Chair | | Interim Writing | |
| | the 2012 | develop and | | | Assessment | |
| | administration | maintain | | | Writing Portfolio's | |
| | of the FCAT | a | | determine the effectiveness | Writing Journals | |
| | | writer's | | of teaching strategy. | g .: | |
| | within the | noteboo | | | Summative: | |
| | Narrative | k/folder; | | | 2013 FCAT 2.0 | |
| | Prompt was the | | | | Writing Test | |
| | Writing Process. | _ | | implemented to evaluate | | |
| | | strategies to | | student's Writing Journals | | |
| | fourth grade lack | | | and Writing Portfolios. | | |
| | the skills needed | | | | | |
| | 1 / | have students | | Student writing samples | | |
| | | utilize drafting | | will be reviewed | | |
| | edit for language | | | weekly by the teacher | | |
| | | to sustain | | and maintained in a | | |
| | | writing; use | | student portfolio to track | | |
| | within the Next | | | progress. Scores will be | | |
| | | charts, teacher | | submitted to Language | | |
| | | conferencing, | | Arts Chairperson for data | | |
| | | or peer editing; | | disaggregation. | | |
| | | use revising/ | | | | |
| | | editing | | | | |
| | Writing. | chart and | | | | |
| | | conferencing | | | | |
| | | with | | | | |
| | | teachers for | | | | |
| | | capitalization, | | | | |
| | | punctuation, | | | | |
| | | subject/verb | | | | |
| | | and pronoun | | | | |
| | | agreement in | | | | |
| | | simple and | | | | |
| | | compound | | | | |
| | | sentences. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Utilize drafting |
|---------------------|
| techniques to |
| sustain writing |
| by: |
| by: using a graphic |
| organizer/ |
| plan to write a |
| draft organized |
| with a logical |
| sequence of |
| beginning, |
| middle, and |
| end, using |
| supporting |
| details, or |
| providing facts |
| and/or opinions |
| through |
| (concrete |
| examples, |
| statistics, |
| comparisons, |
| real life |
| examples, |
| anecdotes, |
| amazing facts), |
| applying |
| transitional |
| words/phrases |
| to organize |
| and sequence |
| ideas to provide |
| fluency in the |
| fluency in the |
| writing. |
| |
| Use revising/ |
| editing charts, |
| teacher |
| conferencing, or |
| peer editing by: |

| r | earranging | | |
|----------|------------------------|--|--|
| N N | vords, | | |
| s | entences, and | | |
| | paragraphs, | | |
| | creating clarity | | |
| | by using | | |
| | combination | | |
| | entence | | |
| | structures | | |
| | e.g. simple | | |
| | compound) | | |
| Ĭ, | o improve | | |
| | ventence | | |
| | entence | | |
| | luency, | | |
| a | adding | | |
| S | supporting letails, | | |
| d | letails, | | |
| a | and using | | |
| | ransitions | | |
| | hat connect | | |
| t1 | he supporting | | |
| d | letails. | | |
| | | | |
| | Jse revising/ | | |
| e | editing | | |
| | chart and | | |
| c | conferencing | | |
| l v | vith | | |
| | eachers for | | |
| c | capitalization, | | |
| p | ounctuation, | | |
| s | subject/verb | | |
| | and pronoun | | |
| a | agreement in | | |
| S | simple and | | |
| | compound | | |
| | sentences. | | |
| ľ | | | |
| | Encourage | | |
| - Cr | students to | | |
| S | iuuciiis io | | |

| write a clear and legible piece by producing a piece that has been taken through the writing process. | | |
|---|--|--|
| witting process. | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|------|--|
| Writing Goal #1a: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of | | | |
| , | of Performance:* | Performance:* | | | |
| 4th Grade: | | r criormance. | | | |
| According to the | | | | | |
| data collected from | | | | | |
| the 2012 FCAT 2.0 | | | | | |
| Writing Test 75% | | | | | |
| (44) of students | | | | | |
| received a score of | | | | | |
| 3.0 or higher in their | | | | | |
| Narrative Writing | | | | | |
| Prompt. | | | | | |
| F | | | | | |
| Our goal for the | | | | | |
| 2012-2013 school | | | | | |
| year is to ensure that | | | | | |
| 78% (46) of 4 th grade | | | | | |
| students achieve at | | | | | |
| least a 3.0 or higher. | | | | | |
| least a 5.0 of higher. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 8th Grade: | | | | | |
| According to the | | | | | |
| data collected from | | | | | |
| the 2012 FCAT 2.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Writing Test 66% | | | | | |
| (55) of students | | | | | |
| received a score of | | | | | |
| 3.0 or higher in their | | | | | |
| Persuasive Writing | | | | | |
| Prompt. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Our goal for the | | | | | |
| 2012-2013 school | | | | | |
| year is to ensure that | | | | | |
| 69% (57) of 8th grade | | | | | |
| students achieve at | | | | | |
| least a 3.0 or higher. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| | Grade: % (44) | 4th Grade: 78% (46) | | | |
|-------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | , | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Oth A | Crada | Oth Cwada. | | | |
| 66% | Grade: 8 | 8 th Grade: 59% (57) | | | |

| la.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | 1a.2. | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------|--|
| 8th Gi | | 8th Grade: | 8 th Grade: | 14.2. | |
| The ar | | Administration | Classroom Walk- | | |
| deficie | | | throughs will be | | |
| as note | ted on Notebook, Journal | Department Chair | conducted daily | | |
| the 203 | | ' | by administration. | | |
| admini | nistration which contains | | The Classroom | | |
| of the l | FCAT brainstorming in a | | walkthrough logs | | |
| | ng Test variety of ways: using | | will be utilized | | |
| within | n the graphic organizers, | | to determine the | | |
| Persua | asive drawing, generating and | d | effectiveness of | | |
| Promp | | | teaching strategy. | | |
| the Wr | | | | | |
| Proces | | | Student-teacher | | |
| | nts in the group discussions, and | | conferences will | | |
| | n grade printed material. | | be implemented to | | |
| | he skills | | evaluate student's | | |
| needed | 1 1 | | Writing Journals | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | rite, draft, plan to develop | | and Writing | | |
| revise, | | | Portfolios. | | |
| | nguage supporting details. | | | | |
| conver | | | Student writing | | |
| | ublishing Ask students to revise | | samples will be | | |
| | the Next for clarity of content, | | reviewed weekly | | |
| Genera | Ę | | by the teacher and | | |
| | nine State choice. | | maintained in a | | |
| | ards for | | student portfolio | | |
| | Narrative Edit for correct spelling | | to track progress. | | |
| | xpository of high frequency and | | Scores will be | | |
| Writin | | | submitted to | | |
| | words, using a word | | Language Arts | | |
| | bank, dictionary, or | | Chairperson for | | |
| | other resources as | | data dissegregation. | | |
| | necessary. | | | | |
| | Prepare students to | | | | |
| | write in a format | | | | |
| | appropriate to audience | | | | |
| | and purpose using | | | | |
| | required spacing and | | | | |
| | margins, graphics and | | | | |

| | | | illustrations as needed. | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--|
| | | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | 1a.3. | |
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Stude nts scoring at 4 or higher in writing. | 1b.1. N/A | lb.1. N/A | 1b.1. N/A | lb.1. N/A | 1b.1. N/A | | |
| Writing Goal #1b: N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | |
| | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | |

Writing Professional Development

| Professional | | I | I | |
|--------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Frotessional | | | | |
| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| 4 Square Writing Method | K-8 Teachers | Lead Teacher | K-8 Teachers | August 13, 2012 | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, writing samples | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| Melissa Forney FCAT Writing Teacher Training | 4 th and 8 th Grade Teachers | Melissa Forney | 4 th and 8 th Grade L.A. Teachers | July 9-10, 2012 | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, writing samples | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| Melissa Forney Primary Pizzaz | K-2 Teachers | Melissa Forney | K-2 Teachers | August 14, 2012 | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, writing samples | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| Melissa Forney Razzle Dazzle | 3-5 Teachers | Melissa Forney | 3-5 Teachers | August 15, 2012 | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, writing samples | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |
| Springboard Training | 6-8 Teachers | TBA | 6-8 Teachers | August 8-9, 2012 | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, writing samples | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |

| Engarmage students to | Zalda Dlagan Whiting Tarthaula | Intornal | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------|--|
| Encourage students to | Zelda Bloser Writing Textbooks | Internal | |
| develop and maintain a | | | |
| writer's notebook/folder; | | | |
| to use organizational strategies to | | | |
| make a plan for writing; have students | | | |
| utilize drafting techniques to sustain | | | |
| writing; use revising/editing charts, | | | |
| teacher conferencing, or peer editing; use | | | |
| revising/editing chart and conferencing | | | |
| with teachers for capitalization, | | | |
| punctuation, subject/verb and pronoun | | | |
| agreement in simple and compound | | | |
| sentences. | | | |
| Utilize drafting techniques to sustain | | | |
| writing by: | | | |
| using a graphic organizer/plan to write a | | | |
| draft organized with a logical sequence | | | |
| of beginning, middle, and end, using | | | |
| supporting details, or providing facts | | | |
| and/or opinions through (concrete | | | |
| examples, statistics, comparisons, real | | | |
| life examples, anecdotes, amazing facts), | | | |
| applying transitional words/phrases to | | | |
| organize and sequence ideas to provide | | | |
| fluency in the writing. | | | |
| | | | |
| Use revising/editing charts, teacher | | | |
| conferencing, or peer editing by: | | | |
| rearranging words, sentences, and | | | |
| paragraphs, | | | |
| creating clarity by using combination | | | |
| sentence structures (e.g. simple | | | |
| compound) to improve sentence fluency, | | | |
| adding supporting details, and using | | | |
| transitions that connect the supporting | | | |
| details. | | | |
| | | | |
| Use revising/editing chart and | | | |
| conferencing with teachers for | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| | T | _ | |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| capitalization, punctuation, subject/verb | | | |
| and pronoun agreement in simple and | | | |
| compound sentences. | | | |
| | | | |
| Encourage students to write a clear | | | |
| and legible piece by producing a piece | | | |
| that has been taken through the writing | | | |
| process | | | |
| Subtotal: \$2,935.95 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal:\$0.00 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| To integrate writing throughout the | Melissa Forney FCAT Writing Teacher | Internal | \$500.00 |
| curriculum by including the writing | Training | | |
| process in Science, Social Studies and | | | |
| Spanish so students can become familiar | Melissa Forney Primary Pizzaz | | \$375.00 |
| with the writing process. | | | |
| 8 F | Melissa Forney Razzle Dazzle | | \$375.00 |
| | | | |
| | Springboard Training | | \$150.00 |
| | _ | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$1400.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Total: \$4,335.95 | | | |
| | • | • | |

End of Writing Goals

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Civics EOC Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | 1 5 | | | |
|--|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|
| 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: | Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| 4 64 1 4 | I1 1 | l _{1 1} | Ī _{1 1} | I _{1 1} | 1 1 | r |
|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 1. Students scoring at | 1.1. As noted | 1.1. Provide | 1.1. Administration | 1.1. Institute weekly, on- | 1.1. Formative: | |
| Achievement Level 3 in | on the | classroom | Grade Level Chair | | Social Studies Journals | |
| Civics. | administra | | Department Chair | sessions for Civics | Baseline Assessment | |
| | tion of the | help students | Department Chan | teachers to ensure that | Interim Assessment | |
| | Civics EOC | develop an | | the Civics curriculum | Graphs/Charts | |
| | | understanding | | is taught with fidelity | Graphs/Charts | |
| | the area | of thecontent- | | | Summative: | |
| | where | specific | | address all State and | Civics District Spring | |
| | students | vocabulary | | District Benchmarks and | Accessment | |
| | showed | taught in | | curricular requirements. | Assessment | |
| | deficiency | government/ | | eurreular requirements. | | |
| | was the | civics. | | Utilize District-published | | |
| | structure and | Civies. | | lesson plans with | | |
| | functions | Provide | | assessments aligned to | | |
| | of the | opportunities | | tested End of Course | | |
| | branches of | for students to | | Exam Benchmarks to | | |
| | government. | strengthen their | | maximize opportunities | | |
| | Be verminent. | abilities to read | | for students to master | | |
| | Students lack | | | tested content. | | |
| | the ability | graph, charts, | | | | |
| | to read and | maps, timelines, | | Monthly school generated | | |
| | comprehend | political | | assessments will be | | |
| | Civics | cartoons, and | | administered and scored | | |
| | primary | other graphic | | in order to monitor | | |
| | resources, | representations. | | students' progress and to | | |
| | documents | 1 | | adjust the instructional | | |
| | and | Provide activities | | focus. | | |
| | interpretat | that allow | | | | |
| | ions of the | students to | | | | |
| | content. | interpret primary | | | | |
| | | and secondary | | | | |
| | | sources of | | | | |
| | | information. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Provide | | | | |
| | | opportunities | | | | |
| | | for students | | | | |
| | | to examine | | | | |
| | | opposing points | | | | |

| | | of view on a | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------|---|
| | | variety of issues. | | | | | |
| C: | 2012 Current | 2013Expected Level | | | | | |
| Civics Goal #1: | | CD C # | | | | | |
| | Level of | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| The results of the | Performance:* | | | | | | |
| 2012 Civics EOC | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Baseline Assessment | | | | | | | |
| indicate that 0% (0) of | | | | | | | |
| students performed at an | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Achievement Level of 3. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Our Goal for the 2012- | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2013 school year is to | | | | | | | |
| have at least 10% (8) of | | | | | | | |
| students achieve a Level 3 | | | | | | | |
| proficiency in the Civics | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| EOC Assessment. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 00/ (0) | 100/ (0) | | | | | |
| | 0% (0) | 10% (8) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| achievement data, and reference | Barrier | | Responsible for | Effectiveness of | | | |
| to "Guiding Questions", identify | | | Monitoring | Strategy | | | |
| and define areas in need of | | | | | | | |
| improvement for the following | | | | | | | |
| group: | | | | | | | |
| group. | | | | | | ļ. | ļ |

| 2 54-14 | h 1 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------|------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or | As noted | Provide | | Institute weekly, on- | Formative: | |
| above Achievement Levels | on the | enrichment | | | Social Studies Journals | |
| | administra | activities that | | sessions for Civics | Baseline Assessment | |
| | tion of the | allow students | | | Interim Assessment | |
| | Civics EOC | opportunities | 1 | the Civics curriculum | Graphs/Charts | |
| | Assessment, | to discuss | | is taught with fidelity | Oraphs/Charts | |
| | the area | the values, | | | Summative: | |
| | where | complexities, | | address all State and | Civics District Spring | |
| | students | and dilemmas | | District Benchmarks and | | |
| | showed | involved in | | curricular requirements. | 1 ISSESSITION | |
| | deficiency | social, political, | | carriediai requirements. | | |
| | was the | and economic | | Utilize District-published | | |
| | I | issues; assist | | lesson plans with | | |
| | functions | students in | | assessments aligned to | | |
| | of the | developing | | tested End of Course | | |
| | branches of | well-reasoned | 1 | Exam Benchmarks to | | |
| | government. | positions on | 1 | maximize opportunities | | |
| | | issues. | | for students to master | | |
| | Students lack | | | tested content. | | |
| | the ability | Provide | | | | |
| | to read and | enrichment | | Monthly school generated | | |
| | comprehend | opportunities for | | assessments will be | | |
| | Civics | students to write | | administered and scored | | |
| | primary | to inform and to | | in order to monitor | | |
| | resources, | persuade. | | students' progress and to | | |
| | documents | | | adjust the instructional | | |
| | and | Provide | | focus. | | |
| | interpretat | opportunities for | | | | |
| | ions of the | students to utilize | | | | |
| | content. | print and non- | | | | |
| | | print resources to | | | | |
| | | research specific | | | | |
| | | issues related | | | | |
| | | to government/ | | | | |
| | | civics; help | | | | |
| | | students provide | | | | |
| | | alternate | | | | |
| | | solutions to | | | | |
| | | the problems | | | | |

