FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2011-2012 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MIAMI LAKES EDUCATIONAL CENTER

District Name: Dade

Principal: James V. Parker

SAC Chair: Michael Bevilacqua

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 9/30/2011

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Note: 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 Section 1 of the writing and science goals.)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data
(Use this data to complete Section 5 of the reading and mathematics goals and Section 3 of the writing goals.)

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

HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's highly qualified 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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT (High Standards, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Principal	James V. Parker	Bachelor of Science, 1977 Salisbury State College, Maryland; Masters,1990 Florida International University, Florida; Local Directors Certification; Florida International University, Florida, Executive Development Program Leadership; Miami-Dade County Public Schools Executive Training Program; and	7	17	Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2004-2011 2011 2010 2009 2008 2007 School Grade Pending A A A B AYP N N N N N High Standards Rdg 59 62 57 53 44 High Standards Math 87 85 87 85 76 Lrng Gains - Rdg 58 62 61 62 53 Lrng Gains - Math 87 81 84 83 77 Gains Rdg. Low 25% 56 55 54 62 55 Gains Math Low 25% 78 74 79 82 71

		Miami-Dade Public Schools Leo-T Program			
Assis Principal	Dr. Ana Maria Lopez-Ochoa	Nova Southeastern University, Florida. Doctor of Education, 2002 Nova Southeastern University, Florida. Certification in Educational Leadership, 1992 Florida International University, Florida. Masters (MS) in Guidance & Counseling, 1984 Florida International University, Florida. Bachelor in Mathematics, 1974	6	20	Vice Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2009-2010 Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2004-2009 Administrative Director – Instructional Supervision from 1999 - 2004 2011 2010 2009 2008 2007 School Grade Pending A A A B AYP N N N N N High Standards Rdg 59 62 57 53 44 High Standards Math 87 85 87 85 76 Lrng Gains - Rdg 58 62 61 62 53 Lrng Gains - Math 87 81 84 83 77 Gains Rdg. Low 25% 56 55 54 62 55 Gains Math Low 25% 78 74 79 82 71
Assis Principal	Dr. Beverly Carter-Rémy	Bethune-Cookman University. Bachelor of Science in Elementary Nova Southeastern University. Master of Science Degree in Reading Education. Nova Southeastern University. Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership.	1	15	Vice Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center 2011-2012 school year. Assistant Principal of Lindsay Hopkins Technical Education Center from 2006-2011 2011 2010 2009 2008 2007 LCP'S Pending 2096 2414 2714 2171 OCP'S Pending 1636 1821 1840 1925 Total Completion Rate Pending n/a 66.76% 69.59% 74.58%
Assis Principal	Tammy R. Thomas	Bachelor of Science. Political Science, Clark Atlanta University. Master of Science. Science Education, Florida State University. Educational Specialist Leadership. Nova Southerastern University. English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Endorsement. Certification in Elementary Education (Grades 1-6)	1	6	Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center 2011-2012 school year. Assistant Principal of Doral Middle School 2011-2007 2011 2010 2009 2008 2007 School Grade A A A A C AYP N N Y N N High Standards Rdg 76 78 73 71 59 High Standards Math 69 58 78 75 60 Lrng Gains - Rdg 69 71 68 71 50 Lrng Gains - Math 69 81 80 80 55 Gains Rdg. Low 25% 83 71 76 74 44 Gains Math Low 25% 64 84 78 79 72
Assis Principal	Juan R. Gonzalez	Florida International University, Florida. Bachelors in Elementary Education, 1992 St Thomas University, Florida. Masters in Guidance and Counseling, 1997. Nova Southeastern, Florida. Certification in Educational Leadership ,2000	10	10	Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2004-2011 2011 2010 2009 2008 2007 School Grade Pending A A A B AYP N N N N N High Standards Rdg 59 62 57 53 44 High Standards Math 87 85 87 85 76 Lrng Gains - Rdg 58 62 61 62 53 Lrng Gains - Math 87 81 84 83 77 Gains Rdg. Low 25% 56 55 54 62 55 Gains Math Low 25% 78 74 79 82 71

Assis Principal	Thomas W. Jenkins	Florida International University, Florida. Masters (MS) Vocational Industrial Education, 1999 Florida Atlantic University, Florida. Bachelor of Arts in Art ,1982 Broward Community College ,FL.Associate of Arts in Commercial Art ,1980	9	12	Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2004-2011 2011 2010 2009 2008 2007 School Grade Pending A A A B AYP N N N N N High Standards Rdg 59 62 57 53 44 High Standards Math 87 85 87 85 76 Lrng Gains - Rdg 58 62 61 62 53 Lrng Gains - Math 87 81 84 83 77 Gains Rdg. Low 25% 56 55 54 62 55 Gains Math Low 25% 78 74 79 82 71
Assis Principal	Michael Tandlich	Florida International University, Florida .Bachelors of Science in Physical Education, 1979 Nova Southeastern University, Florida. Masters in Educational Leadership, Jan 1999.	3	6	Senior Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2008-2011 Assistant Principal of Lawton Chiles Middle school from 2005-2008 2011 2010 2009 2008 2007 School Grade Pending A A A B AYP N N N N N High Standards Rdg 59 62 57 53 56 High Standards Math 87 85 87 85 58 Lrng Gains - Rdg 58 62 61 62 58 Lrng Gains - Math 87 81 84 83 69 Gains Rdg. Low 25% 56 55 54 62 69 Gains Math Low 25% 78 74 79 82 72
Assis Principal	Ana M. Varona	Florida International University, Florida Bachelors in Education,2001 Certification in Specific learning Disabilities (K-12) Florida International University ,Florida Masters Degree, 2003 Certification in Specific Learning Disabilities (K-12)	2	3	Assistant Principal of Miami Lakes Educational Center from 2009-2011 Temporary Adult Assistant Principal of Southwest Senior Adult from 2008-2009 Teacher at Southwest Miami Senior High School from 2002-2008 2011 2010 2009 2008 2007 School Grade Pending A A B C AYP N N N N N High Standards Rdg 59 62 57 44 40 High Standards Math 87 85 87 72 62 Lrng Gains - Rdg 58 62 61 56 52 Lrng Gains - Math 87 81 84 83 77 Gains Rdg. Low 25% 56 55 54 55 54 Gains Math Low 25% 78 74 79 75 66

HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's highly qualified 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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
N/A					

HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Regular meetings with new teachers	Principal, Vice Principal, Assistant Principals, Academy Leaders, and Department Heads	June 7, 2012	
2	Provide opportunities for leadership within the academies	Principal, Vice Principal, Assistant	June 7, 2012	

		Principals		
3	Provide opportunities for Professional Development	PD Liaison	June 7, 2012	
4	Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Vice Principal, Assistant Principals	June 7, 2012	
5	Soliciting referrals from current employees	Principal	June 7, 2012	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly qualified.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified
Luis Martinez	ESOL	ESOL and Developmental Language Arts	Mr. Martinez is currently finishing his Reading Endorsement.

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school who are teaching at least one academic course.

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 Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
74	0.0%(0)	6.8%(5)	43.2%(32)	50.0%(37)	41.9%(31)	98.6%(73)	9.5%(7)	8.1%(6)	17.6%(13)

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
Luis Martinez	Raquel Hernandez	Ms. Hernandez is a Reading Teacher and a CRISS Trainer	Monthly meetings to support and mentor.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-based RtI Team

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

- Administrators
- Teachers (Department and Academy)
- TRUST Counselor
- Special Education Personnel
- School Guidance Counselors
- School Psychologist
- School Social Worker
- Members of Advisory Group
- Community Stakeholder

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

Monthly meetings are held to discuss instructional decisions necessary based on input from the monthly Academy and Department data discussions. Progress is monitored through various student achievement indicators. The team identifies professional development and resources necessary in order to meet identified goals. The RtI Leadership Team recognizes needed implementations. Therefore, the RtI Leadership team, in turn, meets as necessary to carry out these functions.

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 by developing and implementing the guidelines addressed in the School Improvement Plan (SIP)
• Adjust the delivery of behavior management system
• Create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions
• Adjust the allocation of school-based resources
• Drive decisions regarding targeted professional development

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

The RtI Leadership Team makes recommendations to the School Advisory Council for the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Members of the RtI Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 goals; academic and social areas that need to be addressed, and set clear goals for instruction as evidenced on the School Improvement Plan.

RtI 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.

Academic
• FCAT
• Interim Assessments
• FAIR Assessment
• Student Grades
• Student Case Management System
• Detentions
• Behavior

• Suspensions/Expulsions
• Referrals by Student Behavior
• Climate Surveys
• Attendance

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

The district professional development and support will include:
1. training for all administrators in the RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
2. providing support for school staff to understand basic RtI principles and procedures; and
3. providing a network of ongoing support for RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

James V. Parker, Principal Site-based administrator
Dr. Ana Lopez-Ochoa, Vice Principal Site-based administrator
Michael Tandlich, Senior Assistant Principal Site-based administrator
Tammy R. Thomas, Assistant Principal Site-based administrator
Erica Evans, Cambridge Academy Career/Technical Education (CTE) Academy Leader
Matais Oxidine, Communication Entertainment Academy Career/Technical Education (CTE) Academy Leader
Michael Bevilacqua, Entrepreneurship Academy Career/Technical Education (CTE) Academy Leader
Glenda Algaze, Health Academy Career/Technical Education (CTE) Academy Leader
Marlon Vernon, Information Technology Academy Career/Technical Education (CTE) Academy Leader
John Moffi, Social Studies Department Chair
Michael Sanchez, Science Department Chair
Neyda Borges, Reading and Language Arts Department Chair

Jose Fernandez, Math Department Chair
Luz Escobar, Special Education Department Chair
Charles Green, Media Specialist Department Chair
Ana Tigerino, Student Services Department Chair
Beatriz Ambas, Test Chair
Helena Castro Activities Director

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

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? (enrichment opportunities)
2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
3. Hold regular team meetings.
4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, and updating them on procedures and progress.
5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate daily instruction and specific interventions.
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

Mathematics Initiatives

1. Suggestions for improving non-mastery target areas include:
• Align instruction with the district pacing guide to allow for testing on common material.
• Promote after school tutoring, E2020 tutoring, or Saturday FCAT tutoring for low-achieving students.
• Use inquiry based instruction, discovery learning, cooperative group instruction, technology, manipulative and other strategies with all subgroups to increase achievement to high level.

Reading Initiatives

1. Suggestions for improving non-mastery target areas include:
• Promote common research-based reading strategies including Reciprocal Teaching and graphic organizers across all grade levels and disciplines.
• Provide in depth, explicit instruction in word analysis skills aimed at the lower 25% of students by developing focused Bell Ringer activities.
• Explore supplemental materials and online technologies to enhance high-order reasoning strategies that include activities to synthesize and evaluate the information from multiple sources.
• Promote recreational reading to increase time spent with print.
• Use of multiple books and sources to provide wide experiences with print genres, and create regular opportunities across academic and career/ technical (CTE) curriculum for content-focused reading and writing.

NCLB Public School Choice

Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status
No Attachment

Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification
No Attachment

Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is based on a cross section of the faculty and administrative team that represents highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum. Reading strategies will be implemented in all academic and CTE classrooms with the assistance of the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Common reading strategies will be supported throughout the school. Progress monitoring will occur quarterly through the Interim Assessments.

The LLT is charged with cultivating the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by being active participants in all Literacy Leadership Team meetings and activities.

*High Schools Only

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

Miami Lakes Educational Center (MLEC) has a unique history in Miami-Dade County Public Schools; it was designed to house academies and career based technical programs. Students apply to MLEC, indicating their technical pathway of choice. Upon admission to MLEC students are placed into their selected Career Technical Academy. To support students' efforts, Career Technical Educators (CTE) and core academic teachers provide an interdisciplinary curriculum within the academy holding the students greatest interest, resulting in core academic instruction related to their grade level class with an emphasis on their future careers. MLEC has five career-technical academies: Cambridge, Entrepreneurship, Health, Communications/Entertainment, and Information Technology. This model will create a highly qualified future workforce by offering state-of-the-art academic, career, and technical education to all our students.

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

The ACT Online Prep Program allowed students the opportunity to receive individualized preparation and feedback in preparation for the ACT and post secondary endeavors. Every student received an individual password and instructions to access the ACT Online Prep Program from home and /or school.

The Student Services Team provides MLEC students and parents with information on post-secondary institutions, transition and readiness. The counselors attend all annual State University System, College Board, ACT and district meetings to keep up with current issues. Information on post secondary schools, scholarships, state and federal financial aid, and college transition is disseminated via individual student and parent conferences, classroom presentations, phone contact, parent nights, student academy meetings, I.E.P. conferences (as requested), and through our schools web site.

In the 2010-2011 school year, the Exit Interview Surveys, completed by seniors, reported the following: 101 (28 percent) students were accepted to 4 year institutions, 222 (61 percent) 2 year community college, 23 (6 percent) adult/vocational tech, 3 (1 percent)military, and 13 (4 percent) other/work. Students at MLEC start from their CTE classes in 9th grade organizing their personal portfolios and resumes and are taught how to keep track of important documents and information. Students must plan, organize, and understand how to seek guidance, form formal and informal study groups, and set priorities. Cambridge and Informational Technology (IT) academies will initiate an Introduction to Technology course while the remaining academies will utilize introduction to Career Pathway courses. As students progress through to senior year, each is asked to present a mandatory CAPSTONE project which is the culmination and planned presentation of "all" key concepts they have learned throughout high school, specifically their chosen career pathway which helps lead into post secondary education.

In the 2011-2012 all graduates from Miami Lakes Educational Center (MLEC) will complete elective courses correlating to their career pathway. These courses assist them in preparing for industry certification exams and transitioning into post secondary education.

In the 2011-2012 school year, Miami Lakes Educational Center will continue to offer its Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) and advanced placement (AP) courses, as well as numerous dual enrollment courses available. MLEC recognizes the importance of college readiness exams such as the PSAT, SAT, and ACT. All tenth graders will comply with the

district's mandate to take the PSAT. Student scores will be provided by winter break and given explanations how to interpret scores and instructed how to access "My College Road" provided by College Board. Additionally, the ASVAB is available. Furthermore, students are urged to take the SAT and ACT junior and/or senior year. Waivers are available.

In the 2010-2011 school year, the following number of scholarships was awarded through Florida Bright Futures – four Florida Academic Scholars granted, 61 Florida Medallion Scholars, and twelve Florida Gold Seal Vocational.

In 2010 – 2011 MLEC and Miami Dade College (MDC) partnered and gave numerous administrations of the CPT here at our school. Student's scores were printed instantly at the end of the exam and interpretation of scores was issued by the test administrator. Based on those scores, students understood their strengths and weaknesses in mathematics, reading and writing and whether they could take college level classes or remedial classes at MDC.

In 2011-2012 MLEC will continue to encourage students to take AP, AICE, and/or dual enrollment classes. In addition, the counselors will continue to conduct classroom visits, to share information and requirements for post secondary institutions as well as scholarship information available through Florida Bright Futures and any other scholarships available.

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 School Feedback Report

Analysis of college readiness is based on the latest data available – from the High School Feedback Report. The percent of graduates who were eligible for the FL Gold Seal Vocational award exceeds both the district and state percentage (2.48%) The percent of graduates who completed at least one AP, AICE or Dual Enrollment course is 42.9% which is above both district and state averages. The percent of graduates with standard high school diploma who took the SAT/ ACT / CPT and scored at or above college-level cut scores is 60.6% in math, 81.8% in reading, and 85.5% in writing. The reading and writing scores exceed both district and state averages. Finally the percent of graduates enrolled in a Florida public postsecondary institution was 56.7% which exceeds both district and state averages. Miami Lakes Educational Center has identified the following as school-wide priorities. As new federal and state guidelines are introduced under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), secondary students and staff must adapt to an increasing rigorous curriculum that stresses career- and college-readiness.
• Increase participation in public postsecondary readiness in reading, writing, and mathematics skills; the school offers elective courses for College Placement Test (CPT) preparation.
• Teachers will be given the opportunity to modify methods of instruction to suit the changing postsecondary requirements of student's college readiness.
• A more concerted effort needs to be made to assure all instructional personnel will become well versed and knowledgeable in the integration of traditional academic subjects with the career-technical curriculum.
• Arrange for CTE students to prepare for and take industry certification exams through their career and technical classes.
• MLEC will recognize the importance of college readiness exams by increasing the percentage of students participating in the ACT. MLEC will continue to be a test center and provide numerous administrations of the ACT exam.

MLEC met seven out of eight of the Perkins Secondary Performance Targets:
MLEC met the Reading Attainment Performance Target of 50%, obtaining 63.21%;
MLEC met the Math Attainment Performance Target of 69.53%, obtaining 86.48%;
MLEC met the Technical Skills Performance Target (including CAPE and Industry Certification exams), and of 86.38%, obtaining 95.82%;
MLEC met the Completion Performance Target of 89.53%, obtaining 98.74;
MLEC met the Graduation Rate Performance Target of 90.74%, obtaining 96.58%;
MLEC approached, though did not meet, the Placement Performance Target of 85.50%, obtaining 81.34%;
MLEC met the Non-Traditional Enrollement Performance Target of 19.69%, obtaining 24.18%; and
MLEC met the Non-Traditional Completion Target of 94.40%, obtaining 98.15%.

MLEC Post-Secondary met four out of six of the Perkins Secondary Performance Targets:
MLEC Post-Secondary met the Technical Skills Performance Target of 74%, obtaining 81.55%;
MLEC Post-Secondary approached, though did not meet, the Completion Performance Target of 44%, obtaining 36.84%;
MLEC Post-Secondary met the Retention Performance Target of 53%, obtaining 55.19%;
MLEC Post-Secondary did not meet, the Placement Performance Target of 83%, obtaining 68.87;
MLEC Post-Secondary met the Non-Traditional Enrollment Performance Target of 9%, obtaining 11.79%;
MLEC Post-Secondary met the Non-Traditional Completion Performance Target of 19.23%, obtaining 25.74%.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading Reading Goal #1:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 32 % of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-1012 school year is to increase Level 3students proficiency by 3 percentage points to 35%.
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
32% (270)	35% (296)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2- Reading Application . Students need to identify Author's Purpose in text and how Author's Perspective influences text.	1.1. Utilize grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining and or explaining	1.1. RtI Team	1.1. Review formative bi-weekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	1.1. Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment
2	1.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3- Literary Analysis Fiction/Non Fiction.	1.2. Provide opportunities for students to identify and interpret elements of story structure within a text, Help students understand character development, character point of view by asking "What does he think, what is his attitude toward...and what did he say to let me know?" Use poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. Note how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification. Use text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc) to locate, interpret, and organize	1.2. RtI Team	1.2. Review formative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	1.2. Formative Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment

	information,	

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

2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading Reading Goal #2:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 25% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency Our goal for the 2011-1012 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 26%.
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
25% (213)	26% (224)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The area of that showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4- Informational Text/ Research Process. Students struggle with organizational skills necessary to organize text information and features.	2.1. Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include building strong arguments to support answers, exploring shades of meaning, using reciprocal teaching and question-answer relationships, questioning the author, and summarizing.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson	2.1. Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	2.1. Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.

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

3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading Reading Goal #3:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 58% students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 68%.
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
58% (496)	68% (581)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading Reading Goal #3: 3.1.	3.1. Provide opportunities for students to analyze and develop an interpretation of	3.1. RTI Team	3.1. Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made	3.1. Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments

		literary work by describing and authors use of literary elements. Use poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. Note how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification. Use text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc) to locate, interpret, and organize information.		and adjust intervention as needed.	Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis/Fiction/Nonfiction. Students need to identify text structure and explain how it impacts meaning in text.				

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

4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 56% in the Lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gain by 10 percentage points to 66 %.
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
56% (120)	66% (141)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis/Fiction/Nonfiction: Explain and identify the purpose of text features.	4.1. Provide opportunities for students to analyze and develop an interpretation of literary work by describing and authors use of literary elements. Use poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. Note how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification. Use text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc) to locate, interpret, and organize information.	4.1. RTI Team	4.1. Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed	4.1. Formative: FAIR Assessments, Computer Assisted Program reports generated from Jamestown Reading Navigator (JRN) and Reading Plus Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment

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

	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 48% of Blacks and 58% of Hispanics achieved

5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading	proficiency. This was not sufficient to meet AYP in the Black and Hispanic subgroups.
Reading Goal #5A:	Our goal for the 2011-1012 school year is to increase the proficiency of the Black subgroup by 5 percentage points to 53% and the Hispanic subgroup by 4 percentage points to 62%.

Reading Goal #5A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)	

2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
White: N/A Black: 48% (101) Hispanic: 58% (347) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: N/A Black: 53% (112) Hispanic: 62% (371) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category1: Vocabulary – Identify and understands the meaning of conceptually advanced prefixes, suffixes, and root words.	5A.1. Provide students with need more practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms, Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word relationships from context, as well as provide additional instruction on word meanings.	5A.1 RTI Team	5A.1 Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	5A.1. Formative:: FAIR, Computer Assisted Program reports generated from Jamestown Reading Navigator (JRN) and Reading Plus Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5B:	N/A

Reading Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)	

2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5C:		N/A			

5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5C:	N/A
Reading Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)	
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 53% of Economically Disadvantaged students achieved proficiency. This was not sufficient to meet AYP in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup. Our goal for the 2011-1012 school year is to increase the proficiency of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup by 5 percentage points to 58%.
Reading Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged	
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
53% (317)	58% (347)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1: Vocabulary – Identify and understands the meaning of conceptually advanced prefixes, suffixes, and root words.	5D.1. Provide students with need more practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms, and antonyms, Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word relationships from context, as well as provide additional instruction on word meanings.	5D.1. RTI Team	5D.1. Review formative assessment data reports ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	5D.1. Formative:: FAIR, Computer Assisted Program reports generated from Jamestown Reading Navigator (JRN) and Reading Plus Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment

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
Reading Across the Curriculum	9-12	DeVry University	9-12 Instructors	October 28, 2011	Student work folder, classroom walkthroughs	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring for Reading Interventions.	Part-time hourly funding.	EESAC funds	$2,391.57
			Subtotal: $2,391.57
			Grand Total: $2,391.57

End of Reading Goals

Mathematics Goals

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

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

1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #1:	AlgebraI: The results of the 2011 Algebra 1EOC Test indicates that 62% of the students achieved levels in the middle and upper 3rd. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 66%. Geometry: The results of the 2011 Geometry Baseline Test indicates that 1% of the students achieved proficiency levels. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points to 10%
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
Algebra: 62% (123) Geometry: 1%(2)	Algebra: 66% (130) Geometry: 10%(41)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Algebra: 1.1. The lowest scores were in: Body of Knowledge-Algebra Standard:2 (Polynomials) Students have difficulty with multiple representations (graphical to symbolic).	Algebra: 1.1. • Develop departmental guidelines for all students learning notebooks designed to increase student achievement. • Provide teachers with training in developing meaning through mathematical problem solving in a real-world context Assist teachers with effective strategies for integrating technology in their lesson designs to improve connections between multiple representations of equations.	Algebra: 1.1. Rtl Team	Algebra: 1.1. Review assessment reports to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains.	Algebra: 1.1 Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Test
	Geometry: 1.2 Area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 Geometry Baseline exam was Two-Dimensional Geometry.	Geometry: 1.2. • Develop departmental guidelines for all students learning notebooks designed to increase student achievement.	Geometry: 1.1. Rtl Team	Geometry: 1.2. Review assessment reports to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains.	Geometry: 1.2. Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative:

		Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2		• Provide teachers with training in developing meaning through mathematical problem solving in a real-world context • Assist teachers with effective strategies for integrating technology in their lesson designs to improve connections between multiple representations of equations. • Increase the use of Geometer's Sketchpad and manipulatives to increase retention of key concepts in two-dimensional geometry.			Results from the 2012 Geometry EOC Test

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

2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #2:	Algebra: 1.1. The lowest scores were in: Body of Knowledge- Algebra Standard: 2 (Polynomials) Students have difficulty with multiple representations (graphical to symbolic). Geometry: The results of the 2012 Geometry Basline Test indicates that 1% of the students achieved proficiency levels. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points to 10%
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
Algebra: 62% (123) Geometry: 1%(2)	Algebra: 66% (130) Geometry: 10%(41)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Algebra: 1.1. The lowest scores were in: Body of Knowledge- Algebra Standard: 2 (Polynomials) Students have difficulty with multiple representations (graphical to symbolic).	Algebra: 1.1. • Develop departmental guidelines for all students learning notebooks designed to increase student achievement. • Provide teachers with training in developing meaning through mathematical problem solving in a real-world context Assist teachers with effective strategies for integrating technology in their lesson designs to improve connections	Algebra: 1.1. RtI Team	Algebra: 1.1. Review assessment reports to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains.	Algebra: 1.1 Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Test

		between multiple representations of equations.			
2	Geometry: 1.2 Area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 Geometry Baseline exam was Two-Dimensional Geometry.	Geometry: 1.2. • Develop departmental guidelines for all students learning notebooks designed to increase student achievement. • Provide teachers with training in developing meaning through mathematical problem solving in a real-world context • Assist teachers with effective strategies for integrating technology in their lesson designs to improve connections between multiple representations of equations. • Increase the use of Geometer's Sketchpad and manipulatives to increase retention of key concepts in two-dimensional geoemtry.	Geometry: 1.1. RtI Team	Geometry: 1.2. Review assessment reports to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains.	Geometry: 1.2. Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2012 Geometry EOC Test

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

3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics Mathematics Goal #3:	N/A
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics Mathematics Goal #4:	N/A
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*

N/A			N/A		

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5A:	The results of the 2011 Algebra 1EOC Test indicates that 67% of the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. This was not sufficient to meet AYP in the Black subgroup. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 70% by providing appropriate remediation and interventions.

Mathematics Goal #5A: Ethnicity
(White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)

2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
White: N/A Black:67% (68) Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: N/A Black:70% (71) Hispanic:N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
</table>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5A.1. The lowest scores were in: Standard:2 (Measurement) Students need support in conversion concepts related to measurement	5A.1. Provide inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities to improve conversion concepts. Assign students to cooperative student teams and require that the students explain to their peers in both verbal and written form the process used to arrive at a solution.	5A.1. RtI Team	5A.1. Review assessment reports to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains	5A.1. Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2011-2012 Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC Tests
2	5A.2. The lowest scores were in: Category2: (Geometry and Spatial Sense) Students struggle with 3-dimensional figures and their applications.	5A.2. Provide inductve reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities to improve special sense as it pertains to 3-dimensional figures. Assign students to cooperative student teams and require that the students explain to their peers in both verbal and written form	5A.2. RtI Team,	5A.2. Review assessment reports to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains	5A.2. Formative: District Interim Assessment Reports, student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2011-2012 Algebra 1 and Geoemtry EOC Test

	the process used to arrive at a solution.			

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

5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5B:	N/A

Mathematics Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)

2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A	N/A

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>

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

5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5C:	N/A

Mathematics Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)

2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A	N/A

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>

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

5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5D:	N/A

Mathematics Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged

	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
	N/A	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
Best Practices in Mathematics	9-12	Dr. Lopez-Ochoa	9-12 course-alike learning teams	October 28, 2011	Evidence of best practice activities in student work folders	Site-administrators
Use of technology	9-12	Dr. Lopez-Ochoa	9-12 course-alike learning teams	August 22, 2011 - June 7, 2012 (monthly meetings)	Evidence of technology use in grade level planning sessions	Site administrators

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring for Math Interventions.	Part-time hourly funding.	EESAC funds	$2,391.57
			Subtotal: $2,391.57
			Grand Total: $2,391.57

Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science Science Goal #1:	The results of the 2011 Biology Baseline Exam indicate that 1 % of the students achieved proficiency. Expected level of performance for 2012 is 11% proficiency.
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
1%(5)	11%(42)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Areas of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2011 Biology Baseline exam was The Big Idea: The Practice of Science. Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities that are linked to increased rigor through inquiry-based learning in Life Science. Students need support in developing and analyzing independent projects and to incorporate inquiry-based virtual science experiments.	1.1. Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase their scientific thinking. Develop and implement inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypothesis, data analysis, and explanation of variable and experimental design in Life Science. Students may demonstrate the Scientific methods by participation in the Science Fair and/or other competitions.	1.1. RtI Team	1.1. The RtI Team will review students work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor school base assessment and Interims to ensure adequate intervention.	1.1 Formative – District Baseline Data and school based assessment. Summative 2012 – EOC Biology Evaluation

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science Science Goal #2:	The results of the 2011 Biology Baseline Exam indicate that 1 % of the students achieved proficiency. Expected level of performance for 2012 is 11% proficiency.
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
1%(5)	11% (42)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Areas of deficiency as noted on the administration of the 2011 Biology Baseline exam was The Big Idea: Diversity and Evolution of Living Organisms Students need exposure to strategies that allow them to conceptualize the classification system and how the mechanism and evidence of evolution explains the various types of living organisms	2.1. Provide a variety of hands-on inquiry-based learning opportunities for students to analyze, draw appropriate conclusion, and apply key instructional concepts as to the origin, development, and classification of major life forms.	2.1. Administration	2.1. The Administrative team will review student work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor school based assessment and interims to ensure adequate progress and to adjust instruction.	2.1. Formative - District Base-line data and school based assessment, projects entered at the Regional Science and Engineering fair. Summative - 2012 Biology EOC

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
PLC - Rigor through Inquiry-based learning – focus Biology	9-12	Grade level teachers	All Science teachers	Sept 22, 2011 and October 27, 2011.	Student work folders, walkthroughs, and assessments.	Administration, Chairperson
Use of Hand-held interactive devices	9-12	Grade level teachers	All Science teachers	Sept 22, 2011 and October 27, 2011.	Student work folders, walkthroughs, and assessments	Administration, Chairperson

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00

			Subtotal: $0.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring for Science Interventions.	Part-time hourly funding.	EESAC funds.	$2,391.58
			Subtotal: $2,391.58
			Grand Total: $2,391.58

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) in writing Writing Goal #1:	The result of the 2011 FCAT Writing Test indicates that 98% of students scored level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher from 98% to 98%.
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
98% (401)	98% (401)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the Writing FCAT were focus and elaboration in the area of informational /expository essays that contained at least three paragraphs and include a topic sentence, supporting details, and relevant information.	1.1. During writing instruction, students will utilize 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, and amazing facts). Also, peer editing and anchor papers will also be used throughout the lesson.	1.1. Administration, Department Chairperson	1.1. Administer and score students' writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust focus.	1.1. Formative – District Baseline Data and writing prompts. Summative 2012-FCAT Writing Test.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2A:	N/A
Writing Goal #2A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)	

2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2B:	N/A

Writing Goal #2B: English Language Learners (ELL)

2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2C:	N/A

Writing Goal #2C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)

2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A	N/A

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

1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2D:	The results of the 2009-2010 FCAT Writing Test indicate that the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup met AYP.

Writing Goal #2D: Economically Disadvantaged	
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
Writing Across the Curriculum	9-12	DeVry University	9-12 Instructors	October 28, 2011	Student work folders, classroom walkthroughs	Administration

---

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00

			Subtotal: $0.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase attendance to 97.04% by minimizing absences due to truancy resulting from lack of student follow through with school policy and procedure in excusing absences. It is also our goal to create a climate in our school where parents, students and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated. Lastly, our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more), and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 5%.
2011 Current Attendance Rate:*	2012 Expected Attendance Rate:*
96.54% (1507)	97.04% (1515)
2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
302	287
2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
605	575

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1.1. Attendance rate from previous year decreased due to truancy increase by (24.3 %) from previous year. The truancies were associated with the following: -student's failure to submit notes from home -absences related to personal/emotional and family conflicts	1.1. Conduct grade level/academy assemblies in order to address school/district attendance policy. Provide students with information on school procedures for submitting documentation in order to excuse absences.	1.1 Assistant principal	1.1 Weekly updates to administration and to entire staff during monthly faculty meetings.	1.1 Use monthly/daily attendance rosters to monitor attendance and evaluate progress using COGNOS reports

1	- to insufficient resources to track, monitor and follow through with truant students	Provide student with information on support services available that suit the individual need of the student. Establish the necessary resources to monitor daily/weekly attendance reports in order to identify students with excessive absences/tardiness, and conduct conferences by phone or in person with students/parents to identify the reason for absences. Refer student who may be developing a pattern of absences to the Student Support Team (SST) for intervention. As needed place students on an attendance contract.			
2	1.2 1.1. Tardiness increased from the previous year due to the newly established high school hours (7:20 – 2:20).	1.2 1.1. Conduct grade level/academy assemblies in order to address school/district tardy policy. In addition provide students with school hours as determined by the School Board. Identify and establish procedures for students who may be developing a pattern of tardiness. Implement school wide lockdown procedures. Establish consequences for late arrival to school. Place student on a contract.	1.2. Administrators	1.2. Weekly updates to administration and to entire staff during monthly faculty meetings.	1.2. Use monthly/daily attendance rosters to monitor attendance and evaluate progress
3	1.3. Temporary relocation due to construction- School will have to relocate	1.3. Establish a support group that includes staff, family and students in order to create a welcoming climate for family, Create student-focused programs, and activities for the students, and offer support to students and their families during relocation	1.3. Administration	1.3. Administration will monitor support group's meetings, their recommendations and implementation strategies.	1.3. Support group's attendance logs and minutes of meetings

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
Truancy Prevention	9-12 Attendance and Tardiness	Staff from Attendance Services	All teachers, counselor and attendance clerk	September 22, 2011	A Truancy Intervention Program will be developed during the PD. An assistant Principal will monitor the implementation of this program	Assistant Principal and designee

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2011-2012 school years is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10%.
2011 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2012 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions
0	0
2011 Total Number of Students Suspended In School	2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended In School
0	0

	2011 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2012 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	
	10		9	
	2011 Total Number of Students Suspended Out of School		2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out of School	
	10		9	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 The total number of outdoor suspension decreased from 21 incidents during the 2009-2010 school year to 10 in the 2010-2011 school year. This represents a decrease of 52.4% As a school of choice, Miami Lakes Educational Center does not exercise indoor suspension due to satisfactory conduct requirement for admission. Outdoor suspensions are based on level of offence as per the Code of Student Conduct.	1.1. Academy orientation to review the Code of Student Conduct with teachers, parents, and students for appropriate behavior. Provide students with an agenda which includes the Code of Student Conduct. As an alternative to outdoor suspension, implement an after school detention program. Provide counseling sessions for parents and students as an alternative to outdoor suspension.	1.1. Administrative Team	1.1. Monitor Spot Success report by grade level and monitor COGNOS report on student outdoor suspension rate. Discuss progress during administrative meetings.	1.1. COGNOS Reports, Daily Attendance, and Monthly SCAM reports
2	1.2. The total number of indoor and outdoor suspension increased from incidents during the 2010-2011 school years; an increase of incidents. Parents are unfamiliar with the Student Code of Conduct and are unaware of the reason for their child's suspension.	1.2. The school's Guidance Counselor and the Community Involvement Specialist will contact parents of students who have been placed on indoor suspension. Parents will be provided with training on building an understanding of the Students Code of Conduct.	1.2. Guidance Counselor	1.2. Monitor Parents Contact Log for evidences of communication with parents of students who have been placed on indoor suspension.	1.2. Parent Communication Log Parent sing-in Log

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

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

				Target Dates		

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)	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	9 - 12	Martha Chavez	School wide	Sept. 22, 2011	Utilize classroom walk-through to monitor teacher's enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct. Monitor SPOT Success monthly report.	Administration
Student Code of Conduct	9 - 12	Martha Chavez	School wide	Sept. 22, 2011	Workshop to review classroom management strategies with teachers	Administration

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2009-2010 school year.*	Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to decrease our dropout rate by 0.5 percentage points and to maintain our current graduation rate.
2011 Current Dropout Rate:*	2012 Expected Dropout Rate:*
0.13% (2)	0%
2011 Current Graduation Rate:*	2012 Expected Graduation Rate:*

	94.97% (340)		94.97% (340)		

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 The dropout rate remained the same from the 2009-2010 school year to the 2010-2011 school year. This occurred due to a lack of post-secondary exposure.	1.1. Identify and meet with At-Risk students and discuss the Student Progression Plan, options and credit recovery programs, and other programs available in an effort to enroll the student in alternative educational options.	1.1. School Counselor	1.1. Monitor enrollment log of At-Risk students, referring students to Student Services for alternative programs.	1.1. Enrollment Logs

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
Graduation Requirements	9-12	Guidance Counselor	School-Wide	September 16, 2011	Monitor Parent Sign-In Roster	Guidance Counselor

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	During the 2009-2010 school year, parent participation in schoolwide activities was 5%. Our goal for the 2010-2011 school year is to increase parental participation by 10% from 5% to 15%.
2011 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2012 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*
5%	15%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of participation in school wide activities by parents of English Language Learners (ELL) and of other Languages	1.1. Provide parents with advanced notification (in parents' home language) of school events and activities via Connect Ed messages. Stager events and times to provide parents with multiple opportunities to attend events.	1.1. Administration	1.1. Utilize Sign-In sheets, rosters and logs to determine the number of parents attending school community events.	1.1. School Sign-In Sheets, rosters, telephone logs, and Connect Ed
2	1.2. Parent limited access to resources available through the Parent Portal	1.2. Provide Professional Development in the Parent Resource Center on the use of the Parent Portal	1.2. Administration	1.2. Utilize Sign-In sheets, rosters and logs to determine the number of parents attending school community events.	1.2. School Sign-In Sheets, rosters, and telephone logs.

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
Instructions for parents on the use of					Effectiveness will be	

| the on-line Parent Portal to monitor student progress | 9-12 | Selected School Staff | Parent Academy/ Portal Workshop | September 13, 2011 | determined by event attendance and staff feedback | Administration |

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

N/A Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. N/A Goal N/A Goal #1:	N/A
2011 Current level:*	2012 Expected level:*
N/A	N/A
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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						

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of N/A Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A			$0.00
Mathematics	N/A			$0.00
Science	N/A			$0.00
Writing				$0.00
Attendance	N/A			$0.00
Suspension	N/A			$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A			$0.00
N/A	N/A			$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A			$0.00
Mathematics	N/A			$0.00
Science	N/A			$0.00
Writing				$0.00
Attendance	N/A			$0.00
Suspension	N/A			$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A			$0.00
N/A	N/A			$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A			$0.00
Mathematics	N/A			$0.00
Science	N/A			$0.00
Writing				$0.00
Attendance	N/A			$0.00
Suspension	N/A			$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A			$0.00
N/A	N/A			$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Tutoring for Reading Interventions.	Part-time hourly funding.	EESAC funds	$2,391.57
Mathematics	Tutoring for Math Interventions.	Part-time hourly funding.	EESAC funds	$2,391.57
Science	Tutoring for Science Interventions.	Part-time hourly funding.	EESAC funds.	$2,391.58
Writing				$0.00
Attendance	N/A			$0.00
Suspension	N/A			$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A			$0.00
N/A	N/A			$0.00
				Subtotal: $7,174.72
				Grand Total: $7,174.72

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

◯ Intervene   ◯ Correct II   ◯ Prevent II   ◉ Correct I   ◯ Prevent I   ◯ NA

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/23/2011)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school.

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
EESAC activities will support implementation of SIP. The EESAC Committee will meet on a monthly basis to address concerns raised by the Literacy Leadership Team to provide support and enhance student achievement.	$7,142.72

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

EESAC will entertain requests from department heads and academy leaders in support of SIP initiatives.

◯ Intervene   ◯ Correct II   ◯ Prevent II   ◉ Correct I   ◯ Prevent I   ◯ NA

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

Dade School District
MIAMI LAKES EDUCATIONAL CENTER
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	59%	87%	83%	47%	276	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	58%	87%			145	3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	56% (YES)	78% (YES)			134	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					565	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					Pending	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
MIAMI LAKES EDUCATIONAL CENTER
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	62%	85%	94%	36%	277	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	62%	81%			143	3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	55% (YES)	74% (YES)			129	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					549	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
MIAMI LAKES EDUCATIONAL CENTER
2008-2009

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	57%	87%	86%	40%	270	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	61%	84%			145	3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	54% (YES)	79% (YES)			133	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					558	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested