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## VISION and MISSION STATEMENTS

VISION: The core philosophy and vision of Pinecrest Academy South Charter School is to provide an innovative challenging curriculum in a learning environment that promotes individualized instruction and supports students through the process of achieving high standards for educational success.

MISSION: The mission of Pinecrest Academy South Charter School is to provide a challenging curriculum where academic excellence, character development, and individual growth are nurtured in a safe environment that involves the active participation of community members, parents, teachers and students.

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

## SCHOOL PROFILE/ DEMOGRAPHICS

Brief History and Background of the School

## Brief History and Background of the School

Pinecrest Academy South Charter School was founded and opened in August 2006. Pinecrest Academy South has two locations servicing a total of 1,045 students in Kindergarten through 5th Grade. Pinecrest South Campus is located at 15130 SW 80th Street, Miami, Florida 33193 and Pinecrest North Campus is located at 10207 West Flagler Street, Miami, Florida 33174. Registration is open to any student who resides in Miami-Dade County. Pinecrest Academy South does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, nationality, or ethnic origin in the admission of students.

Beautification projects at both campuses including tiled floors, general landscaping, painting and awning installment will continue throughout the summer and early fall months.

Unique School Strengths for Next Year
Pinecrest Academy South will increase its enrollment of students in Kindergarten through 5th grade by approximately $40 \%$. The total enrollment will increase from 575 students to 1,045 students. This increase will allow us to provide more focused instructional initiatives relating to the elementary curriculum. In addition, the school will begin a new initiative by implementing an Accelerated Multiage Curriculum in Kindergarten through 2nd grade and a Multiage Curriculum in 3rd through 5th grade.

One of the awards achieved by the school was the "Get Fit by Finals" campaign award of $\$ 1000.00$ for student achievement. Our students also participated in the "Art of Found Objects" sponsored by Ocean Bank and the Children's trust fund. Several students artwork was selected for the annual Art auction fundraiser.

We will continue to utilize data to focus instruction in order to maintain or exceed our total points earned towards our Grade A status.

Unique School Weaknesses for Next Year
Unique School Weaknesses for Next Year

Due to the $45 \%$ increase in enrollment, a large number of students will be new to our programs and learning philosophy. Student placement will be affected by limited educational background information and data. Instability at the principal level has led to challenges in establishing common goals. A large percentage of our instructional faculty has less than three years teaching experience which limits our ability to establish an effective mentoring program.

## Student Demographics

Pinecrest Academy South serves a population that consists of 90\% Hispanic, 6\% White, and 3\% other. Economically disadvantaged students account for $36 \%$ of the population. Additionally, 3\% of students are Students with Disabilities (SWD), $12 \%$ are classified as English Language Learners (ELL), and nearly 3\% of students are gifted.

## Student Attendance Rates

```
Student Attendance Rates
Pinecrest Academy South has increased its student attendance over the past three years
2006-2007: 96.1%; 2007-2008: 96.81%; 2008-2009: 98%
```

Student Mobility
Student Mobility

The mobility rate at Pinecrest Academy South has remained relatively stagnant. 2006-2007: 10\%; 2007-2008 9\% and 20082009: $9 \%$. There will be a significant financial impact of FTE funding due to the $45 \%$ increase in student enrollment.

Student Suspension Rates
Student Suspension Rates

Over the past three years, only one student has been suspended from Pinecrest Academy South.

Student Retention Rates
Student Retention Rates

Pinecrest Academy South has decreased the number of students being retained. 2006-2007: 2.1\%; 2007-2008: 1.6\%; 20082009 1.2\%.

## Class Size

Class Size

All of our SWD and ELL students are fully mainstreamed in general education classrooms while receiving accommodations stated on their IEP and ELL plan. The average class size at Pinecrest Academy South will continue to be in compliance with State and District mandates: K-2: 18; 4-5: 22. 96\% of the teachers at Pinecrest Academy South are considered Highly Qualified by the Florida Department of Education.

## Academic Performance of Feeder Pattern

## Academic Performance of Feeder Pattern

Pinecrest Academy South population feeds into the following schools: Howard Doolin Middle School, Lamar Curry Middle School and Zelda Glazer Middle School. Howard Doolin Middle School maintained its grade of a B while increasing high standards in reading from 65\% to 68\%. Hispanic students and English Language Learners did not meet AYP in math and reading; Economically Disadvantaged students and Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in math. Lamar Curry Middle School maintained its grade of an A while increasing high standards in reading from a $79 \%$ to an $84 \%$ and in math from $81 \%$ to $84 \%$. Although obtaining a $97 \%$, students with disabilities did not meet AYP in math. Zelda Glazer Middle School has been able to achieve a grade of an A in its second year of inception. $81 \%$ of students met high standards in reading and $78 \%$ in math. Meeting AYP and a letter grade of an A is indicative of Zelda Glazers outstanding success.

## Partnerships and Grants

Partnerships and Grants

The school will continue to maintain our partnerships with Barnes and Nobel book store, the Scholastic Educational company and the "Get Fit by Finals" campaign, which provides additional resources including library books and funding for intervention programs.

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window
School Grades Trend Data

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Trend Data

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | \# of Years at Current School | \# of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Principal | Ms. Carmen Cangemi | BS in Exceptional <br> Student <br> Education, <br> Florida <br> International <br> University; MS in <br> Reading, Barry <br> University. <br> Certification in <br> Exceptional <br> Student <br> Education K-12, <br> Reading K-12, <br> Educational <br> Leadership all levels. |  | 3 | Principal at Pinecrest Academy South 20092010 <br> Assistant Principal at Mater Middle School <br> 2008-2009: Grade A. Reading Mastery $67 \%$, Math Mastery $70 \%$, Science Mastery $38 \%$, Writing Mastery $100 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2009 school year. <br> 2007-2008: Grade A. Reading Mastery 69\%, Math Mastery 68\%, Science Master 40\%, Writing Mastery 95\%. All subgroups met AYP for the 2008 school year. <br> 2006-2007: Grade B. Reading Mastery 65\%, Math Mastery 66\%, Science Master $35 \%$, Writing Mastery $94 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2007 school year. <br> Lead Teacher at Mater Middle School <br> 2005-2006: Grade A. Reading Mastery 68\%, Math Mastery $62 \%$, Writing Mastery $83 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2006 school year. <br> Reading Coach at Mater Middle School <br> 2004-2005: Grade A. Reading Mastery $58 \%$, Math Mastery $62 \%$, Writing Mastery 91\%. All subgroups met AYP for the 2005 school year. |
| Principal | Ms. Victoria Larrauri (Principal, North Campus) | BS in Business, Florida State University; MS in Elementary Education, Barry University. Certification in Elementary Education 1-6, Educational Leadership all levels. | 4 | 5 | Academy South <br> 2008-2009: Grade A. Reading Mastery $83 \%, 71 \%$. Math Mastery $81 \%$, Science Mastery 49\%, Writing Mastery 97\%. All subgroups met AYP for the 2009 school year. <br> 2007-2008: Grade A. Reading Mastery $86 \%$, Math Mastery $80 \%$, Science Mastery $57 \%$, Writing Mastery $97 \%$ All subgroups met AYP for the 2008 school year. <br> 2006-2007: Grade A. Reading Mastery $85 \%$, Math Mastery $80 \%$, Science Mastery $45 \%$, Writing Mastery $85 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2007 school year. <br> Principal at Pinecrest Preparatory Academy (South Campus) <br> 2005-2006: Grade A. Reading Mastery 87\%, Math Mastery 77\%, Writing Mastery $83 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2006 school year. <br> Interim Principal at Mater Academy <br> 2004-2005: Grade A. Reading Mastery $77 \%$, Math Mastery $72 \%$, Writing Mastery 90\%. All subgroups met AYP for the 2005 school year. |
| Assis Principal | Ms. Ana Diaz | BS in Elementary Education, <br> University of <br> Florida; Master of Education, <br> University of Florida. <br> Certification in Elementary <br> Education 1-6, <br> Educational <br> Leadership all levels | 4 | 2 | Assistant Principal at Pinecrest Academy South <br> 2008-2009: Grade A. Reading Mastery $83 \%, 71 \%$. Math Mastery $81 \%$, Science Mastery 49\%, Writing Mastery 97\%. All subgroups met AYP for the 2009 school year <br> 2007-2008: Grade A. Reading Mastery $86 \%$, Math Mastery $80 \%$, Science Mastery $57 \%$, Writing Mastery $97 \%$ All subgroups met AYP for the 2008 school year. <br> Reading Coach at Pinecrest Academy South <br> 2006-2007: Grade A. Reading Mastery $85 \%$, Math Mastery $80 \%$, Science Mastery 45\%, Writing Mastery $85 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2007 school year. <br> Reading Coach at Pinecrest Preparatory Academy (South Campus) <br> 2005-2006: Grade A. Reading Mastery 87\%, Math Mastery 77\%, Writing Mastery $83 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2006 school year. <br> Reading Coach at Caribbean Elementary <br> 2004-2005: Grade D. Reading Mastery |


|  |  |  |  |  | 44\%, Math Mastery 37\%, Writing Mastery 68\%. Caribbean Elementary did not meet AYP in any of their subgroups. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assis Principal | Ana Valdes | BS in Elementary <br> Education, <br> Florida <br> International <br> University; MS in <br> Educational <br> Leadership, Nova <br> Southeastern <br> University. <br> Certification in <br> Elementary <br> Education K-5, <br> Primary Pre-K-3, <br> ESOL <br> Endorsement, <br> Educational <br> Leadership all levels. | 3 |  | Reading Coach at Pinecrest Preparatory Academy <br> 2008-2009: Grade A. Reading Mastery 86\%, Math Mastery 78\%, Science Mastery $33 \%$, and Writing Mastery $92 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2009 school year <br> Reading Coach at Pinecrest Academy South <br> 2007-2008: Grade A. Reading Mastery $86 \%$, Math Mastery $80 \%$, Science Mastery 57\%, Writing Mastery 97\% All subgroups met AYP for the 2008 school year. <br> Kindergarten Teacher at Pinecrest Academy South <br> 2006-2007: Grade A. Reading Mastery 85\%, Math Mastery $80 \%$, Science Mastery $45 \%$, Writing Mastery $85 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2007 school year. <br> Third Grade Teacher/ Test Chairperson at Oxford Academy <br> 2005-2006: There is no FCAT data available for Oxford Academy during the 2005-2006 school year. This was the schools first year of inception. <br> Kindergarten Teacher at St. Brendan Catholic School <br> 2004-2005: St. Brendan Catholic School is a private institution which does not utilize the FCAT as a standardized assessment. |

* Note: Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades and AYP information along with the associated school year)

HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | \# of Years at Current School | $\begin{aligned} & \# \text { of Years as a } \\ & \text { Coach } \end{aligned}$ | Prior Performance Record * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | J annette Gonzalez | BS in Elementary <br> Education, <br> Florida <br> International <br> University; MS in <br> Reading <br> Education, <br> Florida <br> International <br> University; Ed.S <br> in Educational <br> Leadership, Nova <br> Southeastern <br> University; <br> Certification in <br> Elementary <br> Education, <br> Reading K-12, <br> ESOL <br> Endorsement | 4 | 1 | Lead Teacher at Pinecrest Academy South Campus <br> 2008-2009: Grade A. Reading Mastery $83 \%, 71 \%$. Math Mastery $81 \%$, Science Mastery 49\%, Writing Mastery $97 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2009 school year <br> 2007-2008: Grade A. Reading Mastery 86\%, Math Mastery 80\%, Science Mastery 57\%, Writing Mastery $97 \%$ All subgroups met AYP for the 2008 school year. <br> 2006-2007: Grade A. Reading Mastery $85 \%$, Math Mastery $80 \%$, Science Mastery $45 \%$, Writing Mastery $85 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2007 school year. <br> Lead Teacher at Pinecrest Preparatory Academy (South Campus) <br> 2005-2006: Grade A. Reading Mastery $87 \%$, Math Mastery $77 \%$, Writing Mastery $83 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2006 school year. <br> Reading Coach at Doral Academy <br> 2004-2005: Grade A. Reading Mastery 85\%, Math Mastery 77\%, Writing Mastery $91 \%$. All subgroups met AYP for the 2005 school year. |

* Note: Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades and AYP information along with the associated school year)

HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

| Description of Strategy | Person <br> Responsible | Projected <br> Completion <br> Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| why) |  |  |  |


| 1. Implementation of teacher mentoring program | Principal and <br> Assistant <br> Principal | On-going |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. Allocate funds to provide veteran teachers with a mentor <br> stipend | Principal | June 2010 |  |
| 1. Soliciting referrals from current employees | Assistant <br> Principal | On-going |  |

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

| Name | Certification | Teaching <br> Assignment | Professional <br> Development/ Support <br> to Become Highly <br> Qualified |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Michelle Cabassi | Temporary <br> Educator's | 2nd Grade | Ms. Cabassi will be taking <br> the Math portion of the <br> General Knowledge Test <br> to obtain her Professional <br> Educator's Certificate. |
| Alex Acosta | Temporary <br> Educator's | Mr. Acosta will be taking <br> the General Knowledge <br> Test to obtain his <br> Professional Educator's <br> Certificate |  |

## Staff Demographics

$\left.$| Total Number <br> of <br> Instructional <br> Staff | \% of <br> First-Year <br> Teachers | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with 1-5 <br> Years of <br> Experience | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with 6-14 <br> Years of <br> Experience | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with 15+ <br> Years of <br> Experience | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with <br> Advanced <br> Degrees | \% Highly <br> Qualified | \% Reading <br> Endorsed <br> Teachers | National <br> Board <br> Certified <br> Teachers |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | \% ESOL |
| :---: |
| Endorsed | \right\rvert\,

Teacher Mentoring Program

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Magda Miguelez | Any new hires at the North Campus | Magda <br> Miguelez has <br> 11 years teaching experience and has consistently demonstrated mastery of teaching skills. | The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis to discuss evidencebased strategies for each domain. The mentor will assist with the development of a year long evidence based portfolio including reflections from observations and professional development. |
| Diane Goldman | Any new hires at the South Campus | Diane <br> Goldman has <br> 30 years teaching experience and has consistently demonstrated master of teaching skills. | The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis to discuss evidencebased strategies for each domain. The mentor will assist with the development of a year long evidence based portfolio including reflections from observations and professional development. |

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only
Title I, Part A
$\qquad$
Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D
$\square$
Title III
$\square$
Title X- Homeless
$\square$
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
$\square$
Violence Prevention Programs
$\square$
Nutrition Programs
$\square$
Housing Programs
$\square$
Head Start
$\square$ Adult Education
$\square$
Career and Technical Education
$\square$ J ob Training
$\square$
Other
$\square$

## Response to Instruction/ Intervention (RtI)

$\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { School- based RtI Team } \\ \text { Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team. }\end{array}\right.$
Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

The Pinecrest Academy South Rtl team is comprised of various members of the administration, faculty and staff. Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of Rtl skills of school staff via classroom walk-throughs and informal and formal evaluations, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities.
Assistant Principal: Assist the Principal in carrying out the vision/mission and the implementation of the RtI. Grade Level Chairpersons: Provide information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, lead biweekly team meetings to disseminate information and coordinate lesson plans.
Reading Coach: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, and collaborates with staff to implement tier 1 and tier 2 interventions. Provides guidance on K-5 reading plan, provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning.
SPED Chair: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials, and collaborates with general education teachers through co-teaching and consultations.

Describe how the school-based Rtl Leadership Team functions (e.g. meeting processes and roles/functions).

The Rtl Leadership team will meet monthly and on an needed basis to discuss and monitor how data-driven instruction and assessments are impacting the performance of our students.
Review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will
identify professional development and resources and utilize the data to drive instruction. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

Describe the role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan

The RtI Leadership Team met with the EESAC (Educational Excellence School Advisory Counsel) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on students achievement (FCAT, SAT, and FAIR assessments) to develop clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

## -Rtl Implementation

Describe the data management system used to summarize tiered data.

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Describe the plan to train staff on Rtl.

Professional Development will be provided during designated professional development days, during small sessions and faculty meetings. A school-wide PD session regarding the effective implementation of the Rtl team will take place in August with a subsequent follow up in October.

## School Wide Florida's Continuous Improvement Model

```
Data Disaggregation 2008-2009 FCAT Data
What strengths and weaknesses were identified in the 2009 data by grade level, subject area, and clusters/strands?
```


## Reading:

Strengths: In grades 3 and 4, student scores in Words and Phases increased by 10\%. Grade 3 student scores in Words and Phrases increased by $15 \%$ from last year. Grade 5 student scores increased in the area of Reference and Research by $7 \%$. Weaknesses: Grade 3 student scores decreased in Main Idea/Purpose by 2\% and in Comparisons by 8\%. Grade 4 student scores decreased in Main Idea by $5 \%$ and Comparisons $2 \%$. Grade 5 student scores decreased in Words and Phrases by $8 \%$, in Main Idea by 5\% and in Comparisons by 6\%.

Math:
Strengths: Grade 3 student scores maintained proficiency in Measurement, Geometry, Algebraic Thinking and Data Analysis, and increased proficiency in Number Sense by $8 \%$. Grade 4 student scores increased proficiency in Number Sense by 9\%, and maintained proficiency in Geometry, Algebraic Thinking and Data Analysis. Grade 5 student scores increased proficiency in Number Sense by 7\%, and maintained proficiency in Measurement, Geometry and Algebraic Thinking. Weaknesses: Grade 4 student scores decreased in Measurement by $12 \%$. Grade 5 student scores decreased in Data Analysis by 9\%.

Writing:
Strengths: In 2009 Grade 4, $98 \%$ of students achieved high standards on the FCAT Writing administration as compared to 97\% in 2008.

## Science:

Strengths: In Grade 5, students maintained proficiency in Physical/Chemical and Life/Environmental Science.
Weakness: The percent of Grade 5 students meeting high standards decreased in Earth/Space by 3\% and in Scientific Thinking by 5\%

Instructional Calendar Development

What is the process for developing, implementing, and monitoring an Instructional Focus Calendar for reading, writing, mathematics, and science?

The IFCs will be created in July 2009 based on the disaggregation of the March 2009 FCAT data. The IFCs will be updated after the October and J anuary administrations of the Interim Assessments in Reading, Mathematics and Science.
Once the IFCs are presented to the faculty, teachers will be responsible under the guidance of the Rtl team, to determine the instructional focus of whole group lessons as well as small group/differentiated instruction.

The benchmarks will be selected as indicated by an analysis of cluster performance and will be measured by progress on class-work assignments, assessments and standardized data results. The allotment of instructional time for each benchmark was determined by the need of all students to be exposed to all Benchmarks before the administration of the FCAT and follows the district pacing guides. Furthermore, the IFC accommodates for thorough instruction, application, evaluation and re-teaching if necessary in either whole group or small group setting.
The administrative team will monitor the implementation of the IFCs via daily walk-throughs, data talks with the teachers, evaluating lesson plans, and tailored professional development for those teachers that encounter difficulty in implementing this model. In addition, teachers who will be assigned a mentor will be afforded the opportunity to observe other teachers who are successful and the Grade Level Chairpersons will provide additional assistance to the teacher. The teacher will participate in Professional Learning Communities, and utilize the support of their colleagues during weekly team meetings.

Which instructional Benchmarks will be given priority focus, based on need, for each content area (reading, writing, mathematics, and science)?

Reading: Main Idea/Purpose was the least proficient strand and will be given priority focus.
Mathematics: Data Analysis and Measurement were the least proficient strands and will be given priority focus.
Writing: Expository Writing was the least proficient strand and will be given priority focus.
Science: Earth/Space was the least proficient strand and will be given priority focus.

What is the process to ensure instruction is based on individual students' needs, as opposed to the master schedule?
Once FCAT scores were disaggregated, student learning gains by teacher were analyzed and the master schedule will be adjusted to prevent low-performing teachers from teaching low performing or weak students again. This analysis allows for the strongest teachers to be paired with the struggling students.

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

A daily focus of the school is for teachers and students to ask each other, "Why are we learning this?" to ensure that instruction is always relevant. Teachers are also provided reading materials and "bell ringers" that are based on current events.

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?

During our annual Career Day students are exposed to several different careers and are provided with activities related to career choice through the Social Studies curriculum.
$\left[\begin{array}{l}\mathrm{DO} \\ \text { Direct the I nstructional Focus } \\ \text { How are lesson plans and instructional delivery aligned across grade levels and subject areas? }\end{array}\right.$

Grade Levels will meet to develop lesson plans and design instruction based on the benchmarks and district pacing guides created for each subject area.

How are instructional focus lessons developed and delivered?
The focus lessons selected by the instructional coaches are aligned to the Benchmarks and standards for each subject area and cover those Benchmarks that are annually assessed on the FCAT. All teachers will be responsible for implementing focused lessons at the end of each instructional period.

How will instructional focus lessons be revised and monitored?

Teachers and members of the administrative team will assure effective instruction and planning by analyzing data results. Administrative walk-throughs and observations will also provide data on student performance.

[^0]How are assessments used to identify students reaching mastery and those not reaching mastery?

Student mastery will be measured by an $80 \%$ adequate performance in order to assure student proficiency. The assessment results will be used to evaluate instructional focus of whole group lessons. Item-analysis will be used in order to re-teach the questions that students missed most frequently. Focus lessons will include differentiated instruction for those students earning less than $50 \%$, additional instruction and practice opportunities for those students earning between 50-70\%, and enrichment/advanced instruction to students earning 80-100\%.

## Maintenance

How is ongoing assessment and maintenance of Benchmark mastery for each grade level and content area built into the Instructional Focus Calendar?

IFC integrates cross curricular and subject specific lessons to assess and monitor student performance. Assessment data for students performing at mastery level will be analyzed to tailor instruction to individual needs. Students performing at or above mastery level will enhance their proficiency by participating in project activities, hands on activities or advanced courses that will reinforce the skill and maintain the level of mastery.

Describe the process and schedule for teams to review progress monitoring data (summative and mini assessments) to identify the required instructional modifications that are needed to increase student achievement.

Teachers will convene in their Professional Learning Communities to address creative strategies that will target students performing below mastery, while enhancing the learning environment of students performing at mastery level or above. Specific departments meet monthly to collaborate on the vertical alignment of curriculum. Minutes will be submitted along with the agenda to the assistant principal. An administrator will attend the meetings on a rotation basis.

## Monitoring

Describe the Principal's and Leadership Team's roles as instructional leaders and how they will be continuously involved in the teaching and learning process.

The Principal takes a leadership role, as well as the RtI, by performing daily classroom walk-throughs to evaluate the learning environment, teacher performance and student engagement. Principal and leadership team will meet with teachers on a monthly basis to discuss assessment results and student progress. Findings will be shared at the bi-monthly Rtl meetings. RtI members will mentor teachers in developing a data driven Individual Professional Development Plan that reflects the Instructional Focus Calendar. Necessary adjustments to the Instructional Focus Calendar will be made by the RtI.

| ACT- |
| :--- |
| Supplemental and I ntensive I nstruction/ I nterventions |
| Identify the core, supplemental, and intensive instruction and interventions. |
| Reading: Core: Houghton Mifflin, Supplemental: Voyager, Accelerated Reader, Measuring-Up. <br> Math: Harcourt Brace, Everyday Math, Supplemental: Measuring-Up, Get Ahead Math <br> Science: McMillan/Mcgraw Hill, Supplemental: Foss Kits <br> Social Studies: Harcourt Brace |
| How are supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions and tutorials structured to re-teach non-mastered target areas? |
| Resources from the state adopted textbooks which are designed for intensive instruction will be utilized. <br> Computerized programs or instructional software (e.g. Measuring-Up), in addition to Internet instructional Web sites such as <br> FCAT Explorer, will also be utilized. Teachers will utilize instructional strategies or best practices discussed in Professional <br> Learning Communities to provide different methods of providing instruction to students in non-mastered areas. Resources <br> and strategies provided at professional development workshops will also be utilized. Students consistently demonstrating <br> non-mastery will be required to participate in tutorial sessions before or after school. |

How does the school identify staff's professional development needs to improve their instructional strategies?
Resources from the state adopted textbooks which are designed for intensive instruction will be utilized.
Computerized programs or instructional software (e.g. Measuring-Up), in addition to Internet instructional Web sites such as FCAT Explorer, will also be utilized. Teachers will utilize instructional strategies or best practices discussed in Professional Learning Communities to provide different methods of providing instruction to students in non-mastered areas. Resources
and strategies provided at professional development workshops will also be utilized. Students consistently demonstrating non-mastery will be required to participate in tutorial sessions before or after school.

Which students will be targeted for supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions?
Resources from the state adopted textbooks which are designed for intensive instruction will be utilized.
Computerized programs or instructional software (e.g. Measuring-Up), in addition to Internet instructional Web sites such as FCAT Explorer, will also be utilized. Teachers will utilize instructional strategies or best practices discussed in Professional Learning Communities to provide different methods of providing instruction to students in non-mastered areas. Resources and strategies provided at professional development workshops will also be utilized. Students consistently demonstrating non-mastery will be required to participate in tutorial sessions before or after school.

How will the effectiveness of the interventions be measured throughout the year?

Teachers will analyze the results from the focus assessments (i.e. benchmark assessments and software programs) to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention. Students who perform below mastery in math and reading will be placed on a Progress Monitoring Plan that informs the parents of the intervention measures being implemented.

## Enrichment

Describe alternative instructional delivery methods to support acceleration and enrichment activities.

Students who exceed mastery levels will participate in our Accelerated Multiage Curriculum which allows them exposure to an advanced curriculum.

Describe how students are identified for enrichment strategies.

Students are identified based on standardized assessment data including the FCAT and SAT assessments and the collaboration of parents and teachers.

## Professional Learning Communities

| PLC Organization (grade <br> level, subject, etc.) | PLC Leader | Frequency of <br> PLC Meetings | Schedule (when) | Primary Focus of PLC (include <br> Lesson Study and Data Analysis) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kindergarten <br> through Second <br> Grade <br> Reading and <br> Math | Grade Level <br> Chairpersons | Bi-weekly | Disaggregation of classroom-based <br> assessments. <br> Every other Tuesday or <br> Thursdact lesson studies. <br> Professional development (best practices, <br> research-based reading strategies. <br> Monitor and implement vertical alignment <br> of curriculum. |  |
| Third through <br> Fifth Grade <br> Reading Math <br> and Science | Grade Level <br> Chairpersons | Bi-weekly | Disaggregation of standardized <br> assessments, district interim assessment, <br> FCAT, and classroom-based assessments. |  |
| Every other Tuesday or or |  |  |  |  |
| Thursday |  |  |  |  | | Conduct lesson studies. |
| :--- |
| Professional development (best practices, |
| research-based reading strategies, test |
| preparation skills, focus lessons, etc) |
| Monitor and implement vertical alignment |
| of curriculum. |

## NCLB Public School Choice

Note: For Title I schools only

- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status No Attached Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SI NI Status
- Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification No Attached Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification
- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status No Attached Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

Pre-School Transition

## Postsecondary Transition

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


## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goal
Needs Assessment: Based on School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:
Did the total percent proficient increase or decrease? What is the percent change?
What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed decrease in proficiency?
Did all student subgroups meet AYP targets? If not, which subgroups did not meet the targets?
Did $50 \%$ or more of the lowest $25 \%$ make learning gains? What is the percent of the lowest $25 \%$ of students making learning gains?

Did $50 \%$ or more of the total number tested make learning gains? What is the percent of students making learning gains?

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) for I mprovement |  |  | Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading Goal <br> Needs Assessment: <br> - On the 2009 administration of the FCAT Reading Test: <br> o $83 \%$ of students met high standards. This represents a decrease of $3 \%$ compared to $86 \%$ who achieved mastery in 2008 <br> o The average percent correct responses in 3rd grade decreased in Main Idea from $73 \%$ to $71 \%$ and in Reference and Research from 80\% to 67\%. <br> o The average percent correct responses in 4th grade decreased in Main Idea from 75\% to 70\% and in Comparisons from 67\% to 65\% <br> o The average percent correct responses in 5th grade decreased in Words/Phrases from $75 \%$ to 67\%; in Main Idea from $72 \%$ to $67 \%$ and in Comparisons from $79 \%$ to 73\%. <br> o All subgroups met AYP in reading. <br> o 68\% of students in the lowest quartile made reading gains. This represents a decrease of $13 \%$ compared to $81 \%$ who made learning gains in 2008. <br> o $75 \%$ of students made learning gains. This represents a decrease of $3 \%$ compared to $78 \%$ who achieved learning gains in 2008. <br> In grades 3-5, 83\% of students achieved mastery on the 2009 administration of the FCAT Reading Assessment. This represents a decrease of $3 \%$ compared to $86 \%$ who achieved mastery in 2008. The average percent correct responses in 3rd grade decreased in Main Idea from $73 \%$ to $71 \%$ and in Reference and Research from 80\% to 67\% <br> The average percent correct responses in 4th grade decreased in Main Idea from 75\% to 70\% and in Comparisons from 67\% to 65\% <br> The average percent correct responses in 5th grade decreased in the Words/Phrases from 75\% to 67\%; in Main Idea from $72 \%$ to $67 \%$ and in Comparisons from $79 \%$ to $73 \%$. |  |  | Given instruction based on the Sunshine State Standards, $84 \%$ of students in grades 3-5 will achieve mastery in reading on the 2010 FCAT Reading Assessment |  |
|  | Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. The school will implement the new FAIR assessment to monitor student progress in reading. | 1.Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach | 1. Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students accurately and according to the preset timelines | 1. Printout of FAIR OPM data |
| 2 | 2. Implement biweekly meetings to review student data and develop lesson plans to align instruction to student needs | 1.Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach | 2. Meeting minutes will be submitted to the Assistant Principal for review. | 2. Classroom walkthroughs and regular review of lesson plans will be conducted to ensure the alignment of instruction to data. |
| 3 | 3. Utilize the M-DCPS library media services online databases to enhance | 3. Reading Coach, Grade level chairpersons | 3. Reading Coach will meet with grade teams to assist in planning lessons based | 3. Classroom walkthroughs and regular review of lesson plans will be conducted to |


| reading instruction | on instructional objectives <br> through the web based <br> program | ensure appropriate <br> resources a being utilized. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) <br> for I mprovement | Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| In grades 3-5, 75\% of students achieved learning gains <br> on the 2009 administration of the FCAT Reading <br> Assessment. This represents a decrease of 3\% <br> compared to 78\% who achieved learning gains in 2008. | Given instruction based on the Sunshine State <br> Standards, 76\% of students in grades 3-5 will achieve <br> learning gains on the 2010 FCAT Reading Assessment. |  |  |
|  | Action Step | Person Responsible <br> for Monitoring the <br> Action Step | Process Used to <br> Determine Effectiveness <br> of Action Step |
| 1 | 1. Use data from the FAIR <br> assessment to provide <br> focused differentiated <br> instruction | 1. Principal, Assistant <br> Principal and Reading <br> Coach | 1. Administration will review <br> evidence of differentiated <br> instruction related to <br> student data |
| 1. Classroom charts with <br> group assignment and <br> instructional focus related <br> to student data |  |  |  |


| Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) <br> for I mprovement | Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Based on 2009 FCAT Reading data, 83\% of economically <br> disadvantaged students achieved high standards. This <br> represents a decrease of 5\% compared to 88\% who <br> achieved high standards in 2008. | Given instruction based on the Sunshine State <br> Standards, 84\% of economically disadvantaged <br> students in grades 3-5 will achieve learning gains for <br> reading on the 2010 FCAT Reading Assessment. |  |  |
|  | Action Step | Person Responsible <br> for Monitoring the <br> Action Step | Process Used to <br> Determine Effectiveness <br> of Action Step |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 1. Determine the core <br> instructional needs of <br> economically disadvantaged <br> students using previous <br> FCAT reading scores and <br> FAIR assessment results | 1. Reading Coach | 1. Implement strategies <br> based on student needs <br> determined by assessment <br> comparisons |
| 1. Student progress will be <br> assessed with FAIR and <br> compared to FCAT and SAT <br> results. |  |  |  |


| Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) for I mprovement |  |  | Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Based on 2009 FCAT Reading data, $68 \%$ of the lowest 25\% made learning gains. This represents a decrease of $13 \%$ compared to 81\% who made learning gains in 2008 |  |  | Given instruction based on the Sunshine State Standards, $72 \%$ of students in the lowest $25 \%$ in grades 3-5 will achieve learning gains for reading on the 2010 FCAT Reading Assessment. |  |
|  | Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.Provide students scoring in the lowest 25\% interventions using the Voyager reading program | 1. Language Arts / Reading teacher, Reading Coach | 1. Student progress is assessed using Ongoing progress monitoring periodically | 1. OPM data will be used to determine student progress |
| 2 | 2. Monitor student progress using the ongoing progress monitoring component of Voyager reading program | 2. Reading Coach | 2. Reading Coach and Administration will meet regularly with teachers implementing the Voyager program to review progress | 2. Ongoing progress monitoring component of the Voyager program |
| 3 | 3. Provide teachers with in house professional development in utilizing differentiated instruction in reading | 3.Reading Coach | 3. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to monitor differentiated instruction groups | 3. Review of student data for identification of groups and strategies used |

## Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

| Objective Addressed | Content/ Topic | Facilitator | Target Date | Strategy for Follow-up/ Monitoring | Person <br> Responsible <br> for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 84\% of students in grades 35 will achieve mastery for reading on the 2010 FCAT Reading Assessment. | FAIR Administration and Data Analysis | District <br> Language Arts <br> Department | $\begin{aligned} & \text { August } \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ | Reading Coach will meet with grade level teams to review implementation of strategies related to data results. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach |
| $72 \%$ of students in the lowest $25 \%$ in grades $3-5$ will achieve learning gains for reading on the 2010 FCAT Reading Assessment. | Voyager | Reading Coach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { August } \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ | Reading Coach will monitor student progress with OPM tools embedded in the Voyager program. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach |

$\square$

Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Voyager Passport | FTE | \$5,000.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$5,000.00 |
| Technology |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Substitute funding for Professional Development days | FTE | \$1,000.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$1,000.00 |
| Other |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
|  |  | al Total: \$6,000.00 |
|  |  | End of Reading Goal |

## Mathematics Goal

| Needs Assessment: | Based on School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Did the total percent proficient increase or decrease? What is the percent change? |
|  | What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed decrease in proficiency? |
|  | Did all student subgroups meet AYP targets? If not, which subgroups did not meet the targets? |
|  | Did $50 \%$ or more of the lowest $25 \%$ make learning gains? What is the percent of the lowest $25 \%$ of students making learning gains? |
|  | Did $50 \%$ or more of the total number tested make learning gains? What is the percent of students making learning gains? |


| Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) for Improvement |  |  | Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Needs Assessment: <br> - On the 2009 administration of the FCAT Math Test: <br> o $81 \%$ of students met high standards. This represents an increase of $1 \%$ compared to $80 \%$ who achieved mastery in 2008 <br> o The average percent correct responses in 5th grade decreased in Measurement from 75\% to 63\% <br> o All subgroups met AYP targets in math. <br> o $80 \%$ of students in the lowest quartile made gains in math. This represents an increase of 3\% compared to $77 \%$ who made learning gains in 2008. <br> o 75\% of students made learning gains. This represents no change from the 2008 administration. <br> In grade 5, 65\% of students achieved mastery on the 2009 administration of the FCAT Math Test. This represents a decrease of $3 \%$ compared to $68 \%$ who achieved mastery in 2008. |  |  | Given instruction based on the Sunshine State Standards, 74\% of students in grades 3-5 will achieve mastery for Math on the 2010 FCAT Math Assessment. |  |
|  | Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.Utilize quarterly benchmark assessments to | 1.Principal, Assistant Principal, Lead | 1. Grade level teams will review the results of | 1. Quarterly assessments tied to Sunshine State |


|  | monitor student progress <br> and align instruction <br> accordingly | Teacher | assessment data quarterly <br> to determine progress <br> towards benchmark. | Standards |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 2. Increase the use of <br> manipulatives and hands- on <br> activities to reinforce math <br> concepts | 2. Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Lead <br> Teacher | 2. Lead Teacher will assist <br> teachers in the creation of <br> center and stations and <br> administration will ensure <br> activities are implemented. | 2. Progress of students on <br> assessments |
| 3 | 3. Utilize small group <br> instruction for targeted skill <br> reinforcement | 3. Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Lead <br> Teacher | 3. Lead teacher will assist <br> teachers in analyzing <br> student assessments to <br> determine small group <br> instruction targets | 3. Progress of students on <br> assessments |


| Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) for I mprovement |  |  | Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In grade 4, students answered an average of 63\% correct in measurement on the 2009 administration of the FCAT Math Assessment. This represents a decrease of $12 \%$ compared to $75 \%$ correct in the 2008 administration. |  |  | Given instruction based on the Sunshine State Standards, the percent of correct answers in measurement will increase to $76 \%$ in 4th grade. |  |
|  | Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Increase the use of authentic measurement activities to reinforce measurement concepts in the real world | 1. Principal, Assistant Principal, 4th Grade Chairperson | 1. The 4th Grade <br> Chairperson will assist teachers in the development of authentic measurement activities and meet to review student progress in the area of measurement. | 1. Progress of students on measurement assessments |

Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) for I mprovement

Based on 2009 FCAT Math data, 78\% of our economically disadvantaged students achieved high standards. This represents a decrease of 1\% compared to $79 \%$ who achieved high standards in 2008.

|  | Action Step | Person Responsible <br> for Monitoring the <br> Action Step |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1. Determine the core <br> instructional needs of <br> economically disadvantaged <br> students using previous <br> FCAT math scores and <br> quarterly assessment <br> results | 1. Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Lead <br> Teacher |

## Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement

Given instruction based on the Sunshine State
Standards, 84\% of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 will achieve learning gains for math on the 2010 FCAT Math Assessment.

| Process Used to <br> Determine Effectiveness <br> of Action Step | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. Implement strategies <br> based on student needs <br> determined by assessment <br> comparisons | 1. Student progress will be <br> assessed and compared to <br> FCAT and SAT results. |

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

| Objective Addressed | Content/ Topic | Facilitator | Target Date | Strategy for Follow-up/ Monitoring | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In grade 5, 65\% of students achieved mastery on the 2009 administration of the FCAT Math Assessment. This represents a decrease of $3 \%$ compared to 68\% who achieved mastery in 2008 | Effective use of manipulatives and hands-on activities | Lead Teacher | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { September } \\ 2009 \end{array}$ | Observation of manipulative use and documentation in lesson plans | Principal, Assistant Principal and Lead Teacher |
| In grade 4, students answered an average of $63 \%$ correct in the measurement strand of the 2009 administration of the FCAT Math Assessment. This represents a decrease of $12 \%$ compared to 75\% correct in the 2008 administration | Differentiated Instruction | Lead Teacher | $\begin{aligned} & \text { November } \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ | Administration will conduct targeted walkthroughs to monitor effectiveness of differentiated instruction training. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Lead teacher are responsible for monitoring the use of differentiated instruction in math |


| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manipulatives and various Math supplies | FTE | \$5,000.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$5,000.00 |
| Technology |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Get Ahead Math program | FTE | \$1,000.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$1,000.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
|  |  | al Total: \$6,000.00 |

## Science Goal

Needs Assessment: Based on School Grade Data:

Did the total percent proficient increase or was the percent proficient maintained?
What clusters/strands showed decrease in proficiency?

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) <br> for I mprovement | Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Needs Assessment: <br> On the 2009 administration of the FCAT Science Test: <br> • 53\% of students in grade 5 achieved mastery. This <br> represents a decrease of 4\% compared to 57\% who <br> achieved mastery in 2008. <br> - The average percent correct responses in 5th grade <br> decreased in Earth/Space and from 57\% to 54\% and in <br> Scientific Thinking from 67\% to 62\%. <br> - The average percent correct responses in 5th grade <br> decreased in Earth/Space from 57\% to 54\% and in <br> Scientific Thinking from 67\% to 62\%. | Given instruction based on the Sunshine State <br> Standards, 63\% of students in grade 5 will achieve <br> mastery for reading on the 2010 FCAT Science <br> Assessment. |
| In grade 5, 53\% of students achieved mastery on the |  |
| 2009 administration of the FCAT Science Assessment. |  |
| This represents a decrease of 4\% compared to 57\% |  |
| who achieved mastery in 2008. |  |
| The average percent correct responses in 5th grade |  |
| decreased in Earth/Space from 57\% to 54\% and in |  |
| Scientific Thinking from 67\% to 62\%. |  |


| Objective Addressed | Content/ Topic | Facilitator | Target Date | Strategy for Follow-up/ Monitoring | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Given instruction based on the Sunshine State Standards, $63 \%$ of students in grade 5 will achieve mastery for reading on the 2010 FCAT Science Assessment. | Science experiences through the Safari Montage application | Safari-Montage representative | November $2009$ | All science teachers will participate in the Safari-Montage training and document in lesson plans | Principal, <br> Assistant <br> Principal, Lead <br> Teacher |

Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Safari-Montage Video Resources | FTE | \$2,000.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$2,000.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Total: \$0.00 |  |  |
|  |  | al Total: \$2,000.00 |

End of Science Goal

## Writing Goal

Needs Assessment:
Based on School Grade Data:
Did the total percent proficient increase or was the percent proficient maintained?
What clusters/strands showed decrease in proficiency?

Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) for I mprovement

Based on 2009 FCAT Writing data, $98 \%$ of the students in 4th grade scored 3.5 or above in writing. This represents an increase compared to $97 \%$ of 4 th graders who scored 3.5 or above in 2008.Based on 2009 FCAT Writing data, $98 \%$ of the students in 4th grade scored 3.5 or above in writing. This represents an increase compared to $97 \%$ of 4th graders who scored 3.5 or above in 2008.

|  | Action Step | Person Responsible <br> for Monitoring the <br> Action Step |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1. Students will use the <br> writing process daily; all <br> writing will be dated and <br> recorded in a journal, <br> notebook or work folder for <br> monitoring of growth across <br> time. | 1. Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Reading <br> Coach |
| 2 | 2. The revision and editing <br> process will be explicitly <br> taught and seen in student <br> writing drafts. | 2. Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Reading <br> Coach |
| 3 | 3. Students will examine <br> and analyze examples of <br> quality writing pieces. | 3. Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Language <br> Arts Teachers |

## Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement

Given instruction based on the Sunshine State
Standards, on the 2010 administration of the FCAT Writing Test, at least $98 \%$ of 4 th grade students will achieve mastery
,
,

| Process Used to <br> Determine Effectiveness <br> of Action Step | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. A grade level wide <br> consistent method of <br> saving student work will be <br> established. | Evaluation Tool <br> 1. Progress between <br> monthly writing prompt <br> responses |
| 2. Administration will meet <br> with teachers to monitor <br> revision and editing process | 2. Progress between <br> monthly writing prompt <br> responses |
| 3. Teachers will lead <br> discussion groups to <br> highlight quality writing | 3. Evidence of quality <br> writing characteristics in <br> writing responses |


| $\|$    |
| :--- |
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) <br> for I mprovement Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement   <br> Based on 2009 FCAT Writing data, 98\% of the students <br> in 4th grade scored 3.5 or above in writing. This <br> represents an increase compared to $97 \%$ of 4th graders <br> who scored 3.5 or above in 2008. Given instruction based on the Sunshine State <br> Standards, on the 2010 administration of the FCAT <br> Writing Test, at least 98\% of 4th grade students will <br> achieve mastery   <br>  Action Step Person Responsible <br> for Monitoring the <br> Action Step Process Used to <br> Determine Effectiveness <br> of Action Step <br> 1 2. The revision and editing <br> process will be explicitly <br> taught and seen in student <br> writing drafts. 2. Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Reading <br> Coach 2. Administration will meet <br> with teachers to monitor <br> revision and editing process2. Progress between <br> monthly writing prompt <br> responses |

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

| Objective Addressed | Content/ Topic | Facilitator | Target <br> Date | Strategy for <br> Follow-up/ <br> Monitoring | Person <br> Responsible <br> for Monitoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Given instruction based on the <br> Sunshine State Standards, on the <br> 2010 administration of the FCAT | Teaching the use <br> Of revision and <br> Writing Assessment, at least 98\% <br> of 4th grade students will achieve <br> mastery | Monitor student writing <br> portfolios, notebooks <br> and journals. The <br> students will use <br> different color pens to <br> make revisions. | Reading <br> Reading Coach <br> and Grade Level <br> Chairpersons |  |  |

Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | $\$ 0.00$ |
|  |  | Total: $\$ 0.00$ |
| Technology | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Description of Resources | No Data | $\$ 0.00$ |
| No Data |  | Total: $\$ 0.00$ |
|  | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Professional Development | FTE | $\$ 1,000.00$ |
| Description of Resources |  | Total: $\$ \mathbf{1 , 0 0 0 . 0 0}$ |
| Substitute funding for Professional <br> Development days | Available $\mathbf{A m o u n t}$ |  |
|  | Funding Source | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Other | No Data | Final Total: $\$ \mathbf{1 , 0 0 0 . 0 0}$ |
| Description of Resources |  | End of Science Goal |
| No Data |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Parent Involvement Goal

Needs Assessment: Based on information from School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:
Were parent involvement activities and strategies targeted to areas of academic need?
Based on information from surveys, evaluations, agendas, or sign-ins:
Was the percent of parent participation in school activities maintained or increased from the prior year?

Generally, what strategies or activities can be employed to increase parent involvement?

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I dentify Area(s) for I mprovement |  |  | Objective Linked to Area of I mprovement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Based on records of volunteer hours logged by teachers, $98 \%$ of our families volunteered at least 30 hours during the 2008-2009 school year. This percentage remained the same as compared to the 2007-2008 school year. Based on records of volunteer hours logged by teachers, $98 \%$ of our families volunteered at least 30 hours during the school year. |  |  | The school will increase the percent of families who complete at least 30 volunteer hours by June 2010 to 99\%. |  |
|  | Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Increase opportunities for parents to volunteer through targeted planning of school activities | 1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers | 1. Administration will review parent volunteer hour logs for evidence of completion | 1. Review of volunteer logs |
| 2 | 2. Assist our Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) in its efforts to recruit parent volunteers by providing class incentives for 100\% participation | 2. Principal, Assistant Principal, PTO President | 2. PTO president will report the number of classes who have reached the 100\% participation goal | 2. Total percent of families who participate in the PTO |

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

| Objective Addressed | Content/ Topic | Facilitator | Target <br> Date | Strategy for <br> Follow-up/ <br> Monitoring | Person <br> Responsible <br> for <br> Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

No data submitted

Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
|  |  | Final Total: \$0.00 |
|  |  | Parent I nvolvement Goal |

## Other Goals

No Other Goals were submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Goal | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Voyager Passport | FTE | \$5,000.00 |
| Mathematics | Manipulatives and various Math supplies | FTE | \$5,000.00 |
|  |  |  | Total: \$10,000.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Goal | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Mathematics | Get Ahead Math program | FTE | \$1,000.00 |
| Science | Safari-Montage Video Resources | FTE | \$2,000.00 |
|  |  |  | Total: \$3,000.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Goal | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Substitute funding for Professional Development days | FTE | \$1,000.00 |
| Writing | Substitute funding for Professional Development days | FTE | \$1,000.00 |
|  |  |  | Total: \$2,000.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Goal | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | Total: \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | Final Total: \$15,000.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

> jn Intervene jn Correct II jn Prevent II jn Correct I jn Prevent I j NA

No Attached school's Differentiated Accountability Checklist of Compliance

## 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.
$\checkmark$ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
| :--- | :--- |
| Purchase additional library resources | 5000 |
| Science lab equipment for hands on experiments | 4000 |
| Provide incentives for FCAT achievement | 1000 |

## Describe the Activities of the School Advisory Council for the Upcoming Year

[^1]
# - Develop initiatives to increase parental involvement 

## SAC Members

## Members

1) Carmen Cangemi, Principa
2) Jannette Del Rio, SAC Chair
3) Rebecca Mirabent, Student
4) Charito Saavedra, Teacher
5) Karyn Arellano, Teacher
6) Magda Miguelez, Teacher
7) Jessica Pujals, Business Member
8) Raysa Pera, Parent
9) Linette Portugese, Parent
10) Indiana Lopez- Mclaughlin, Parent
11) Raquel Otaola, Paren
12) Linae Navia, Parent
13) Darlen Otano, Parent
14) Annette Gonzalez, School Support Personnel

| 2008-2009 Adequate Yearly P | ss (AY | Repor | - Pag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Dade | PINE | ECREST A | ACADE | EMY | (SOUTH | H CAMPUS | ) 0342 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of students enrolled in th Click here | e Nu | er O | stud | $s$ in | ac | oup |  |  | Read: Math: | $\begin{aligned} & 257 \\ & 257 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2008 \\ & \text { Scho } \end{aligned}$ | $2009$ | A |  | Did th make Yearly | he Sch <br> Adeq <br> Prog | hool quate ress? | YES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This section shows the percen | d and | form | ance f | each | oup | d to d | termin | AYP ( | arts a | and | ). |  |  |  | This impr to de (Part | section ovem termi $\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{2}}$ ). | on show ent for ine AYP | s the each g via sa |  | used arbor | This sect of studen proficien AYP via t | tion sho nts "on t used the grow | ows the $p$ track" to to determ wth mode | perce o be mine el. |
| Group | Readi Teste the st | 5\% of ents? | Math Tested the st | 5\% of ents? | 65\% or abo level in Readi | ing at grade | 68\% s or abov level in | ring at grade Math? | Impro perfor Writing | ved mance g by 1 |  | Increased Graduati Rate ${ }^{3}$ by | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ed } \\ & \text { ion } \end{aligned}$ |  | Perce Stude below grade level Readi | nt of nts in ng | Safe Harbor Reading | Perce Stude below grade level Math | ent of ents N in | Safe Harbor Math | $\%$ of <br> students <br> on track <br> to be <br> proficient <br> in <br> reading | Growth model reading | \% of students on track to be proficient in math | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grow } \\ & \text { mode } \\ & \text { math } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 2009 | Y/N | 2009 | Y/N | 2009 | Y/N | 2009 | Y/N | 2008 | 2009 | Y/N | 2007 | 2008 | Y/N | 2008 | 2009 | Y/N | 2008 | 2009 | Y/N | 2009 | Y/N | 2009 | Y/N |
| TOTAL ${ }^{4}$ | 100 | Y | 100 | Y | 82 | Y | 80 | Y |  |  | Y |  |  | NA | 18 | 18 | NA | 22 | 20 | NA | 85 | NA | 79 | NA |
| WHITE |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| BLACK |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| HISPANIC | 100 | Y | 100 | Y | 81 | Y | 80 | Y |  |  | Y |  |  | NA | 17 | 19 | NA | 22 | 20 | NA | 85 | NA | 80 | NA |
| ASIAN |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 100 | Y | 100 | Y | 83 | Y | 78 | Y |  |  | NA |  |  | NA | 12 | 17 | NA | 21 | 22 | NA | 86 | NA | 79 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | 100 | Y | 100 | Y | 89 | Y | 85 | Y |  |  | NA |  |  | NA | 17 | 11 | NA | 24 | 15 | NA | 92 | NA | 83 | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007-2008 Adequate Yearly P | ss (AY | Repor | - Pag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Dade | PIN | ECREST A | ACAD | EMY ( | (SOUTH | H CAMPUS | S) 0342 |  |  |
| Number of students enrolled in th Click here | e Nu | er of | stud | ts in | ac | oup |  |  | Read: Math: | $\begin{aligned} & : 185 \\ & : 185 \end{aligned}$ |  | 2008 <br> Grade ${ }^{1}$ : | A |  | Did th make Yearl | he Sch Adeq y Prog | hool quate gress? | YES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This section shows the percen | d and | rform | nce f | each | oup u | to d | ermin | AYP | arts a | and | $c^{2}$ ). |  |  |  | This impr to de (Par | secti ovem term $t b^{2}$ ). | ion show ment for ine AYP $\qquad$ | ws the each via sa | group afe ha | used arbor | This sec of stude proficien AYP via | tion sho nts "on nt used the grow | ows the $p$ track" to to determ wth mode | perce <br> to be <br> mine <br> del. |
| Group |  | 5\% of ents? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Math } \\ & \text { Tested } \\ & \text { the } \end{aligned}$ | \% of nts? |  | ing at grade | $\begin{aligned} & 62 \% \text { so } \\ & \text { or abo } \\ & \text { level in } \end{aligned}$ | ring at grade Math? |  | oved rmance gy 1 |  | Increas Graduat Rate ${ }^{3}$ by | d <br> $1 \%$ ? |  | Perce Stude below grade level Read | ent of nts v in ing | Safe Harbor Reading | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Perce } \\ & \text { Stude } \\ & \text { below } \\ & \text { grade } \\ & \text { level i } \\ & \text { Math } \end{aligned}$ | ent of ents w in | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Safe } \\ & \text { Harbor } \\ & \text { Math } \end{aligned}$ | $\%$ of <br> students <br> on track <br> to be <br> proficient <br> in <br> reading | Growth model reading |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grov } \\ & \text { mod } \\ & \text { matt } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 2008 | Y/N | 2008 | Y/N | 2008 | Y/N | 2008 | Y/N | 2007 | 2008 | Y/N | 2006 | 2007 | Y/N | 2007 | 2008 | Y/N | 2007 | 2008 | Y/N | 2008 | Y/N | 2008 | Y/N |
| Total ${ }^{4}$ | 100 | Y | 100 | Y | 82 | Y | 78 | Y |  |  | Y |  |  | NA | 19 | 18 | NA | 22 | 22 | NA | 79 | NA | 76 | NA |
| WHITE |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| BLACK |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| HISPANIC | 100 | Y | 100 | Y | 83 | Y | 78 | Y |  |  | Y |  |  | NA | 18 | 17 | NA | 22 | 22 | NA | 81 | NA | 76 | NA |
| ASIAN |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED | 100 | Y | 100 | $Y$ | 88 | Y | 79 | Y |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  | 12 | NA |  | 21 | NA | 78 | NA | 94 | NA |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | 100 | Y | 100 | Y | 83 | Y | 76 | Y |  |  | NA |  |  | NA | 33 | 17 | NA | 25 | 24 | NA | 85 | NA | 83 | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |


| 2006-2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Dade PINECREST ACADEMY (SOUTH CAMPUS) 0342 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of students enrolled in the grades tested: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Read: 189 <br> Math: 189 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2006-2007 } \\ & \text { School Grade }{ }^{1} \text { : } \end{aligned}$ |  | A |  | Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress? |  |  | YES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Click here to see Number of students in each group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and $\mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{2}}$ ). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b ${ }^{2}$ ). |  |  |  |  |  | This section shows the perc of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model. |  |  |  |
| Group | Reading Tested 95\% of the students? |  | Math Tested 95\% of the students? |  | 51\% scoring at or above grade level in Reading? |  | $56 \%$ scoring at or above grade level in Math? |  | Improved performance in Writing by $1 \%$ ? |  |  | Increased Graduation Rate ${ }^{3}$ by $1 \%$ ? |  |  | Percent of Students below grade level in Reading |  | Safe Harbor Reading | Percent of Students below grade level in Math |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Safe } \\ & \text { Harbor } \\ & \text { Math } \end{aligned}$ | \% of students on track to be proficient in reading | Growth model reading | \% of students on track to be proficient in math | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grov } \\ & \text { mod } \\ & \text { math } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 2007 | Y/N | 2007 | Y/N | 2007 | Y/N | 2007 | Y/N | 2006 | 2007 |  |  | Y/N | 2005 | 2006 | Y/N | 2006 | 2007 | Y/N | 2006 | 2007 | Y/N | 2007 | Y/N | 2007 | Y/N |
| TOTAL ${ }^{4}$ | 100 | Y | 100 | Y | 81 | Y | 78 | Y |  |  | Y |  |  | NA |  | 13 | NA |  | 22 | NA | 72 | NA | 73 | NA |
| WHITE |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| BLACK |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| HISPANIC | 100 | Y | 100 | Y | 82 | Y | 78 | Y |  |  | Y |  |  | NA |  | 11 | NA |  | 22 | NA | 73 | NA | 74 | NA |
| ASIAN |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| AMERICAN INDIAN |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | 100 | Y | 100 | Y | 67 | Y | 75 | Y |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  | 18 | NA |  | 25 | NA | 67 | NA | 76 | NA |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

| Dade School DistrictPI NECREST ACADEMY (SOUTH CAMPUS)2008-2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 83\% | 81\% | 98\% | 53\% | 315 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the \% scoring 3.5 and above on Writing and the $\%$ scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| \% of Students Making Learning Gains | 75\% | 75\% |  |  | 150 | 3 ways to make gains: <br> - Improve FCAT Levels <br> - Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br> - Improve more than one year within Level |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Adequate or 2 <br> Progress of <br> Lowest 25\% in <br> the School? | $68 \%$ (YES) | $80 \%$ (YES) |  |  |  | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest <br> $25 \%$ of students in reading and math. Yes, |
| if 50\% or more make gains in both reading |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and math. |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$

Dade School District
PI NECREST ACADEMY (SOUTH CAMPUS)
2007-2008

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Meeting High Standards ( FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 86\% | 80\% | 97\% | 57\% | 320 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the $\%$ scoring 3.5 and above on Writing and the \% scoring 3 and above on Science. <br> Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| \% of Students Making Learning Gains | 78\% | 75\% |  |  | 153 | 3 ways to make gains: <br> - Improve FCAT Levels <br> - Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br> - Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25\% in the School? | 81\% (YES) | 77\% (YES) |  |  | 158 | 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. |
| Points Earned |  |  |  |  | 631 |  |
| 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 <br> Dade School District PI NECREST ACADEMY (SOUTH CAMPUS)

2006-2007

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 85\% | 80\% | 85\% | 45\% | 295 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the \% scoring 3.5 and above on Writing and the \% scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| \% of Students Making Learning Gains | 75\% | 73\% |  |  | 148 | 3 ways to make gains: <br> - Improve FCAT Levels <br> - Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br> - Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25\% in the School? | 84\% (YES) | 80\% (YES) |  |  | 164 | 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. |
| Points Earned |  |  |  |  | 607 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent Tested } \\ & =100 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade |  |  |  |  | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and \% of students tested |


[^0]:    CHECK
    Assessment

    Describe the types of ongoing formative assessments to be used during the school year to measure student progress in core, supplemental, and intensive instruction/intervention.

[^1]:    The School Advisory Council has an important function for the success of Pinecrest Academy South Charter School. Listed below are some of the functions of our SAC.

    - Monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan
    - Provide a forum for discussion and determination of financial expenditures
    - Assist in targeting school needs

