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## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.

| School Grades Trend Data |
| :--- |
| Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/ Statewide Assessment Trend Data |
| High School Feedback Report |

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

## ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25\%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | \# of Years at Current School | \# of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25\% ), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Principal | David <br> Thompson | Bachelor of Science in Physical Education, Master of Education in Physical Education and Educational Leadership | 18 | 9 | During the 2011-2012 school year: Grade D, missed a C by 3 points. Reading Mastery 40\%, Math Mastery 31\%, Writing Mastery 64\%, Science mastery 24\%. During the 2010-2011 school year: Grade C, Reading Mastery 50\%, Math Mastery 41\%, Writing Mastery 71\%, Science mastery 24\%. <br> During the 09-10 school year: Grade C, Reading Mastery 50\%, Math Mastery 44\%, Science Mastery 31\%; During the 08-09 school year: Grade C, Reading mastery $54 \%$, Math Mastery 45\%, Science Mastery 29\%, <br> 07-08 Grade C, Reading Mastery 52\%, Math Mastery 49\%, Science Mastery 29\%, 06-07 Grade C Reading Mastery $50 \%$, Math Mastery $51 \%$, Science Mastery $25 \%$; 05-06 Grade of B, Reading Mastery 52\%, Math Mastery $42 \%$. <br> During all nine years of this administrator's tenure as assistant principal, more than $50 \%$ of the lower quartile has made |



## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest $25 \%$ ), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | \# of Years at Current School | \# of Years as an I nstructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25\% ), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Math | Tara Castleberry | Masters of Business Administration/Math 5-9 | 7 | 1 | During the 2011-2012 school year: Grade D, missed a C by 3 points. Reading Mastery 40\%, Math Mastery 31\%, Writing Mastery 64\%, Science mastery 24\%. During the 2010-2011 school year: Grade C, Reading Mastery 50\%, Math Mastery 41\%, Writing Mastery 71\%, Science mastery 24\%. <br> During the 09-10 school year: Grade C, Reading Mastery 50\%, Math Mastery 44\%, Science Mastery 31\%; During the 08-09 school year: Grade C, Reading mastery 54\%, Math Mastery 45\%, Science Mastery 29\%, <br> 07-08 Grade C, Reading Mastery 52\%, Math Mastery 49\%, Science Mastery 29\%, 06-07 Grade C Reading Mastery 50\%, Math Mastery 51\%, Science Mastery 25\%; 05-06 Grade of B, Reading Mastery 52\%, Math Mastery 42\%. |

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

|  | Description of Strategy | Person <br> Responsible | Projected <br> Completion <br> Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  | Not Applicable (If not, please <br> explain why) |  |
| 2 | Retention of high quality teachers is done through our <br> district's benefits package and different incentives offered by <br> community organizations. State-sponsored programs <br> supported by the district also include DROP and the School <br> Recognition Program. BMS has a strong support system for <br> beginning teachers under the auspices of the mentoring <br> program. |  |  |
| For more experienced teachers, the district encourages <br> National Board Certification. This certification offers public <br> recognition of the accomplishments of experienced teachers, <br> and additional salary. BMS currently has four teachers with <br> National certification: Dawn Gibbs, Buddy Hunt, Barbara <br> Jacobs, and Theresa Simmons. | Principal and <br> Assistant | On-going |  |
| Teachers at BMS are encouraged to take the Clinical <br> Educator workshop so that they will be able to supervise a <br> student teacher. |  |  |  |


| 3 | Katie Gibson was accepted into the leadership academy <br> sponsored jointly through the SREB and DOE. | SREB coach <br> and school level <br> administrators | Summer of <br> 2011 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% [35]).

| Number of <br> staff and <br> paraprofessional <br> that are <br> teaching out- <br> of-field/ and <br> who are not <br> highly <br> effective. | Provide the strategies <br> that are being <br> implemented to <br> support the staff in <br> becoming highly <br> effective |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | District provides <br> consulting teachers <br> through the START <br> program for all begining <br> teachers. District provides <br> study guides for the SAE <br> as needed. Bellviews out <br> of field teachers will also <br> be provided with a school <br> based mentor teacher. |
| Bellview has two teachers <br> teaching out of field. | ( |

## Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)).
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Total Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Instructional } \\ \text { Staff }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\ \text { First-Year } \\ \text { Teachers }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\ \text { Teachers } \\ \text { with 1-5 } \\ \text { Years of } \\ \text { Experience }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\ \text { Teachers } \\ \text { with 6-14 } \\ \text { Years of } \\ \text { Experience }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\ \text { Teachers } \\ \text { with 15+ } \\ \text { Years of } \\ \text { Experience }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\ \text { Teachers } \\ \text { with } \\ \text { Advanced } \\ \text { Degrees }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Highly } \\ \text { Effective } \\ \text { Teachers }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Reading } \\ \text { Endorsed } \\ \text { Teachers }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { National } \\ \text { Board } \\ \text { Certified } \\ \text { Teachers }\end{array} \\ \hline 83 & 12.0 \%(10) & 26.5 \%(22) & 36.1 \%(30) & 25.3 \%(21) & 48.2 \%(40) & 96.4 \%(80) & 24.1 \%(20) & 3.6 \%(3) \\ \hline \text { Endorsed } \\ \text { Teachers }\end{array}\right\}$

## Teacher Mentoring Program/ Plan

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anne Copenhaver | Tatum Tirado <br> Jessica <br> Russell <br> Ashley <br> Anderson <br> Teresa <br> Barham | Ms. <br> Copenhaver is an instructional teacher choosen by the district for the START program to provide instructional assistance in the classroom setting. | The mentor will visit the mentees' classroom frequently and provide observations. The school district also has the START program where master teachers will work with the beginning teachers exclusively instead of being in a classroom for three years. The mentor will suggest instructional strategies to be used in the classrooms based on teacher observations. |
| J errod Novotny | Frank Walker Edgar Burt | Mr. Novotny is an instructional teacher choosen by the district for the START program to provide instructional assistance in the classroom setting. | The mentor will visit the mentees' classroom frequently and provide observations. The school district also has the START program where master teachers will work with the beginning teachers exclusively instead of being in a classroom for three years. The mentor will suggest instructional strategies to be used in the classrooms based on teacher observations. |