| | | researched. | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------|--------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Civics Goal #2: | 2012 Current | 2013Expected Level | | | | | |
| | Level of | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| The results of the | Performance:* | | | | | | |
| 2012 Civics EOC | | | | | | | |
| Baseline Assessment | | | | | | | |
| indicate that 0% (0) of | | | | | | | |
| students performed at an | | | | | | | |
| Achievement Level of 4-5. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Our Goal for the 2012-2013 | | | | | | | |
| school year is to have at | | | | | | | |
| least 10% (8) of students | | | | | | | |
| scoring at achievement | | | | | | | |
| Levels 4-5 on the Civics | | | | | | | |
| EOC Assessment. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 0%(0) | 10% (8) | | | | | |
| | 0,0(0) | 10,0(0) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |

Civics Professional Development

| D C | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Professional | | | | |
| Development | | | | |
| (PD) aligned with | | | | |
| Strategies through | L | | | |
| Professional | | | | |
| Learning | | | | |
| Community | | | | |
| (PLC) or PD | | | | |
| Activity | | | | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Differentiated Instruction in Social Studies | K-8 Social Studies | K-8 Social Studies | K-8 Social Studies Teachers | August 16, 2012 October 2012-January 2013 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |

Civics Budget(Insert rows as needed)

| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Total: \$5,240.88 | | | |

End of Civics Goals

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

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

| U.S. History EOC Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. | | | 1.1. N/A | 1.1. N/A | 1.1. N/A | |

| U.S. HistoryGoal #1: | 2012 Current | 2013Expected Level | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------|--|
| U.S. HistoryGoat #1. | Level of | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| N/A | Performance:* | | | | | | |
| 1771 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.5. | 1.5. | 1.5. | 1.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| achievement data, and reference | Barrier | <i>E3</i> | Responsible for | Effectiveness of | | | |
| to "Guiding Questions", identify | | | Monitoring | Strategy | | | |
| and define areas in need of | | | | | | | |
| improvement for the following | | | | | | | |
| group: | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | | |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. | 2.1. NT/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | 2.1. N/A | | |
| above Achievement Levels | IN/A | IN/A | IN/A | IN/A | IN/A | | |
| 4 and 5 in U.S. History. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| T. G. T | 2012.6 | 20125 (11 1 | | | | | |
| U.S. History Goal #2: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| D.T./ A | Performance:* | of Ferrormance. | | | | | |
| N/A | oriormance. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | μ ν/ Α | μ ν / Α | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |
| | | | | | | | |

U.S. History Professional Development

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| N/A | | | | | | |

U.S. History Budget(Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|--|
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | | |
| funded activities /materials. | | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| N/A | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | | |
| Technology | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| N/A | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | | |

| Professional Development | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Total: \$0.00 | | | |

End of U.S. HistoryGoals

Attendance Goal(s)

| Attendance Goal(s) | Problem- solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|--|---|-----------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| 1. Attendance | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|---------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|------------------------------|----------------|--|
| 1. Attenuance | | Identify and refer | | Weekly updates to | TCST logs | |
| | | | | | and attendance | |
| | excused/ | | | TCST Team | rosters | |
| | unexcused | pattern of non- | 1001 | 1 COT 1 Cam | 103(013 | |
| | absences; | attendance to | | Our goal for this year is to | | |
| | | the Truancy | | increase attendance by 1% | | |
| | decreased | Child Study | | by minimizing absences | | |
| | in academic | Team (TCST) | | due to truancy and illness. | | |
| | | for intervention | | due to truancy and niness. | | |
| | T . | services and | | In addition, our goal for | | |
| | | provide parent | | this year is to decrease the | | |
| | areas. | workshops in | | number of students with | | |
| | In addition, | their native | | excessive absences (10 | | |
| | tardies have | | | or more), and excessive | | |
| | also affected | language to ensure the | | tardiness (10 or more) by | | |
| | | | | 10% | | |
| | not live within a | understanding of | | 10% | | |
| | close proximity | the services. | | | | |
| | | Provide | | | | |
| | to the school, therefore, | incentives for | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | students such as | | | | |
| | | • Student of | | | | |
| | during class | the Month | | | | |
| | time. | • 100% | | | | |
| | | Attendance | | | | |
| | | Award | | | | |
| | | Maintain | | | | |
| | | a clean | | | | |
| | | environment | | | | |
| | | throughout | | | | |
| | | the school. | | | | |

| Attendance Goal #1: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| ritterrative Goar # 1. | Attendance Rate:* | Attendance Rate:* | | | |
| Our goal for the | | | | | |
| 2012-2013 academic | | | | | |
| school year is to | | | | | |
| increase student | | | | | |
| attendance from | | | | | |
| 95.3 % (560) to | | | | | |
| 95.8% (563) by | | | | | |
| minimizing absences | | | | | |
| due to illnesses | | | | | |
| and truancy, and to | | | | | |
| create a climate in | | | | | |
| our school where | | | | | |
| parents, students | | | | | |
| and faculty feel | | | | | |
| welcomed and | | | | | |
| appreciated. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| In addition, our goal | | | | | |
| for this year is to | | | | | |
| decrease the number | | | | | |
| of students with | | | | | |
| excessive absences | | | | | |
| (10 or more) by | | | | | |
| from 180 to 171 and | | | | | |
| excessive tardiness | | | | | |
| (10 or more) from | | | | | |
| 152 to 144. | | | | | |
| | 95.3 % (560) | 95.8% (563) | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | |
| | Number of Students | Number of Students | | | |
| | with Excessive Absences | with Excessive Absences | | | |
| | (10 or more) | (10 or more) | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 180 | 171 | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | Students with | | | | | |
|--|---------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| 152 | 144 | | | | | |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Attendance Program | K-8 th | Attendance Clerk and Grade Book Manager | General Education Teachers and Non-Instructional Staff | September 4-5, 2012 Monthly meetings will take place after initial meeting. | Attendance Program will be implemented the first day of school and monitored on a monthly basis. | Attendance Clerk and Administration |

| Truancy Prevention | K-8 Attendance | Counselor | All teachers, counselor and attendance clerk | August 20-June 6, 2013 | The Truancy Child Study Team will monitor school absences and tardies through logs and attendance rosters. | School Counselor, Lead Teacher and Assistant Principal. |
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--|------------------------|--|---|
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--|------------------------|--|---|

Attendance Budget(Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded | | | |
|---|---|----------------|-----------|
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | |
| funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| - '' | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Truancy Prevention | Provide incentives for students with | EESAC | \$ 800.00 |
| | improved attendance. | | |
| Connect ED | Provide communication to parents | EESAC | \$1400.00 |
| | regarding school events, student absences | | |
| | and important updates. | | |
| Subtotal: \$2200.00 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Total: \$2200.00 | | | |

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

| | | the nameer or s | tudents the percentage | represents next to the p | ereemage (e.g. 707) | (95)). | • |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------|---|
| Suspension | Problem- | | | | | | |
| Goal(s) | solving | | | | | | |
| | Process to | | | | | | |
| | Decrease | | | | | | |
| | Suspension | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| Questions", identify and | | | | Sualegy | | | |
| define areas in need of | | | | | | | |
| improvement: | | | | | | | |
| K. Suspension | l.l. | l.l. | 1.1. | l.l. | l.l. | | |
| | | | | General Education | Parent Contact Logs | | |
| | | Behavior | Assistant Principal | | Suspension Reports | | |
| | | Management | | contact logs as evidence | | | |
| | the Code of | Plans. | | of communication; | | | |
| | Student Conduct | | | principal will monitor | | | |
| | due to not | Parents will | | parent contact logs. | | | |
| | analyzing the | be informed of | | | | | |
| | | Code of Student | | Administration will meet | | | |
| | the consequences | | | with parents of students | | | |
| | | Back to School | | who are suspended from | | | |
| | | Night and | | school. | | | |
| | | must sign the | | | | | |
| | | document. | | | | | |
| | | document. | | | | | |

| Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by at least 10%. | of In —School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | 26 | | | | | |
| | 2012Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In —School | | | | | |
| | 23 | 21 | | | | | |
| | 2012Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| | | 30 | | | | | |
| | Out- of- School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | | | | |
| | 26 | 23 | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Suspension Professional Development

| | Professional | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Development | | | | |
| | (PD) aligned with | | | | |
| S | 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Student Code of Conduct Contract | K-8 th | All Staff Members | All grades, subjects, school-wide | August 20-August 24, 2012 | Monitor Teacher's behavior management plans | Counselor and Administration |
| Parent Training | <u> </u> | | Parent, Teacher and Administration | September 4-5, 2012 and Ongoing | Monitor Parent Training Log, Contact Parents for Suspensions | CIS Personnel |
| Classroom Management | K-8 th | ТВА | K-8 Teachers | August 20-June 6, 2013 | Monitor teacher's behavior management plans, classroom walk-thru's | Counselor and Administration |

Suspension Budget(Insert rows as needed)

| Juspension Dudget (msert rows as | 1100000) | 1 | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Include only school-based funded | | | |
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | |
| funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |

| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Teachers and/or Administration will contact parents of students who have been on indoor suspension. Parents will be provided with a copy of the Student Code of Conduct. | Printing of Student Code of Conduct | EESAC | \$ 570.00 |
| Subtotal: \$570.00 | | | |
| Total: \$570.00 | | | |

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

| Dropout Prevention Goal(s) | Problem- solving Process to Dropout Prevention | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|--|---|-----------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| K. Dropout Prevention | | | | | 1.1. N/A | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------|------|-------------|------|--|
| Dropout Prevention | | | | | | | |
| Goal #1: *Please refer to the | | | | | | | |
| percentage of students | | | | | | | |
| who dropped out during the 2011-2012 | | | | | | | |
| school year. | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 012 Current Dropout Rate:* | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* | | | | | |
| N/A | Propout Kate. | Diopout Rate. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| C | Graduation Rate:* | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| N/A | | | | | | |

Dropout Prevention Budget(Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|--|
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | | |
| funded activities /materials. | | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| N/A | | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | | |
| Technology | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| N/A | | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | | |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| N/A | | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| N/A | | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | | |
| Total: \$0.00 | | | | |

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)-

EXCELSIOR LANGUAGE ACADEMY IS A TITLE I SCHOOL FOR THE 2012-2013 SCHOOL YEAR

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section. Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

| Parent Involvement Goal(s) | Problem- solving Process to Parent Involveme nt | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|-----------------|------|--|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. | | N/A | 1.1. N/A | 1.1. N/A | 1.1. N/A | | |
| N/A | level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |

| _ | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| Г | | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | |
| - 1 | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1 |
| - 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| - 1 | | | | | | | 1 |

Parent Involvement Professional Development

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Title I Parent Guidelines | K-8 | Community Involvement Specialist (CIS) | Parents | August 20, 2012-Ongoing | Review sign-in sheet/logs to determine the number of parents attending. | Administration and CIS Representative |

Parent Involvement Budget

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |

| NT/A | | | |
|---|--|----------------|-------------|
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Teachers and/or Administration will maintain close communication with parents to participate in school-wide events, meetings, and trainings. | Parent Involvement Instructional Materials | Title I | \$1584.24 |
| CIS Personnel will provide parent workshops and trainings to communicate school activities, events, understanding of school curriculum and parental involvement requirements. In addition, CIS personnel will assist parents with internet/software programs in order to facilitate the home and school communication and learning environment. | CIS Personnel | Title I | \$18,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$19584.24 | | | |
| Total: \$19584.24 | | | |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| | | . 0 0 | ()) | |
|--------------|-------------------------|-----------|------|--|
| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving | | | |
| | Process to | | | |
| | Increase Student | | | |

| | Achievement | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| STEM Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide students with STEM school-wide activities and Fairs to enable them to apply mathematical, technological and scientific inquiry into real world experiences. | of Economically Disadvantaged students in our school, technological tools are scarce at the home. In addition, assistance with projects to be completed at home will be difficult due to the language barrier. | school year all grades K-8 teachers will implement | Department Chair | a weekly basis with their grade levels and/or Departments to monitor weekly science labs and student performance on GIZMO's interactive lessons. Administrators will conduct daily classroom walk- | 2.0 2013 Science FCAT 2.0 |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

STEM Professional Development

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| GIZMOS | 3-8 | Science Liaison/ Department Chair | 3 rd – 8 th grade teachers | August 16-17, 2012 | Observations, classroom walkthroughs, Monitor and review test results | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and Administrative Leadership Team |

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal:\$0.00 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Total: \$0.00 | | | |

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

| CTE Goal #1: Our goal is to provide students opportunities to research specific careers of interest so that by the end of 6 th -8 th grade they have a strong understanding of requirements for their career choice. | student completion of CTE program or acquiring skills necessary for | CTE program state | Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor | Monitor and review student schedules with CTE teacher and guidance counselor to ensure enrollment of intermediate and advanced level courses, building strong academies. | |
|---|--|---|---|--|------|
| | | that will focus on implementing research and delivery of career choice. | | | |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

CTE Professional Development

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| N/A | | | | | | |

CTE Budget(Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded |) | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|----------|--|
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | | |
| funded activities /materials. | | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| N/A | | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | | |
| Technology | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| N/A | | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | | |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| N/A | | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| N/A | | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | | |
| Total: \$0.00 | | | | |
| End of CTE Coul(a) | · | • | <u> </u> | |

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

| Additional Goal(s) | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | | represents next to the p | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|--|---|-----------------|------|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | N/A | | I.1. N/A | 1.1. N/A | 1.1. N/A | | |
| Additional Goal #1: N/A | | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. 1.3. | 1.2. | |

Additional Goals Professional Development

| 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| N/A | | | | | | |

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| N/A | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Technology | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| N/A | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |

| Professional Development | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Total: \$0.00 | | | |

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget(Insert rows as needed)

| That buget insert lows as needed) | |
|--|--------|
| Please provide the total budget from each section. | |
| Reading Budget | |
| | Total: |
| Mathematics Budget | |
| | Total: |
| Science Budget | |
| | Total: |
| Writing Budget | |
| | Total: |
| Attendance Budget | |
| | Total: |
| Suspension Budget | |
| | Total: |
| Dropout Prevention Budget | |
| | Total: |
| Parent Involvement Budget | |
| | Total: |
| Additional Goals | |
| | Total: |
| | |

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

| 2012-2013 School | Improvement Plan | (SIP)-Form SIP-1 | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
| | | | |
| | | | Grand Total: |
| Differentiated A | ccountability | | |
| | ntiated Accountabili | ty (DA) Compliance | |
| | | | double click the desired box; 2.when the menu pops up, select "checked" under "Default Value" |
| | K", this will place an " | | dodote effek the desired box, 2. when the menu pops up, select effected under Default value |
| School | x, this will place an | A in the box.) | |
| Differentiated | | | |
| Accountability | | | |
| Status | | | |
| □Priority | □Focus | □Prevent | |
| Unloada conv. | of the Differentiated | Accountability Checklist | in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page |
| education support en racial, and economic | ompliance SAC members are not apployees, students (for community served by | middle and high school | district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below. |
| □ Yes | □ No | | |
| If No describe the i | measures being taken | to comply with SAC requ | rements |
| 11110, 40001100 0110 1 | mousures semg union | ve comply with size requ | |
| | | | |
| D 1 4 1 1 | · CA CACC A | . 1 1 | |
| | | upcoming school year. | The Confidence of the second o |
| reviewed to determine | e school needs for the 20 | 112-2013 school year. In th | ponsible for final decision making of the school. School Climate Survey and Assessment Data were e beginning of the school year, the SIP will be reviewed and revisions will be made based on the |
| | | | IP will be sent to the district School Board for approval and implementation will begin in August 2012. |
| | | | ws the SIP on a quarterly basis and makes necessary adjustments. |

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.

Amount

| Truancy Prevention: | \$800.00 |
|---|-----------|
| Provide incentives for students with improved attendance. | |
| Connect Ed: | \$1400.00 |
| Provide communication to parents regarding school events, student absences and important updates. | |
| Printing of Code of Student Conduct: | \$570.00 |
| Parents and students will be provided with a copy of the Student Code of Conduct. | |