| Mary Exum | Chantel Steed | Ms. Exum is an instructional teacher choosen by the district for the START program to provide instructional assistance in the classroom setting. | The mentor will visit the mentee's classroom frequently and provide observations. The school district also has the START program where master teachers will work with the beginning teachers exclusively instead of being in a classroom for three years. The mentor will suggest instructional strategies to be used in the classrooms based on teacher observations. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J anet Johnson | Stephen King Katie Brown | Ms. Johnson is an instructional teacher choosen by the district for the START program to provide instructional assistance in the classroom setting. | The mentor will visit the mentees' classroom frequently and provide observations. The school district also has the START program where master teachers will work with the beginning teachers exclusively instead of being in a classroom for three years. The mentor will suggest instructional strategies to be used in the classrooms based on teacher observations. |
| Tara Rush | Katie Brown | Ms. Rush is on the same grade level team as Ms. Brown and will be the school-based mentee for this teacher. | The mentor will provide the mentee with the necessary information to assist in such activities as are necessary for her integration into the climate of the school. Policies and procedures that are unique to this school environment will be communicated in writing and verbally. |
| Dawn Gibbs | George Herndon Cynthia Miller <br> Andrea Davis <br> Ashley <br> Sweger <br> Kelsey <br> Womack <br> Katherine <br> Stefansson <br> Allison Powell | Mrs. Gibbs has experience with most aspects of the educational environment at Bellview. Due to her flexible schedule in the library she is available to teachers most of the time and can assist in classrooms if necessary. | The mentor will provide support to the mentees during the transition period that occurs during any school change. Through verbal and written communication the mentor will help the mentee culturally acclimate to the Bellview environment. |

## 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
Students are provided an opportunity to participate in before and after school programs for remediation and enrichment for academics and health and physical education. Students also have the chance to get mentored through our volunteer program and any mentoring programs we can participate in through federal grants secured by outside organizations.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Information Exchange system and our local student data base, we have determined that there are 6 Migrant students at Bellview Middle School. We are providing the following services to these students.
Migrant services are provided by the districts Migrant advocate since we have so few migrant students at our school.

## Title I, Part D

Services to neglected and delinquent students are provided by various district-operated programs. These services are overseen by the Title I office.

Title II
Staff Development is offered at both the school and district level. Staff Development support is used to provide additional training to school personnel in many areas including the Continuous Improvement Model, School Leadership Team, differentiation, cooperative learning and data disaggregation and analysis.

## Title III

The district supported ESOL office provides specialists and teachers on special assignment to support schools that ESOL centers including Bellview Middle School. Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners. Teachers who have ELL students in their classrooms all have their ESOL endorsement as required by law. Bellview Middle School had 25 ESOL students receiving services in grades 6-8.

## Title X- Homeless

The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This program is overseen by the Title I office. Bellview Middle School had 35 families reporting homelessness during the last survey period but it is highly likely that this number is much higher because of the current economic situation.

## Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be used to provide support services for struggling students. These students will be identified by attendance, grades, previous retention, FCAT scores and teacher recommendation. These students will be able to access before or after school help in any content area to support classroom achievement.

## Violence Prevention Programs

There are a number of activities planned to continue to reduce violence at Bellview Middle School. All BMS students will participate in the 14 lessons provided by grade level through the Second Step program as a continuation of the program started in the 2010-2011 school year. Red Ribbon Week is held in October with school-wide activities and guest speakers. Bellview has also started the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) program to prevent violence.

## Nutrition Programs

Our school is committed to continue to offer nutritional choices in the cafeteria. This includes an ala carte service line along with choices of salads and varying entries in the service line. The school follows the districts nutrition program for summer feeding at select sites.

## Housing Programs

## Not applicable

Head Start
Not applicable

## Adult Education

## Not applicable

## Career and Technical Education

Three Career Academies continue to be available for 7th and 8th graders during the 2012-2013 school year. An Arts, Audio/Visual Technology and Communication academy, Agriscience and Health Science academy and a Pre-Engineering academy are continuing. These academies provide a specific course for students but the teacher will be working closely with academic teams to provide background knowledge and additional activities through all other coursework. The 6 th graders will take a survey course through their CTE class which will introduce them to the 16 career clusters offered thoughout the district.

## J ob Training

Not applicable

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

-School- based MTSS/ Rtl Team<br>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The BMS RtI team consists of the principal, assistant principal, behavior coach, both guidance counselors, math coach and inclusion teachers. The principal will facilitate and coordinate the decision making to assure the school is properly implementing and following through with providing the interventions in an effective manner. In addition, ongoing assessment will be conducted to determine student needs.

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

The school based Rtl team received district training and follow up during the 2010-2011 school year and they have shared this training with the faculty in a whole group setting. The team will continue to identify students who have not made ALG/remained a 1 /stayed in the lower quartile and demonstrated a significant need to get small group or individualized intensive instruction. These students will be pulled out of a Critical Thinking/Research class during either Sustained Silent Reading time or during CIM time for Algebraic Thinking concepts to receive specific instruction to remediate academic deficits.

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

The Rtl team has been instrumental in making plans to address the academic deficits of the lowest performing students and they recommended the specific times to meet these needs to minimize time out of class which can often make students fall farther behind.

## - MTSS I mplementation

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.

Baseline data will be derived from FAIR data and FCAT results from all previous administrations for Reading. Additional diagnostic data will be gathered with the DAR along with classroom information and summative assessments from the reading classes. Students who have not made ALG in Math and continue to test at an Achievement Level 1 will be given a diagnostic test to determine strengths and weaknesses which will be addressed by the inclusion teachers. Behavioral data will be available from the deans, guidance counselors and behavior coach.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

During the 2012-2013 school year, all staff will continue to get follow up training for strategies to implement effective Rtl in both whole group and small group settings. Follow up training will be provided to team leaders and subject area department chairs so that they can share with their colleagues.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

During the 2012-2013 school year Bellview has become a PBS school in order to improve behavior. This will help enable the MTSS/Rtl to effectively help students academically along with behaviorally.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

## School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

I dentify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

The Literacy Leadership Team is made up of the principal, media specialist, three reading teachers, and one each of the Math, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science teachers.

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
The Literacy team will meet twice per month during the 2012-2013 school year and they are responsible for increasing the use of literacy strategies in all content areas. In addition, they are responsible for planning and implementing parent/community night activities.

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

The major initiatives will be to continue to have all content area teachers use reading strategies and increase the reading of complex texts that are necessary to be successful in life. They will also work to develop opportunities for parents and community members to participate in activities that promote literacy at the school.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/15/2012)

## *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.

## Not applicable

*Grades 6-12 Only
Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.
For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

The Literacy Leadership team provides ongoing staff development to all content area teachers and the lesson plan format includes an area for teachers to document the reading strategy being utilized for lesson development. Administration also conducts CWT to ensure that all teachers are utilizing reading strategies on a daily basis. Teachers are also required to turn in weekly literacy strategies to administration that include samples of student work.

## *High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.
How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

Not applicable

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?

In the 6th grade, students will be introduced to all 16 career clusters to help generate interest in planning for the future. The three career academies will focus on careers and jobs in the areas of agriscience, engineering, Arts and communication.

## Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

```
Not applicable
```


## 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: of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in
reading.
Students continue to have difficulty demonstrating
Reading Goal \#1a: proficiency in the area of Reading on the FCAT.

2012 Current Level of Performance:
2013 Expected Level of Performance:
During the 2010-2011 school year, 50\% of the students demonstrated proficiency based on the Reading FCAT. During the 2011-2012 school year $40 \%$ of the students

During the 2012-2013 testing, at least 41\% of the students will demonstrate proficiency in reading based on the Reading demonstrated proficiency on the Reading FCAT 2.0

| 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 | Many students do not understand how to read non-fiction material and understand what has been read well enough to answer in- depth questions and apply the information that has been read. | Students will read nonfiction material in all content areas and learn skills to help them understand what is read and apply it to unique situations in anticipation of answering more rigorous, higher order questions. | Principal, Assistant Principal and reading department chairperson. | On- going monitoring of student comprehension in content coursework and on test and FAIR data. | Teacher made tests, publisher tests, FAIR test, FCAT simulation. |
| 2 | Many students do not read for pleasure on their own. | Institute a Sustained Silent Reading time at least every other day for 20 minutes at a time. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist | On- going monitoring of student reading comprehension in classwork and on test and FAIR data. | Teacher made tests, publisher tests, FAIR data, Media Center circulation data |
| 3 | Students do not often hear good reading skills or have access to a variety of materials | Require students to read 20 texts per year in addition to the content text books. These books will be available in content areas and be related to that content area. Some books will be read aloud by the teacher, e-books, or read by the students themselves. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist | On- going monitoring of student reading comprehension in classwork and on test and FAIR data. | Teacher made tests, publisher tests, FAIR data, Media Center circulation data |
| 4 | Students do not know how to research and analyze data from reading material | Require students to participate in History Fair. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist | On- going monitoring of student reading comprehension in classwork and on test and FAIR data. | Teacher made tests, publisher tests, FAIR data, Media Center circulation data |
| 5 | Lack of ability to learn how to read only through content area coursework | Students scoring below profiency will be placed in a daily double block of reading with highly qualified teachers | Principal, Assistant Principal | On- going monitoring of student reading comprehension in classwork and on test and FAIR data. | Teacher made tests, publisher tests, FAIR data. |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. <br> Reading Goal \# 1b: |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 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:
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement

| Level 4 in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#2a: |  |  | Continue to increase the percentage of students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 on the Reading FCAT compared to 2008-2009 when $11 \%$ (115) of the students scored a 4 or 5. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| During the 2009-2010 school year, 14.5\% (149) of students scored at a level 4 or 5 on the Reading FCAT. During the 2010-2011 school year, $13.5 \%$ (145) of students scored a level 4 or 5 on the reading FCAT. During the 2011-12 schoo year, $15.3 \%(160)$ of the students scored a level 4 or 5 on the reading FCAT 2.0. |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year, at least 16\% of students will score at levels 4 or 5 on the Reading FCAT. |  |  |
| 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 | Students trying to score at higher levels must use higher order strategies to read, analyze and synthesize the text presented to them. | Require students to practice strategies and develop skills needed to easily use higher order techniques to understand material read. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist | Informal observations and assessments of students, lesson plan development | FAIR data, FCAT data |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in <br> reading. <br> Reading Goal \#2b: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |
| Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |


| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 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:

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#3a: |  |  | The percentage of students making annual learning gains in the 2011-2012 school year was 61\%(541). This is an increase from previous years but more increases are expected and anticipated. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| During the 2010-2011 school year, 58\% of the students had ALG. During the 2012-13 school year 61\%(541) of the students made ALG. |  |  | During the 2012-2013 testing, at least 62\% of the students will make ALG on the reading FCAT 2.0 |  |  |
| 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 | Students do not often understand why it is important to read well or improve reading skills. | Increase project based learning opportunities for students so that they understand the relevance of reading in real- life, hands on situations. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist | On- going monitoring of student reading comprehension in classwork and on test and FAIR data. | Teacher made tests, publisher tests, FAIR data and media circulation data. |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Percentage of students making Learning Gains in <br> reading. <br> Reading Goal \#3b: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 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. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25\% making learning gains in reading.

Reading Goal \#4:

During the 2009-2010 school year, the percentage of lower quartile students making annual learning gains dropped to 61\% ( or 140 students) from the previous years $74 \%$..

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| During the 2009-2010 school year, 61\% of the students in the lower quartile made annual learning gains. During the 2010-2011 school year, $68 \%$ of the students in the lower quartile made ALG. During the 2011-2012 school year 68\% (152) of the students in the lower quartile made ALG. |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year, at least 69\% of the students who are in the lowest quartile will make annual learning gains. |  |  |
| 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 | The lowest quartile of students are often nonfluent readers that will not always benefit from a Sustained Silent Reading program. | Add additional fluency training for the lower quartile students and those students not ever demonstrating annual learning gains will be targeted for small group RtI. | Principal, Assistant Principal | FAIR data, fluency testing | FAIR, fluency data |
| 2 | The lowest quartile often consists of many special education students. | Inclusion classes and support will be available for the majority of the SWD. | Principal, Assistant Principal | FAIR data, fluency data, teacher made tests, publisher tests | FAIR |
| 3 | Those SWD that are unable to participate in the general education curriculum will receive reading instruction in a special education class. | Journeys reading materials will be used with these students daily and the content area teachers will work with the students on the same strategies and content areas. | Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, ESE <br> Department <br> Chairperson | FAIR data, Fluency data, publisher tests and online testing program with reading series | FAIR, Voyager on line program |


| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by $50 \%$. |  |  | ```Reading Goal # During the 6 year period from 2010-2011 to 2016- 2017 bellview will reduce the acchievement gap by 50% at 6% increase per year. 5A :``` |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |  |
|  | 40 | 48 | 53 | 58 | 63 |  |  |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5B: |  | There were no subgroups that met targeted AMO in reading |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Perfo |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| During the 201-2012 testing, meeting targeted AMO in Read | no subgroups | During the 2012-2013 school year 2 of 5 sub groups will meet targeted AMO progress in reading |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for | Process Used to Determine <br> Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool |


|  |  | Monitoring | Strategy |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Students have not had <br> access to a lot of non- <br> fiction material and have <br> not been asked to study <br> this information in depth | Increase non- fiction <br> holdings in media center <br> and in classroom libraries. <br> Require Sustained Silent <br> Reading Program <br> throughout school. | Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Media <br> Specialist | Informal reports from <br> teachers, lesson plans <br> and SSR reading logs | FAIR data |
| 2 | Students have not had <br> reasons to complete in <br> depth research and <br> analyze and synthesize <br> the information | Require research projects <br> in all content areas. | Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Media <br> Specialist | Informal reports from <br> teachers, student <br> research projects, and <br> parent feedback | FAIR data |
| 3 | Students are not capable <br> of answering questions <br> with the depth of <br> knowledge required. | Use Webb's DOK <br> strategies and <br> suggestions in all lesson <br> planning and instruction | Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Media <br> Specialist | CWT and lesson plans <br> indicating the DOK <br> strategy usage. Informal <br> reports from teachers, <br> SSR reading logs. | FAIR data and <br> FCAT data |

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. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5C: |  |  | English Language Learners did not make targeted AMO progress during the 2011-2012 school year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 6\% of ELL scored satisfactory on the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test. |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year 18\% of the ELL students will score satisfactory on the FCAT Reading test. |  |  |
| 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 | Many students are nonenglish or limited english speakers and are still in the early stages of reading development in English. | Place students in a "beginners" English Reading program. Students will focus on phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension of the English language. | ESOL Teachers | On going monitoring of student comprehension in Reading coursework and tests. | Teacher made tests, informal observations, publisher tests, FAIR, FCAT, and CELLA tests. |


| 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. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5D: |  | Students with disabilities did not make the targeted AMO of 20\% satisfactory |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Perfo |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| During the 2011-2012 school targeted AMO in Reading | of SWD made the | During the 2012-2013 school year 20\% of the SWD will make the targeted AMO for reading. |  |  |
| 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 | Students with Disabilities often do not experience exposure to the grade level curriculum expectations. | Provide extensive inclusion/ coteaching/support facilitation services to students with disabilities to assure students have maximum access to standard curriculum and expectations | Principal, Assistant Principal | On going formative assessment | FAIR data |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5E: |  |  | During the 2011-2012 school year 37\% of the economically disadvantaged students made the targeted AMO in reading. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| During the 2011-2012 school year 37\% of the economically disadvantaged students made the targeted AMO in reading. |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year, at least 40\% of the economically disadvantaged students will make the targeted AMO in reading. |  |  |
| 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 | Economically disadvantaged students do not always have access to quality reading materials. | Provide classroom libraries including fiction and non-fiction to encourage increased reading for leisure. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist, Literacy Coach | Informal teacher evaluation, student reading logs | FAIR data |

## 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 schoolwide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increase use of Webb's DOK strategies | Reading grades 6-8 and all content areas | Staff Development, SREB coach, school based teachers | All teachers | On going training | Teacher feedback, reading scores, FAIR data | Principal, Assistant Principal |
| I ncreasing rigorous coursework requirements | Reading grades 6-8 and all content areas | Principal, Literacy Team Chairperson | All Teachers | Monthly meetings with reading teachers and monthly strategy training with all teachers | Teacher self evaluations and student feedback | Principal, Media Specialist |
| Increase opportunities for students to participate in Project based learning | Reading grades 6-8 and all content areas | Staff Development, FDLRS or school based teachers with extensive experiences | All Teachers | On going training opportunities provided throughout the school year | Teacher self evaluations and student feedback | Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist |


| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Sustained Silent Reading | books for all classes | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$10,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Computers for research projects | Computers | Title I and school district technology funding | \$16,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$16,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Differentiated Instruction | District Staff Development | District Funding | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Provide on-going training during the school day | Substitute teachers for classroom coverage and extra pay for before school training | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| Provide opportunities for workshops and conference attendance | Registration, travel and substitute coverage of classrooms | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| Reverse field trips for family literacy events | Guest speakers and activities for community members | Title I Parental Involvement | \$2,500.00 |
| Subtotal: \$22,500.00 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total: \$48,500.00 |  |  |  |

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/ speaking.

CELLA Goal \#1:

During the 2012-2013 school year, at least 50\% of the students will demonstrate proficient on CELLA Listening/Speaking.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/ speaking:

In 2012, 50\% (11/22) of students were proficient in Listening/Speaking.

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 | There has been an influx of new arrivals (non- english and limited english speakers) at the beginning of the school year. | Place students in a "beginners" english program to develop basic English speaking skills | ESOL Teachers | On- going monitoring of student listening/speaking skills. | Teacher made tests, informal oral speaking observations, IPT test (for reevaluations, if needed, CELLA. |
|  | The time frame for proficient fluency in the | Place students in appropriate language | ESOL Teachers, Classroom | On- going monitoring of student | Teacher made tests, informal |


| 2 | English Language varies in length. BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) language acquisition is developed within 6 months- 2 years of student arrival. CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) which is needed for proficiency on CELLA takes approximately five to seven years after student arrival. | acquisition class based on their stage of english development. Initiate rigorous English conversation and vocabulary development based on need of students. Place students in general education classes for math, science, social studies, and other electives. | Teachers | \|listening/speaking skills. | oral speaking observations, IPT test (for reevaluations, if needed), CELLA. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non- ELL students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. <br> CELLA Goal \#2: |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year, at least 15\% of the students will demonstrate proficient on CELLA Listening/Speaking. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: |  |  |  |  |  |
| In 2012, 14\% (3/22) of students were proficient in Reading. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | Many students are nonenglish or limited english speakers and are still in the early stages of reading development in English. | Place students in a "beginners" English Reading program. Students will focus on phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension of the English Ianguage. | ESOL Teachers | On going monitoring of student comprehension in Reading coursework and tests. | Teacher made tests, informal observations, publisher tests, FAIR, FCAT, and CELLA tests. |
| 2 | Many students are not literate in their native languages which can hinder development in reading of the second language. | Place students in an English Reading program according to their current reading level. Strategies to "fill in the gap" of phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension of the English language will be taught. Rigorous development of academic vocabulary and exposure to content area themes will be used. | ESOL Teachers, Classroom Teachers | On going monitoring of student comprehension in Reading coursework and tests. | Teacher made tests, informal observations, publisher tests, FAIR, FCAT, and CELLA tests. |
| 3 | Many students do not read English books for fun due to difficulty with comprehension. | Independent Reading will be implemented every day in the ESOL Reading classroom where students may choose books of their interests and reading level. | ESOL Teachers | On going monitoring of student comprehension in Reading coursework and tests. | Teacher made tests, informal observations, publisher tests, FAIR, FCAT, and CELLA tests. |

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

| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal \#3: |  |  | In the 2012-2013 school year, $24 \%$ of students will score proficient on CELLA Writing. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: |  |  |  |  |  |
| In 2012, $23 \%$ (5/22) of students were proficient in writing. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | Many students are used to different writing styles from their home country. For example, students may be unfamiliar with paragraph writing or a simple task as writing from left to right. | Teach students the basic principles of writing in English. Instruction in grammar and conventions will be provided. | ESOL teachers | On going monitoring of student writing, daily writing activities. | Teacher made tests, publisher tests, FCAT/Escambia Writes, CELLA. |
| 2 | Many students lack the vocabulary to provide supporting details in their writing. | Vocabulary instruction will be provided. | ESOL teachers | On going monitoring of student writing, daily writing activities. | Teacher made tests, publisher tests, FCAT/Escambia Writes, CELLA. |
| 3 | Many students native language's grammar follows a different pattern than English. | Teach students grammar rules of English. | ESOL Teachers | On going monitoring of student writing, daily writing activities. | Teacher made tests, publisher tests, FCAT/Escambia Writes, CELLA. |

## CELLA Budget:

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

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.

During the 2011-2012 school year, the percentage of students testing proficient in Math dropped by 10\%
Mathematics Goal \#1a: compared to 2010-2011 data. This was on the FCAT 2.0

2012 Current Level of Performance:
2013 Expected Level of Performance:
During the 2010-2011 school year 41\% (431) of the students tested proficient in Mathematics. During the 2011-2012

During the 2012-2013 school, at least 32\% of the students school year 31\% (334) of the students tested proficient on should test proficient in Mathematics.
the math FCAT 2.0
Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#1b: | N/A |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |


| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement

| Level $\mathbf{4}$ in mathematics. |
| :--- |
| Mathematics Goal \#2a: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: |
| During the 2010-2011 school year, there were $8 \%$ (87) of the <br> students scoring a four or five. During the 2011-2012 school |

During the 2008-2009 school year, $9.4 \%$ (99) of students earned a 4 or 5 on the Math FCAT.

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

During the 2012-2013 school year, at least 12\% of the students will earn a 4 or 5 on the Math FCAT. year $10.7 \%$ (112)scored a level 4 or 5 on the math FCAT 2.0

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Preparing students for a <br> more rigorous curriculum | Increase the number of <br> students taking Algebra <br> in the 8th grade by <br> providing the students <br> with Algebra on an even <br> day and the <br> guidance/advisement <br> class on an odd day with <br> the Algebra teachers | Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Math <br> Coach | Math assessment, <br> informal observations and <br> student, parent and <br> teacher observations | FCAT data, Math <br> simulation data |
| 2 | Preparing students for <br> more rigorous math <br> standards | Increase numeracy skill <br> usage across all content <br> areas. Math club will be <br> developed for high <br> achieving math students. | Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Math <br> Coach | Math assessment, <br> informal observations and <br> student, parent and <br> teacher observations | FCAT data, Math <br> simulation data, <br> Math summative <br> assessments |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#2b: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| N/A |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease 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 |


| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#3a: |  |  | The percentage of students making annual learning in Math increased between 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. The percentage of ALG in Math decreased two percent between 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. ALG decreased again to 55\% during the 2011-2012 scool year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| During the 2009-2010 school year, 63\% (648) of the students made annual learning gains in Math. During the 2010-2011 school 61\% (640) of the students made ALG in Math. During the 2011-2012 school year 55\% (485) of the students made ALG on the Math FCAT 2.0. |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year, at least 56\% of the students will make annual learning gains in Math. |  |  |
| 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 | Students have not had enough opportunities to apply math concepts. | Math Coach was hired. Project based learning will be implemented more fully in classes to increase student's deeper understanding of math concepts. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach | Informal reports from students and teachers, informal observations | Math assessments, Simulation data and FCAT |
| 2 | Students need additional practice with basic concepts | Using numeracy strategies in all classes. Additional math basic skill lessons during student advisement period. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach | Assessments in advisement time, informal assessments and grades. | Math assessments, simulation data and FCAT |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Percentage of students making Learning Gains in <br> mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#3b: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25\% <br> making learning gains in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#4: | The percentage of students making annual learning gains in <br> the lower quartile increased between 2008-2009 and 2009- <br> 2010 but remained the same during the 2010-2011 school <br> year. The \% of ALG dropped 5\% during the 2011-2012 school <br> year |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Level of Performance: |

During the 2010-2011 school year, 67\% (172) of the lower quartile made annual learning gains. During the 2011-2012 school year $62 \%$ (143) of the lower quartile made ALG.

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |
| 1 | Students in the lower <br> quartile usually start the <br> year off behind everyone <br> else and are also heavily <br> represented by SWD. | Inclusion teachers will <br> provide additional help <br> and strategies for the <br> students in the regular <br> math classroom. | Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Math <br> Coach | Math assessment data, <br> informal reports from <br> teachers and students | Math simulation <br> data and FCAT <br> data |
| 2 | Students in the lower <br> quartile who have not <br> made consistent learning <br> gains in the past have <br> difficulty with the next <br> grade concepts | Place these students <br> with a Math or Science <br> teacher during <br> Guidance/Advisement <br> class to provide <br> additional help and <br> instruction | Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Math <br> Coach | Math assessment data, <br> informal reports from <br> teachers and students | Math simulation <br> data and FCAT <br> data |


| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by $50 \%$. |  |  | Middle School Mathematics Goal \#$\quad$In six years Bellview will reduce the achievement gap by <br> $50 \%$ raising math proficiency to $64 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |  |
|  | 31 | 39 | 45 | 51 | 57 |  |  |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#5B: |  |  | During the 2011-2012 school year African American and Hispanic did not meet the targeted AMO in math |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| During the 2011-2012 school year 21\% of American Indian, $57 \%$ of Asian, $44 \%$ of white, $35 \%$ of Hispanic and $17 \%$ of black students scored satisfactory on AMO targeted score. |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year all ethnicities will meet targeted AMO performance levels. |  |  |
| 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 | Students struggle with higher order questions in math testing situations | Increase the usage of higher order questioning in classes | Principal, Assistant Principal | Lesson plans, informal observations, walkthroughs | Math assessments, simulation data, FCAT |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

| Mathematics Goal \#5C: |  |  | scored 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| During the 2011-2012 school year 22\% of ELL students scored 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0. |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year 24\% of ELL students will score 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0. |  |  |
| 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 | ELL students could have difficulty comprehending the reading material found on the FCAT 2.0 Math test. | Students will have the opportunity during the year and also on the test to use extended time to take the test and the use of a dictionary in their native language to help them perform well on the test. | ESOL teachers | Formative assessments during the school year. | Math FCAT 2.0 and Algebra EOC scores. |

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. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#5D: |  |  | During the 2011-2012 school year 32\% of SWD students performed within the proficiency levels on the FCAT 2.0 in Math. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| During the 2011-2012 school year 32\% of SWD students performed within the proficiency levels on the FCAT 2.0 in Math. |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year, at least 37\% of SWD will score within the proficiency levels on the FCAT 2.0 in Math. |  |  |
| 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 | SWD are not always able to access the regular math curriculum. | Provide inclusion teachers and differentiated instruction training so that SWD have access to the general education curriculum | Principal, Assistant Principal | Math assessments, informal reporting from, parents, teachers, and students | Math assessments, Simulation data and FCAT data |
| 2 | SWD who are significantly behind their same grade peers and need to obtain math curriculum in a special education classroom are often extremely behind in ability to meet criteria | Provide specific curriculum designed to be individualized and accelerated. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Accelerated Math data | Accelerated Math, Simulation data and FCAT data |

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

## 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal \#5E:

During the 2011-2012 school year 29\% of the economically disadvantaged students scored proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Math.

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| During the 2011-2012 school year 29\% of the economically disadvantaged students scored proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Math. |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year, at least 30\% of the economically disadvantaged students will score proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Math. |  |  |
| 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 | Economically disadvantaged students have not had access to, nor experience with higher level Math and consequently do not see why something applies to them. | Maintain three career academies focusing on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics to enhance students' ability to see a need for advanced Math. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Informal observations, assessments in coursework | Simulation data, Math assessments, FCAT data |

## Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.

Algebra Goal \#1:

During the 2011-2012 school year the number of students taking Algebra increased by 60\% to 84 students.

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

During the 2012-2013 school year at least 85\% of the students Will score a level 3 or higher on the Algebra I EOC.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Students have not had <br> enough practice applying <br> math concepts to real life <br> activities | Project based learning <br> activities increased in the <br> Algebra classes. | Math Coach and <br> Administration | Formative Assessments | EOC results |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4
and 5 in Algebra.
Algebra Goal \#2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

During the 2011-2012 school year 27\% (21) of the students taking the Algebral EOC scored a level 4 or higher

During the 2011-2012 school year the number of students taking Algebra increased by $60 \%$ to 84 students.

## 2013 Expected Level of Performance:

During the 2012-2013 school year at least 28\% of the studnets taking the Algebra I EOC will score a level 4 or 5.

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Preparing students for <br> more rigorous math <br> standards | Increase numeracy skill <br> usage across all content <br> areas. Math club will be <br> developed for high <br> achieving math students. | Principal, Assistant <br> Principal, Math <br> Coach | Formative Assessments, <br> math club participation | Algebra EOC <br> results |


| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO- 2, Reading and Math Performance Target |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual <br> Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year <br> school will reduce their achievement gap <br> by 50\%. | Algebra Goal \# |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline data <br> 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | $2015-2016$ | 2016-2017 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


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


| 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: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#3C: | N/A |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |


|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

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:

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making <br> satisfactory progress in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#3D: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |
| N/A | N/A |  |


| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#3E: |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | urrent Level of Perfo |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| N/A |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

[^0]| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#1: |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 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:


Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target


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:

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N/A | N/A |  |  |  |  |
| Problem- Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| I | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |


| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#3C: |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 201 | Current Level of Perf | mance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
|  |  |  | 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 |


| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#3D: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |



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

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

| PD <br> Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increase numeracy across the curriculum | 6-8 all content areas | Numeracy Committee, Math Coach | all content area teachers | Teacher Plan/Learn Days, Monthly Dept. meetings | PLC discussions | Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach |
| Increase data collection and instructional planning with differentiation for students | Math classes $6-8$ | Principal, assistant Principal, Math Coach | All Math teachers | All year | CWT and data notebook collection, student test data | Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Accelerated Math or other similar <br> resources for Rtl for lower quartile | texts, workbooks, manipulatives | Title I | $\$ 5,000.00$ |
|  |  |  | Subtotal: $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 0 0 0 . 0 0}$ |
| Technology | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Strategy | Title I | $\$ 1,000.00$ |  |
| Use of Echo Pens to allow Math <br> teachers to explain a lesson and <br> share with other content teachers | Echo Pens and Training |  |  |


| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increasing Numeracy across the content areas | Professional development opportunities | Title I and Title II funds for substitute teachers | \$3,000.00 |
|  |  | Subtotal: \$3,000.00 |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total: \$9,000.00 |  |  |  |

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. <br> Science Goal \#1a: |  |  | The number of student attaining proficiency on the Science FCAT continued to increase in small increments before the 2010-2011 school year when the proficiency rate stayed the same as the previous year. During the 2011-2012 school year the proficiency level dropped to 24\% |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| During the 2009-2010 school year, 31\% (92) of students demonstrated proficiency on the Science FCAT. During the 2010-2011 school year, 31\% of the students demonstrated proficiency on the Science FCAT. During the 2011-2012 school year $24 \%$ (76) of the students scored proficient on the science FCAT 2.0 |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year, at least 25\% of the students will demonstrate proficiency on the Science FCAT. |  |  |
| 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 | Students have very little background knowledge concerning Science concepts | Increase the number of hands on activities involving students to demonstrate advanced Science concepts | Principal, Assistant Principal, science department chairperson | Science assessments, Teacher, Student, Parent observation | Science FCAT and Science summative assessments |
| 2 | Students frequently do not understand the reasoning behind learning Science concepts | Maintain three career academies to increase student understanding of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Concepts | Principal and Assistant Principal | Science assessments, teacher, student, parent informal observations | Science FCAT and Science summative assessments |
| 3 | Students are not interested in Science | Provide additional Science Technology Engineering and Math opportunities. Provide opportunities for science labs and field trips. | Principal and Assistant Principal, science department chairperson. | Science assessments, teacher, student, parent observations and informal surveys | Science FCAT |

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

## 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.

| Science Goal \#1b: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.

Science Goal \#2a:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |
| :--- |
| During the 2009-2010 school year, 6\% (17) of the <br> students earned a level 4 or 5 on the Science FCAT. <br> During the 2010-2011 school, 5\% (17) of the students <br> earned a level 4 or 5 on the Science FCAT. | earned a level 4 or 5 on the Science FCAT.

During the 2008-2009 school year, the percentage of students scoring at achievement levels 4 or 5 was 1\% (4) and this increased during the 2009-2010 school year.

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

During the 2011-2012 school year, at least 7\% of the students will earn a 4 or 5 on the Science FCAT.

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. <br> Science Goal \#2b: |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| N/A |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease 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 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## 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 <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring |
| Infusing <br> content <br> through <br> career <br> academies | 6-8 all content <br> Reas <br> Monitoring |  |  |  |  |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Professional Learning Communities | Substitutes for planning during the regular school day | Title I | \$1,500.00 |
| Subtotal: \$1,500.00 |  |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Research for Science Fair | Netbooks | Title I | \$15,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$15,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Science Labs | Consumable supplies | District Science funding and Titlel | \$3,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$3,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total: \$19,500.00 |  |  |  |

End of Science Goals

## Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level During the 2009-2010 school year, the percentage of 3.0 and higher in writing. students scoring at proficient levels on the FCAT Writes test based on Level 3.0 and higher increased. During the
Writing Goal \#1a: 2010-2011 school year this percentage increase too based on a score of 3.0 or higher.

2012 Current Level of Performance:
2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| During the 2009-2010 school year, there were 94\% of the students scoring at 3.0 or higher and this level increased by at least one percent during the 2010-2011 school year. During the 2011-2012 school year 64\% of the students scored 3.5 or higher on the FCAT Writes test. |  |  | During the 2012 the students w the FCAT Write | 2-2013 school year, at will score at or above the es test based on a scor | east 1\% more of proficient level on of 3.5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students continue to demonstrate difficulty with adding supporting details to writing. | Professional development designed to increase the use of literacy strategies across all content areas | Principal, <br> Assistant <br> Principal, Media <br> Specialist | Informal observations, teacher reports, student work samples | FCAT Writes and ongoing writing samples |
| 2 | Students have difficulty summarizing and using their own words in written work. | Utilize technology designed to eliminate cut and paste strategies so that students must use their own summarizations | Principal, <br> Assistant, <br> Principal, Media <br> Specialist, <br> Technology <br> Coordinator | Informal observations, teacher reports, student work samples | FCAT Writes, History Fair and Science Fair student samples |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring <br> at 4 or higher in writing. <br> Writing Goal \# 1b: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible <br> for Monitoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Increasing <br> literacy <br> strategies <br> across the <br> curriculum | Grades 6-8 | Media <br> Specialist,SREB <br> Coach, | School wide <br> activities | Monthly subject <br> area meetings, <br> faculty meetings, <br> Teacher <br> Plan/Learn days, <br> team meetings | Teachers document <br> writing strategies on <br> lesson plans and in <br> team planning <br> minutes | Principal and <br> Assistant <br> Principal |



## Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

| * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)). |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. <br> Civics Goal \#1: |  |  | This Civics EOC goal is not required until 2014-15. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| N/A |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease 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. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.

| Civics Goal \#2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategies <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| for teaching <br> Common <br> Core Civics <br> Standards | Grade 7 | Social <br> Studies <br> Curriculum <br> Specialist | 7th Grade Social <br> Studies Teachers | Teacher Plan Days <br> Summer Institute | 2014-15 EOC <br> scores | Social Studies <br> Dept. Chair <br> District Social <br> Studies <br> Ctunsultant |
| Assistant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Principal |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Civics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$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 <br> Attendance Goal \#1: |  |  | Ferry Pass Middle School in 2012 will maintain or increase by . $1 \%$ the average daily attendance rate. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: |  |  | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |  |  |
| 2011-2012 Attendance Rate 93.7 |  |  | The expected attendance rate for 2012-2013 is 93.8 |  |  |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |  |  |
| 2011-2012 395 students with excessive absences |  |  | 390 expected number of students with excessive absences |  |  |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |  |  |
| 2011-2012 111 students with excessive Tardies |  |  | 110 expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students frequently quit coming to school in middle school because of the late start time. | All homeroom teachers will call the parents of absent students as quickly as possible to alert them to the absence. | Principal, Assistant Principal and guidance counselors. | Average Daily Attendance rates will be pulled monthly to monitor this and random parent phone calls will be made from the front office. | Student Information System |
| 2 | Students do not see a need to attend school on a regular basis | Positive reinforcement will take place monthly to recognize and reward the students that have attended school | Principal | Student Information System records will be pulled periodically | Student Information System |

## 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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> (chedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Book studies <br> about <br> poverty and <br> improving <br> school <br> attitude | Grade 6-8 | Varied | All teachers | Teacher <br> presentations during | Year long, one <br> morning a month <br> faculty meetings and <br> at end of each <br> semester |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Assistant <br> Principal |  |  |  |  |  |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  | Available <br> Amount |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | N |

## Suspension Goal(s)

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference of improvement: | to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. Suspension <br> Suspension Goal \#1: | Our goal is to decrease the number of out of school suspensions by $1 \%$. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| During the 2011-2012 school year, there were 770 total incidents of in school suspension with a total school population of approximately 1050 during most of the school year. | During the 2012-2013, there will be no more than 750 incidents of In School Suspension. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended InSchool |
| There were 356 students suspended in school during the 2011-2012 school year. | There will be no more than 350 students suspended in school during the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out- of-School Suspensions |
| There were 524 incidents of out of school suspension during the 2011-2012 school year. | There will be no more than 500 incidents of out of school suspension during the 2012-2013 school year. |


|  | Total Number of Stude ol | nts Suspended Out- of | 2013 Expected of-School | d Number of Student | uspended Out- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | were 261 students susp 011-2012 school. | ended out of school duri | ing There will be no of school during | o more than 250 stude g the 2012-2013 schoo | ts suspended out year. |
|  | Prob | blem-Solving Process | to I ncrease Stude | t Achievement |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students often do not think about their actions before they respond to their peers | Continue teaching Second Step Violence Prevention curriculum to students. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselors, Administrative Deans | Monthly statistics looking at suspension rates | Student information system |
| 2 | Students do not have parental support to help them avoid aggressive situations | Provide support at school through guidance/advisement class where students have a mentor/close contact available to solve problems before they escalate | Principal, Assistant Principal | Monthly statistic looking at suspension rates | Student Information system |
| 3 | Students are not always recognized for appropriate behavior | Implement Positive Behavior Program with quarterly activities provided for those students that have not had discipline problems during that quarter | School wide Behavior Management Team | Monthly statistics looking at suspension rates | Student Information System |

## 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 <br> Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/ or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or schoolwide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Book studies <br> and Fred <br> Jones <br> Learning <br> Communities | Grades 6-8 | Behavior Management Team | School-wide | Teachers will meet monthly to participate in book studies. | Monitoring monthly referral and suspension data | Schoolwide Behavior Management Team |
| Positive <br> Behaior | Grades 6-8 | PBS Committee | School-wide | Teachers will meet monthly | Monitoring monthly referral count and suspension data | PBS Committee |

## Suspension Budget:

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

$\left.$| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | | Available |
| ---: |
| Amount | \right\rvert\, | $\$ 0.00$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| No Data | No Data |


| Technology |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | total: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Positive Behavior | Professional Learning Community | Title I | \$1,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| In School Suspension | Hire an In School Suspension Teacher to work with students so that they do not have out of school suspension | Title 1 | \$60,000.00 |
| In Lieu of Expulsion class | Hire an In Lieu of Expulsion class teacher to show students that they need to behave within the regular classroom | Title I | \$60,000.00 |
| Guidance Counselor | Hire a guidance counselor to assist with RtI behavioral difficulties and to provide counseling services | Title 1 | \$60,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$180,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total: \$181,000.00 |  |  |  |

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

## 1. Parent I nvolvement

Parent I nvolvement Goal \#1:
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.

## 2012 Current Level of Parent I nvolvement:

2013 Expected Level of Parent I nvolvement:
During the 2009-2010 school year, 55\% of the students were represented by a parent or guardian at two or more events including report card days, concerts, award ceremonies, orientation and open house activities and sporting events. During the 2010-2011 school year there were $57 \%$ of the students with a parent or guardian attending two or more activities. During the 2011-2012 school year, at least $58 \%$ of the students will have a parent or guardian attend two or more activities at school.

Parental involvement at Bellview Middle School has been increasing over the past five years.

| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |  |
| 1 | One difficulty that BMS <br> families have is reliable <br> transportation to <br> attend school events | Provide a free cab for <br> families to attend <br> conferences and events <br> at school | Principal, <br> Assistant Principal | Sign in sheets at <br> functions | Sign in shets |  |

## 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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade | PD <br> Level/ Subject <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Book studies <br> about <br> understanding <br> poverty and <br> the under <br> resourced <br> learner | $6-8$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Parent I nvolvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Increase parental involvement in reading, math, writing and science activities | Reverse Field Trips | Title I | \$4,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$4,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Increase teacher awareness of parent perceptions of schools | Book Studies | Title I | \$2,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$2,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Increase parent involvement | Taxi Service | Title I | \$1,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total: \$7,000.00 |  |  |  |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

Increase the involvement of the Technology class with instructional teams in order to increase the effectiveness of the STEM academy.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Teams working with <br> STEM classes, <br> incorporating like <br> themes/projects. | Consult District <br> personnel on strategies <br> to increase <br> effectiveness of STEM <br> academies. | Principal, <br> Assistant Principal <br> and District <br> personnel | Review lesson plans of <br> Teams to show <br> collaboration of <br> concepts and ideas | Lesson plans |

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.

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { PD } \\ \text { Content / Topic } \\ \text { and/ or PLC } \\ \text { Focus }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Grade } \\ \text { Level/ Subject }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { PD } \\ \text { Facilitator } \\ \text { and/ or PLC } \\ \text { Leader }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { PD Participants } \\ \text { (e.g., PLC, } \\ \text { subject, grade } \\ \text { level, or school- } \\ \text { wide) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Target Dates (e.g., } \\ \text { early release) and } \\ \text { Schedules (e.g., } \\ \text { frequency of } \\ \text { meetings) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Strategy for } \\ \text { Follow- } \\ \text { up/ Monitoring }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Teams } \\ \text { Collaborate } \\ \text { with STEM } \\ \text { instructor in } \\ \text { order to } \\ \text { Work on } \\ \text { common } \\ \text { topics and } \\ \text { themes. }\end{array}$ | $6-8$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Person or } \\ \text { Position }\end{array}$ |  |
| Monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |$\}$

## STEM Budget:

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. CTE <br> CTE Goal \#1: |  |  | During the 2012-2013 school year 85\% of students enrolled in Introduction to Information Technology will pass the Microsoft Office certification exam. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Having enough students to fill 14 classes of 8th graders. | Enroll level 2, 3, 4 or 5 8th grade reading students into the IIT class with certified IIT instructors. | Principal | Total class enrollment data | TERMS |

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 <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| Microsoft <br> Office <br> Classes | 8th grade | Michelle <br> Taylor | Introduction to <br> Information <br> Technology <br> Teachers | 1st Semester | Completed <br> courses | Principal |

## CTE Budget:



## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Sustained Silent Reading | books for all classes | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| CELLA | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | Accelerated Math or other similar resources for RtI for lower quartile | texts, workbooks, manipulatives | Title I | \$5,000.00 |
| Science | Professional Learning Communities | Substitutes for planning during the regular school day | Title I | \$1,500.00 |
| Writing | Marzano's High Yield Strategies | Staff development for all teachers to increase the use of summarizing and note taking. | Title I | \$2,000.00 |
| Civics | n/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Increase parental involvement in reading, math, writing and science activities | Reverse Field Trips | Title I | \$4,000.00 |
| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$22,500.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |  |  |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Computers for research projects | Computers | Title I and school district technology funding | \$16,000.00 |
| CELLA | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | Use of Echo Pens to allow Math teachers to explain a lesson and share with other content teachers | Echo Pens and Training | Title I | \$1,000.00 |
| Science | Research for Science Fair | Netbooks | Title I | \$15,000.00 |
| Writing | Summarizing and note taking | I pod touches and netbooks to better facilitate the research and summarizing of students instead of "cut and paste" strategies. | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| Civics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | btotal: \$42,000.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |  |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Differentiated Instruction | District Staff Development | District Funding | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | Increasing Numeracy across the content areas | Professional development opportunities | Title I and Title II funds for substitute teachers | \$3,000.00 |
| Science | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |


| Civics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attendance | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | Positive Behavior | Professional Learning Community | Title I | \$1,000.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Increase teacher awareness of parent perceptions of schools | Book Studies | Title I | \$2,000.00 |
| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal: \$6,000.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |  |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Provide on-going training during the school day | Substitute teachers for classroom coverage and extra pay for before school training | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| Reading | Provide opportunities for workshops and conference attendance | Registration, travel and substitute coverage of classrooms | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| Reading | Reverse field trips for family literacy events | Guest speakers and activities for community members | Title I Parental Involvement | \$2,500.00 |
| CELLA | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Science | Science Labs | Consumable supplies | District Science funding and Titlel | \$3,000.00 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Civics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | In School Suspension | Hire an In School Suspension Teacher to work with students so that they do not have out of school suspension | Title 1 | \$60,000.00 |
| Suspension | In Lieu of Expulsion class | Hire an In Lieu of Expulsion class teacher to show students that they need to behave within the regular classroom | Title I | \$60,000.00 |
| Suspension | Guidance Counselor | Hire a guidance counselor to assist with RtI behavioral difficulties and to provide counseling services | Title 1 | \$60,000.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Increase parent involvement | Taxi Service | Title I | \$1,000.00 |
| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$206,500.00 |  |  |  |  |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance
jn Priority
j Focus
jn Prevent
jn NA

Are you a reward school: j Yes j No

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

## School Advisory Council

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

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
| :--- | :--- |
| At this time, no SAC funds are available for the 2012-13 school year | $\$ 0.00$ |

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

Provide input into school budget. The SAC supports the requirement of school uniforms. Also the SAC has input and approval of the SIP.

## AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-201
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010
SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

| Escambia School District BELLVIEW MI DDLE SCHOOL2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 50\% | 41\% | 71\% | 31\% | 193 | 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\% | 61\% |  |  | 119 | 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? | 68\% (YES) | 67\% (YES) |  |  | 135 | 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 |  |  |  |  | 447 |  |
| Percent Tested $=99 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and \% of students tested |

Escambia School District
BELLVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 50\% | 44\% | 82\% | 31\% | 207 | 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 | 54\% | 63\% |  |  | 117 | 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? | 61\% (YES) | 67\% (YES) |  |  | 128 | 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 |  |  |  |  | 452 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent Tested = } \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and \% of students tested |


[^0]:    * 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:

