FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SOUTH MIAMI MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Juan Carlos Boue

SAC Chair: Claire Greenberg

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: November 21, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/13/2012



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner Florida Department of Education 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor K-12 Public Schools Florida Department of Education 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Principal | Juan Carlos Boue | ESOL, Occupational Specialist, Art, Educational Leadership, Technology Education | 1 | 8 | 12 11 10 09 08 School Grade A A B B C High Standards Rdg. 77 53 47 49 44 High Standards Math 78 77 79 75 72 Learning Gains Rdg. 75 60 53 51 53 Learning Gains Math 80 75 77 75 75 Lowest 25% Reading 68 61 45 56 55 Lowest 25% Math 70 64 64 71 75 AMO Reading/Black 42 AMO Reading/Asian 94 AMO Reading/LL 31 AMO Math/Black 46 AMO Math/Black 38 |
| Assis Principal | Luz Navarro | MG English, MG Math, Educational Leadership | 1 | 18 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A C B C High Standards Rdg. 77 46 49 45 45 High Standards Math 78 79 78 75 74 Learning Gains Rdg. 75 52 55 51 56 Learning Gains Math 80 77 78 80 75 Lowest 25% Reading 68 55 55 49 55 Lowest 25% Math 70 71 68 67 79 AMO Reading/Black 42 AMO Reading/Asian 94 AMO Reading/ELL 31 |

| | | | | | AMO Math/Black 46 AMO Math/Black 38 |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Assis Principal | Iliana Artime | Elementary Education, English, ESOL, Primary Education, Educational Leadership | 1 | 5 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A C C C C High Standards Rdg. 77 53 50 53 50 High Standards Math 78 59 63 62 63 Learning Gains Math 80 51 63 60 73 Lowest 25% Reading 68 59 54 49 60 Lowest 25% Math 70 61 81 61 79 AMO Reading/Black 42 AMO Reading/Asian 94 AMO Reading/LL 31 AMO Math/Black 46 AMO Math/Black 38 |
| Assis Principal | Ingrid Perez- Sanz | Elementary Education, English, ESOL, Primary Education, Educational Leadership | 1 | 1 | '12 '11 School Grade A A High Standards Rdg. 77 83 High Standards Math 78 83 Learning Gains Rdg. 75 72 Learning Gains Math 80 76 Lowest 25% Reading 68 71 AMO Reading/Black 42 AMO Reading/Asian 94 AMO Reading/ELL 31 AMO Math/Black 46 AMO Math/Black 38 |
| Assis Principal | Katyna D. Lopez-Martin | Varying Exceptionalities, ESOL, Educational Leadership | 8 | 8 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A High Standards Rdg. 77 83 84 80 79 High Standards Math 78 83 84 80 79 Learning Gains Rdg. 75 71 72 70 67 Learning Gains Math 80 76 81 76 78 Lowest 25% Reading 68 71 71 72 68 Lowest 25% Math 70 69 71 69 67 AMO Reading/Black 42 AMO Reading/ELL 31 AMO Math/Black 46 AMO Math/Black 38 |

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

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| No data submitted | | | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out- of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| 2 Teachers are listed on the Non-Highly Effective report and no teacher received less than an effective rating. | Teachers have successfully completed the corresponding subject area examinations and certification is in progress. |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | Board | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
| 50 | 2.0%(1) | 12.0%(6) | 46.0%(23) | 40.0%(20) | 48.0%(24) | 100.0%(50) | 10.0%(5) | 6.0%(3) | 8.0%(4) |

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee | Rationale | Planned Mentoring |
|-------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------|
| | Assigned | for Pairing | Activities |
| No data submitted | | | |

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

| Title I, Part A |
|--------------------------|
| N/A |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant |
| N/A |
| Title I, Part D |
| N/A |
| Title II |
| N/A |
| Title III |
| N/A |
| Title X- Homeless |
| |

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

 N/A

 Job Training

 N/A

 Other

 N/A

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

School-based MTSS/Rtl Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

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

Assistant Principals: Provide guidance on the literacy plan; facilitate and support data collection activities; assist in data analysis; and provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning. Develop, implement, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring; and coordinate the school-wide literacy plan.

General Education Department Chairpersons: Provide information about core instruction, participation in student data collection and collaborate with other staff to implement best practices and interventions for low performing students. Exceptional Student Education Chairperson: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials and collaborates with general education teachers through inclusion classes and child study teams. Student Services Personnel: Provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success

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 South Miami Middle School Curriculum Council (SCC) is an extension of the MTSS/RTI and serves as a forum for input from teachers, support staff, and administrators on the operations of the school. The SCC provides structure for effective shared decision-making at the school level. The fundamental purpose of the council is to determine the school's educational program

through the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Through the SIP, the council will develop the educational plan for our school and identify the goals, priorities and strategies to help implement that plan. The SCC will meet on a monthly basis and will discuss areas such as curriculum, instructional programs, technology, professional development, pupil support services and parent involvement. The SIP is continually reviewed and modified to ensure that our students have programming and resources in place to help them achieve to their greatest potential. The MTSS/RTI Leadership Team will:

• Meet on a monthly basis to plan, coordinate, monitor, and ensure the implementation of the School Improvement Plan and all instructional activities.

• Gather information at the meetings which include data trends, interim results, behavior and social issues, and school processes to support and assist with specific instruction and intervention as well as to determine if professional development for faculty is needed.

• Information will be shared with all staff members and correction and/or continuation strategies will be implemented to ensure the needs of all subgroups are being met. The team will update staff on procedures and progress.

• Be responsible for disseminating information to their respective constituents and ensuring that all recommendations are being implemented.

• Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.

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 SMMCS Curriculum Council serves as an advisory group on curriculum matters for the school. It provides a forum within the school to study, analyze, discuss, and ultimately recommend the possibilities and/or alternatives for curriculum matters and concerns. The Council acts as the school's main vehicle in reviewing and reconsidering additions, deletions, and changes to the school's SIP. The SMMCS Curriculum Council met with the School Advisory Council (EESAC) to help develop the SIP. The team provides data on academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed, helps set clear expectations for instruction, facilitates the development of a systemic approach to teaching and aligned processes and procedures.

• The Rtl Leadership Team will assist in planning, monitoring, and adjusting the development and implementation of the school improvement plan through data gathering, data analysis, and identifying barriers for instruction and learning.

• The RtI Problem-solving process will be used by utilizing multiple data sources to determine the causes of problems, and to establish achievable goals which include support for implementation of programs and strategies included in the school improvement plan with fidelity.

• The RtI Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention, and will evaluate the success of interventions based on multiple data sources.

-MTSS Implementation-

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

The SMMCS Curriculum Council serves as an advisory group on curriculum matters for the school. It provides a forum within the school to study, analyze, discuss, and ultimately recommend the possibilities and/or alternatives for curriculum matters and concerns. The Council acts as the school's main vehicle in reviewing and reconsidering additions, deletions, and changes to the school's SIP. The SMMCS Curriculum Council met with the School Advisory Council (EESAC) to help develop the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The team provides data on academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed, helps set clear expectations for instruction, facilitates the development of a systemic approach to teaching and aligned processes and procedures. The LLT Leadership Team will assist in planning, monitoring, and adjusting the development and implementation of the school improvement plan through data gathering, data analysis, and identifying barriers for instruction and learning.

• The LLT Problem-solving process will be used by utilizing multiple data sources to determine the causes of problems, and to establish achievable goals which include support for implementation of programs and strategies included in the school improvement plan with fidelity.

• The LLT Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention, and will evaluate the success of interventions based on multiple data sources.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The delivery of staff development will take place in the form of workshops, conferences, and presentations. Teachers also have the option of taking courses through the Teacher Education Center. Professional development will be provided during teachers' early release days, and weekly departmental meetings. Teachers will be provided with an in-house professional

development session on the MTSS/RTI principles and procedures. The LLT Team will also evaluate and identify additional staff PD needs during Leadership meetings throughout the year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/RTI will be supported by implementing the critical components of a multi-tiered system of supports, integrating the problem-solving process across all tiers, and executing evidence-based instruction and interventions matched to specific student needs. The Leadership Team will provide professional development to align and integrate multiple initiatives, and streamline procedures associated with supporting the use of a data-based problem-solving procedures with fidelity.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

-School-Based Literacy Leadership Team-

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

The LLT will be based on a cross-section of the faculty and administrative team reflecting highly qualified professionals interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum. The LLT will be comprised of the following members:

Juan Carlos Boué, Principal Iliana Artime, Assistant Principal Luz Navarro, Assistant Principal Ingrid Perez-Sanz, Assistant Principal Katyna D. Lopez-Martin, Assistant Principal Sandy Baron, Department Chair Magnet Daysi Budino, Department Chair LA Claire Greenberg, Social Studies Department Chair Nicolette Hardy, Department Chair Math Nattacha Lezcano, Student Services Sofia Padilla, Gifted Department Chair Tina Marshall, Student Services Michael Shaheen, Science Department Co-Chair Roxanne Tolton, SPED Department Chair

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

The school-based LLT Leadership Team will meet monthly to discuss, analyze and monitor student academic and behavioral data. Data is comprised of Interim Assessments and FCAT scores, in addition to teacher-generated formal and informal assessments. Data trends are identified and decisions are made based on the most current data available. Initiatives, assessment, and observational data will be discussed during the meetings to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. Adjustments are made to the instructional calendar to target areas identified by the data to be in need of improvement. Enrichment opportunities will be provided to students that have been identified as having mastered grade-level skills.

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

The main focus with the Literacy Leadership Team for the 2012 - 2013 school year will be a more concentrated effort to utilize data for a greater depth and breadth of learning. This will encompass more data chats with staff and students and how the data is being utilized to plan for differentiated instruction as evidenced in lesson plans and student work. Professional development will be incorporated based on data trends and needs. The school will adopt Norman Webb's Depth of Knowledge levels and begin transitioning to the common core standards. The LLT will continue to promote reading across the curriculum and provide strategies in content and elective classes.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*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.

In order to ensure that reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher, South Miami Middle School will utilize Creating Independence through Student-Owned Strategies (CRISS) to assist students of all abilities learn content information across the curriculum and throughout the grade levels. The school will participate in a literacy block where every teacher will teach focused literacy lessons aligned with the reading instructional focus calendars. An instructional focus calendar will be provided school-wide based on a review of Baseline and Interim assessment data. Strong emphasis will be placed on identifying areas in which the students are encountering the most difficulty. The instructional focus calendar will include reading strategies that will be used in all content areas and are aligned to the Benchmarks and standards that are assessed on the Reading FCAT Test. The administration will monitor implementation of the reading strategies through weekly classroom walkthroughs.

*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?

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?

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

| | d on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and o | lefine areas in need | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1a. F readi | CAT2.0: Students scoring | g at Achievement Level 3 | 3 in The results of the 28% of students | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 28% of students achieved level 3. | | | | |
| Read | ing Goal #1a: | | On the 2013 FC achieve level 3 Reading. | AT 2.0, our goal is for 289 proficiency in | 6 students to | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 28%(| 276) | | 28%(276) | | | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
| 1 | Based on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment, sixth and seventh grade deficiency was in the Reporting Category of Reading Application. Students are in need of targeted, direct reading strategies to improve reading comprehension. | To improve the weaknesses in sixth and seventh grade, students will analyze literature (fiction and nonfiction) to determine main idea and/or essential message in grade level text through inferring, paraphrasing, summarizing and identifying relevant details. | | Conduct ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's ability to apply paraphrasing, summarizing, and determining essential details. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | Formative: Teacher assessments; Interim Assessment Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment | | | |
| 2 | Based on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment, eighth grade deficiency was in the Reporting Category of Vocabulary. Students are in need of targeted, direct vocabulary instruction. | To improve the weaknesses in eighth grade, students will improve word recognition and enhance vocabulary by completing lessons in the Wordly Wise Vocabulary Workbook. | Literacy Leadership Team | Conduct ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's ability to utilize context clues, prefixes, suffixes, and word walls to determine meaning of unfamiliar words and phrases. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | Formative: Teacher assessments; Interim Assessment Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment | | | |

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.

Reading Goal #1b:

| | | | L | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 48% of students achieved levels 4 and 5. | | | | |
| Reading Goal #2a: | On the 2013 FCAT 2.0, our goal is for 49% of students to achieve level 4 or 5 proficiency in Reading. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 48%(475) | 49%(482) | | | | |

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 | deficiency for all grades was in the Reporting Category of Information Text/Research Process. Students are lacking the ability to locate, | To improve the weaknesses in all grades, students will practice utilizing real-world documents such as brochures, fliers, graphs, and maps to locate, interpret and organize information in order to build strong arguments to support answers. | Leadership Team | Conduct ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to read and interpret nonfiction texts and be able to explain how text features enhance their understanding of informational texts. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | Formative: Mini assessments and student writing responses. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.

Reading Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

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

| | on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and c | define areas in need | |
|-------|---|---|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| | CAT 2.0: Percentage of s in reading. | tudents making learning | 1 | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 75% of students made learning gains in reading. | | |
| Readi | ing Goal #3a: | | number of stude | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students achieving learning gains by five percentage points to 80%. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| 75% (| (703) | | 80% (750) | 80% (750) | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process 1 | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 | To improve the area of deficiency, Reading Plus | MTSS/RTI Leadership | Monitor, analyze, and use program generated | Formative: Reading Plus | |

| | | , | | 1 3 3 | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|------|--------------------------|---------------|
| | administration of the | will be implemented as | Team | reports to ensure | reports. |
| | FCAT Reading Test was | part of our School-wide | | students are making | |
| | in the Reporting Category | Literacy Plan and as a | | adequate progress in | Summative: |
| | of Reading Application. | home learning | | reading practices. | 2013 FCAT 2.0 |
| | | component. In addition | | | results |
| 1 | | to completing sessions at | | FCIM will be implemented | |
| | | home, students will have | | by data analysis through | |
| | | the opportunity to | | curriculum council | |
| | participate a minimum of | | | meetings and on-going | |
| | 30 minutes every | | | data chats with | |
| | | two weeks in school, to | | departments, teachers, | |
| | | complete a minimum of | | and students. | |
| | | two sessions weekly. | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and refer of improvement for the following group: | ence to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need |
|---|--|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

| | on the analysis of studen | | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and o | define areas in need | |
|-------|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 4. FC | AT 2.0: Percentage of studies and studies | udents in Lowest 25% | | he 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading s in the lowest 25% made | | |
| Readi | ing Goal #4: | | | e 2012-2013 school year is ents achieving learning gai nts to 73%. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| 68%(′ | 151) | | 73%(162) | 73%(162) | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 reporting category assesment, the area of deficiency was in Reading Application. It is evident that a greater emphasis must be placed in teaching students to summarize, question, clarify and predict. | Daily, students will engage in 30 minutes of reading directed by Reciprocal Teaching strategies and responding to literature through journaling. All classrooms will utilize leveled libraries according to grade level to ensure books for all students. A pull out program will be developed to address the specific needs of our lowest 25%. After school tutoring will be available for students to receive additional support. | | Conduct ongoing classroom assessments focused on students ability to discuss and justify answers by returning to the text for support. Reciprocal Teaching strategies will be incorporated in every lesson. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | Formative: Classroom assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. | |

| 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 # Our goal is to decrease the number of non-proficient students, as identified by the 2012 Baseline Assessment, by 50% on the 2017 FCAT 2.0 administration. 5A : | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| | 76 | 78 | 81 | 83 | 85 | | |

| 5B. Student subgroups by eth Hispanic, Asian, American I nd satisfactory progress in readir Reading Goal #5B: | ian) not making | 51% of students subgroup achiev for the 2012-20 students making | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 51% of students in the Black subgroup and 94% of the Asian subgroup achieved satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students making satisfactory gains in the Black subgroup by five percentage points to 56% and in the Asian subgroup to 100%. | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | Level of Performance: | | | |
| Black 42% (47) Asian 94% (18) Pro | oblem-Solving Process t | Black 53% (59) Asian 100% (19 to Encrease Studer | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 25% are in need of intense remediation and intervention as noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test. Students often expressed concerns with transportation as a barrier to participation in the after school tutoring program | Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FCAT 2.0 and FAIR assessment data for all students reading below proficiency in the 25% and develop an in school pull out tutoring schedule to address the individual areas of Reading Application and Informational Text/Research Process. A greater emphasis will be placed in teaching students to use strategies to comprehend informational text, use graphic organizers, interpret, synthesize and evaluate information from a variety of sources. | | Assess student progress using the FAIR, interim assessments, and Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) to adjust the intervention schedule as needed. Formative and informal classroom assessments, and subsequent benchmark-based assessments will be used to monitor progress and to ensure progress is being made. Intervention adjustments will be made accordingly. | Formative: FAIR, District interim assessments, OPM data Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment | | |
| deficient in the Reporting Category of Informational Text and Research. | instructional needs by reviewing FCAT, Baseline, | Leadership Team, RtI Leadership Team | Assess student progress using the FAIR, Interim Assessments, and Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) to adjust the intervention schedule as needed. Formative and informal classroom assessments, and subsequent benchmark-based assessments will be used to monitor progress and to ensure progress is being made. Intervention adjustments will be made accordingly. | Formative: FAIR, District Interim Assessments, OPM data Summative: 2012 FCAT Assessment | | |
| 3 | a variety of souldes. | | | | | |

| satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | | | progress in read is to increase th | only 31% (16) of the ELL students achieved satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students making satisfactory gains in reading by seven percentage points to 38% (28). | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| 2012 Current Lev | vel of Perforr | mance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| 31% (16) | | | 38% (20) | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | o Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| Students in subroup are intense rem intervetion a the adibnist 2012 FCAT Assessment are deficien Reporting C Informationa Research. | in need of editio nand as noted on ration of the Readign . Students t in the ategory of | Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FCAT and FAIR assessment data for all students reading below proficiency. A pull out program will be incorporated to address areas of concern. A greater emphasis will be placed in teaching students to use strategies to comprehend informational text, use graphic organizers, interpret, synthesize and evaluate information from a variety of sources. Before and After school tutoring will be made available, free of charge to all FCAT Levels 1 and 2 students in need of additional academic assistance. | | The FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with all stakeholders. Formative and informal classroom assessments, and subsequent benchmark-based assessments will be used to monitor student progress. | Formative: Imagine Learning reports, CELLA reports, Achieve 3000 (Teen Biz) reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment | |

| | l on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | reference to "Guiding | g Questions", identify and | define areas in need | |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|----------------------|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | | | N/A | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to Increase Studer | nt 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 | |

| satis | conomically Disadvantag factory progress in read ing Goal #5E: | ged students not making ing. | 67% of student achieved profici school year is t | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 67% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students meeting proficiency in reading by two percentage points to 69%. | | |
|-------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | | d Level of Performance: | 000000 | |
| 67% | (338) | | 69% (348) | 69% (348) | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process 1 | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup are deficient in the Reporting Category of Information Text/Research process. These students are in need of intense remediation and intervention as noted on the administratio of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test. | Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FCAT and FAIR assessment data for all students reading below proficiency in the 25% and develop an in school pull out tutoring schedule to address the individual areas of weakness. A greater emphasis will be placed in teaching students to use strategies to comprehend informational text, use graphic organizers, interpret, synthesize and evaluate information from a variety of sources. | | Assess student progress using the FAIR, interim assessments, and Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) to adjust the intervention schedule as needed. Formative and informal classroom assessments, and subsequent benchmark-based assessments will be used to monitor progress and to ensure progress is being made. Intervention adjustments will be made accordingly. | Formative: FAIR, District Interim Assessments, OPM data Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment | |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|----------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Language Arts Department, Reading Coach | All Teachers | September, 2012 | Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team, Language Arts Dept. Chair |
| MTSS/RTI Implementation | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | District Personnel | All Teachers | October, 2012 | Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| Infusing National Common Core Curriculum Standards in the Classroom | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Literacy Leadership Team | All Teachers | January, 2013 | Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--------------------------|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1A.2 | Improve word recognition and enhance vocabulary by completing lessons in the Wordly Wise Vocabulary Workbook. | School Budget | \$5,000.00 |
| 4A.1 | A reading interventionist will assist in developing a pull-out and tutoring program to meet the needs of non-proficient students | School Budget | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$15,000.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | t | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$ Grand Total: \$15,00 |

End of Reading Goals

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. 68% (39) CELLA Goal #1: 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: The results of the 2012 Spring Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment indicate that 68% of ELL students achieved proficiency in Listening/Speaking. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Based on the 2012 To improve Listening MTSS/RTI Conduct ongoing Formative: skills, students will Leadership classroom assessments Spring Florida Teacher Comprehensive English participate in numerous Team focusing on student's assessments; ability to apply activities such as Language Learning Interim Assessment, ELL doing, choosing, Listening and Speaking Fall, Winter, students are in need of answering, condensing, skills. Spring Fair, targeted, direct extending, duplicating, TeenBiz 3000 listening/speaking modeling, and The FCIM will be Levels 2.3.4 strategies to improve conversing. The implemented by data Imagine Learning listening component will analysis through comprehension. Level 1

| | be built into the ELL | curriculum council asse | essment |
|---|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | lessons based on these | meetings and on-going repo | orts |
| | activities/response | data chats with | |
| | types. | departments, teachers, Sum | imative: |
| | | and students. 2013 | 3 Spring |
| 1 | To improve Speaking | Flori | da |
| | skills, students will | Com | nprehensive |
| | concentrate on their | Engl | lish Language |
| | pronunciation, | Lear | ning |
| | intonation and fluency | Asse | essment |
| | as well as speaking | | |
| | skills. Students will | | |
| | study and practice the | | |
| | essential aspects of | | |
| | speaking and listening | | |
| | in English and develop | | |
| | proficiency in | | |
| | conversation, group | | |
| | discussion, meetings, | | |
| | and classroom | | |
| | activities. | | |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a ma | nner similar to non-ELL students. |
|--|--|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. | The results of the 2012 Spring Florida Comprehensive |
| CELLA Goal #2: | English Language Learning Assessment indicates that 53 ¬% of students achieved proficiency in Reading. |
| | |

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

53% (30)

| | 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 | targeted, direct reading strategies to improve | weaknesses in sixth and seventh grade, students will analyze literature (fiction and nonfiction) to determine | Team | Conduct ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's ability to apply paraphrasing, summarizing, and determining essential details. The FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | Formative: Teacher assessments; Interim assessment reports Summative: 2013 Spring Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment | | |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: | The results of the 2012 Spring Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment indicate ¬¬¬54% of students achieved proficiency in writing. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing | j: | | | | |

| | 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 | Based on the 2012 Spring Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment, ELL students were deficient in the areas of paragraph structure, thesis statement, and voice. | weaknesses, with the support of the HLAP paraprofessional, teachers will focus on | | Use the writing process and maintain a writing portfolio which includes drafts, works in progress, and completed essays. | Writer's Portfolio | | |

CELLA Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | • | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | lent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.0 |

End of CELLA Goals

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

| Basec of imp | I on the analysis of studen provement for the following | t achievement data, and re | eference to "Guiding | g Questions", identify and o | define areas in need |
|-----------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| 1a. Fi math | CAT2.0: Students scoring ematics. | | indicate that 2 | the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathe 8 % of students achieved L CAT 2.0, our goal is for 299 | evel 3 proficiency. |
| Math | ematics Goal #1a: | | | I 3 in mathematics. | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expecte | d Level of Performance: | |
| 28% | (288) | | 29% (293) | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process 1 | to Increase Stude | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment The area of greatest | Provide students with models, both digital and tangible, to enable them to visualize, draw, and measure cross-sections of a range of geometric solids. | MTSS/RTI Leadership Team | National Library of Virtual Manipulatives Florida Focus Common departmental notebooks for student organization and note taking skills | Formative: Teacher made test and District Interim Data reports. Florida Focus Achieves |
| 1 | | Develop guidelines for students to use writing and journaling to identify learned concepts and to eliminate misconceptions. (Think, Solve and Explain activities) | | District Interim Data reports will be review by EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics |
| 2 | | Increase opportunities for students to solve problems involving scale factors using ratios and proportions in a real world content. Develop guidelines for students to use writing and journaling to identify learned concepts and to eliminate misconceptions. (Think, Solve and Explain activities) | MTSS/RTI Leadership Team | National Library of Virtual Manipulatives Florida Focus Common departmental notebooks for student organization and note taking skills District Interim Data reports will be review by EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed. FCIM will be implemented | Teacher made test and District Interim Data reports. Florida Focus Achieves Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics |
| | | | | by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvi | ing Process to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for | | | on or ion onsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No Data Submitted | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate 49% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2a: | On the 2013 FCAT 2.0, our goal is for 49% of students to score at or above Achievement Levels of 4 and 5 in mathematics. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 49% (494) | 49% (495) | | | |

| | 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 | Based on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment Test the area of deficiency, per reporting category, grade six was in the reporting category of Geometry and Measurement, seventh grade was Ratios/Proportional Relationships and eighth grade was Expressions, Equations and Functions. | Allow for more investigative and discovery means of instruction, apply Think- Solve & Explain concepts | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team | level of comprehension. The students will utilize their work folders and rubrics as means of assessing their own learning. Formative and informal classroom assessments, | Formative: Teacher Assessments, Florida Achieves Assessments, Interim Assessments Reports Summative: 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment | | |
| | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 | Lessons will incorporate hands on activities which | Leadership Team | National Library of Virtual Manipulatives | Formative: Teacher made test | | |

| 2 | Mathematics assessment The area of greatest difficulty for students in Grade 7 was Reporting Category1– Ratios and Proportional Relationships. | simulate real world applications of ratios and proportional relationships. Provide students explore proportional relationships through real world application using graphs of collected data. | | Florida Focus Common departmental notebooks for student organization and note taking skills District Interim Data reports will be review by EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | and District Interim Data reports. Florida Focus Achieves Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment. |
|---|---|--|--------------------|--|---|
| 3 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment The area of greatest difficulty for students in Grade 8 was Reporting Category3 – Geometry and Measurement. | Lessons will incorporate hands on activities which simulate real world applications of Geometry and Measurement. Provide the opportunities for students to use similar triangles to solve problems that include height and distance | Leadership Team | National Library of Virtual Manipulatives Florida Focus Common departmental notebooks for student organization and note taking skills District Interim Data reports will be review by EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers | Teacher made test and District Interim Data reports. Florida Focus Achieves Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------|--|------------------------|--------|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | ected Level of Perforn | nance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proc | cess to I | ncrease St | udent Achievement | |
| for | | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| | CAT 2.0: Percentage of s in mathematics. | tudents making learning | | he 2011-2012 FCAT Mathe f students made learning ga | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Mathematics Goal #3a: | | | | On the 2013 FCAT 2.0, our goal is for 85% of students make learning gains in mathematics to 85%. Gains from 80% to 75%. | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | | |
| 80% (| × , | | 85% (822) | | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment The area of greatest difficulty for students in Grade 6 was Reporting Category3 – Geometry and Measurement. | Provide students with models, both digital and tangible, to enable them to visualize, draw, and measure cross-sections of a range of geometric solids. | MTSS/RTI Leadership Team | National Library of Virtual Manipulatives Florida Focus Common departmental notebooks for student organization and note taking skills | Formative: Teacher made tes and District Interir Data reports. Florida Focus Achieves | | |
| 1 | | Students will use writing and journaling to identify learned concepts to eliminate misconceptions. (Think, Solve and Explain activities) | | District Interim Data reports will be review by EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed. | Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment | | |
| | | | | FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | | | |
| | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment The area of greatest difficulty for students in Grade 7 was Reporting Category1– Ratios and Proportional Relationships | models, both digital and tangible, to enable them to determine ratios and proportional relationships. Students will use writing | MTSS/RTI Leadership Team | National Library of Virtual Manipulatives Florida Focus Common departmental notebooks for student organization and note taking skills | Formative: Teacher made tes and District Interir Data reports. Florida Focus Achieves | | |
| 2 | | learned concepts to eliminate misconceptions. (Think, Solve and Explain activities) | | District Interim Data reports will be review by EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies made as needed. | Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment | | |
| | | | | FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | | | |
| | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment The area of greatest difficulty for students in | Students will be provided opportunities to find the perimeters and areas of composite two- dimensional figures, including non-roctongular | MTSS/RTI Leadership Team | National Library of Virtual Manipulatives Florida Focus Common departmental notebooks for student | Teacher made tes and District Interir Data reports. | | |
| | Grade 8 was Reporting Category3 – Geometry and Measurement. | including non-rectangular figures using various strategies. | | organization and note taking skills | Florida Focus Achieves | | |
| | | Students will use writing | | District Interim Data reports will be review by | Summative: Results from the | | |

| 3 | and journaling to identify learned concepts to eliminate misconceptions. (Think, Solve and Explain activities) | EESAC at monthly meetings and adjustments to strategies adjustments to strategies made as needed. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. |
|---|--|--|
|---|--|--|

| | sed on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|---|---|----------|--|-------------------------|------|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expe | ected Level of Performa | nce: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to Li | ncrease St | udent Achievement | |
| for | | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and refere | nce 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 mathematics. | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicates 70% of students in the Lowest 25% achieved learning gains. |
|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #4: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains to 75%. gains by five percentage points to 75%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 70% (172) | 75% (184) |

| 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 | |
| of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment The area of greatest difficulty for students in Grade 6 was Reporting | will be made available | | Assessment Data Reports to adjust instruction, as needed, | | |

| 1 | and Measurement. It is evident that a greater emphasis must be placed in teaching students to apply critical thinking skills so to evaluate real-world scenarios. | mathematics teachers will use differentiated instruction practices. A pullout program will be developed to address the specific needs of our lowest 25%. | FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council | Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 2 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment The area of greatest difficulty for students in Grade 7 was Reporting Category1– Ratios and Proportional Relationships | will be made available for students to receive additional support. Parents will be contacted and informed of school tutoring services. All | Assessment Data Reports to adjust instruction, as needed, to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going | |
| 3 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment The area of greatest difficulty for students in Grade 8 was Reporting Category3 – Geometry and Measurement. | | Assessment Data Reports to adjust instruction, as needed, to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going | Assessments Reports |

| 5A. Ambitious Measurable Ol | but Achievable ojectives (AMO luce their achie | e Annual s). In six year | n Six year students, as identified by the 2012 Baseline Assessment, by | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 77 | 79 | 81 | 83 | 85 | |

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that that 46% of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for 2013 is to increase the Black subgroup making satisfactory progress in mathematics to 54% (60). |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Black: 46% (52) | Black: 54% (60) |

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 | Test. It is evident that these students are weak in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students often expressed concerns with transportationor family issues as | tutoring will be made available for students to receive additional support. Parents will be contacted and informed of school tutoring services. All mathematics | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team | Analyze Interim Assessment Data Reports to adjust instruction, as needed, to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. Formative and informal classroom assessments, and subsequent benchmark-based assessments will be used to monitor progress and to ensure progress is being made. Intervention adjustments will be made accordingly. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | school-site assessment data, intervention assesments. Summative: |

| | I on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | reference to "Guidir | ng Questions", identify and | define areas in need | |
|--|---|------------------------|--|--|----------------------|--|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | | | N/A | N/A | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performance: | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | | |
| | Pr | roblem-Solving Process | s to Increase Stude | ent 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 | |

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

| Mathematics Goal #5D: | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| N/A | | N/A | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I | | | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

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

| | | The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicates% () of our Economically Disadvantaged students achieved learning gains. Our goal for 2013 is to increase the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup not meeting AMO Progress by percentage points to%. | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | % () | % () | | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Anticipated Bar | ier Strategy | Anticipated Barrier | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 25% are in need of intense remediation intervention as note the administration of 2012 FCAT Mathem Test. It is evident t these students are in the Reporting Ca of Geometry and Measurement. Stud often expressed concerns transportation or fal issues as a barrier t participation in the | be made available for and students to receive ad on additional support. If the Parents will be contacted atics and informed of school tutoring services. All weak mathematics teachers egory will use differentiated instruction practices. A pullout program will be developed to address th with specific needs of our nily lowest 25%. Students o will analyze characteristics and | ense remediation and ervention as noted on a administration of the 12 FCAT Mathematics st. It is evident that ese students are weak the Reporting Categor Geometry and asurement. Students en pressed concerns with nsportation or family ues as a barrier to rticipation in the fore and after school | Leadership Team | Review Interim Assessment Data Reports to adjust instruction, as needed, to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. Formative classroom assessments, and subsequent benchmark- based assessments will be used to assess progress. Interventions will be implemented accordingly. | school-site assessment data, intervention assessments. Summative: | | |

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

93%(91)

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

| | I on the analysis of studen provement for the following | t achievement data, and re g group: | efer | ence to "Guiding | Questions", identify and c | define areas in need |
|--|--|--|------|---|---|------------------------------|
| 1. Stu | udents scoring at Achiev | ement Level 3 in Algebra | a. | | he 2012 Algebra I EOC ass dents scored in Level 3. | sessment indicate |
| Algeb | ora Goal #1: | | | Our goal for the success rate | 2012-2013 school year is | to maintain the 7% |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | |
| 7%(7) |) | | | 7%(7) | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to I | ncrease Studer | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | R | Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students was the Reporting Category of Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics. | Provide students with additional practice in solving and graphing quadratic equations that involve real world content. Provide inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities. | | adership Team | Florida Focus Achieves Interim assessment tests Teacher made tests FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | Interim Assessments, Data |
| | l on the analysis of studen provement for the following | t achievement data, and re group: | efer | ence to "Guiding | Questions", identify and c | define areas in need |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. | | | 4 | The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment indicate that a 93% (91) of students scored in the upper third (Levels 4-5). | | |
| Algebra Goal #2: | | | | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percent of students achieving levels 4-5 to 93%. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | |
| | | | | | | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | | |
| | Provide students with additional practice in | | Florida Focus Achieves Interim assessment tests | Formative: Interim | | | | |

93%(91)

| 1 | of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students was the Reporting Category of Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics. | quadratic equations that involve real world content Students will be given opportunities to apply principles of rationals, radicals, quadratics and discrete mathematics in real worked content through mathematical | Teacher made teat | Assessments Teacher made test Summative: 2013 Algebra EOC |
|---|--|---|-------------------|--|
| | | writings. | | |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 3A. Ambitious Measurable Ol school will red by 50%. | 5 | s). In six year | Algebra Goal # Our goal is to decrease the number of non-proficient students, as identified by the 2012 Baseline Assessment, by 50% on the 2017 FCAT 2.0 administration. 3A : | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| <u></u> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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. Algebra Goal #3B: | | | N/A | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of P | erformance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to I | ncrease St | udent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | |

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

| Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fo | | t data, and refer | ence to "G | uiding Questions", iden | tify and define areas in need |
|---|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | | | | |
| Algebra Goal #3D: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvi | ng Process to I | ncrease S ⁻ | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | - | No Data S | Submitted | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and ref of improvement for the following subgroup: | erence to "Guiding | Questions", identify and c | lefine areas in need | |
|--|--|--|----------------------|--|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | that% of st | ne 2012 FCAT Algebra Ass udents in the Economically t make satisfactory progre | y Disadvantaged | |
| Algebra Goal #3E: | Our goal for the 2013 school year is to increase studen proficiency in Algebra by percentage points to | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| % | % | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to | Increase Studen | t Achievement | | |
| | Person or Position | Process Used to | | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|----------|--|--|--|
| 1 | of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students was the Reporting Category of Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics. | | | classroom assignments and assessments that target application. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council | Formative Assessment Teacher made test Test by Florida Focus Summative Assessment: 2013 Algebra I EOC |



End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas n need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 1. Students scoring at Geometry. | t Achievement Level | 3 in | | | |
| Geometry Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfo | rmance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving P | Process to I | ncrease S | itudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data S | Submitted | | |

| 3 | ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|---|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Students scoring at 4 and 5 in Geometry. | or above Achieveme | ent Levels | | | |
| Geometry Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfor | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving P | rocess to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion ponsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data : | Submitted | | |

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will Geometry Goal #

1

| reduce their achiev 50%. | vement gap by | 3A : | | | | ~ | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-20 | 15 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analy in need of improve | | | d reference to | o "Guidi | ng Questions", ide | entify and define areas | |
| 3B. Student subg Hispanic, Asian, A satisfactory prog Geometry Goal # | American India ress in Geome | , 0 | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Lev | el of Performa | nce: | 2013 Exp | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem | n-Solving Process t | o Increase S | tudent | Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barri | er Strategy | Pc Re fo | erson or osition esponsible r onitoring | Deterr | iveness of | Evaluation Tool | |
| | | No Da | ita Submitted | | | | |

| 5 | ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------|--|-----------------|
| 3C. English Language satisfactory progress | Learners (ELL) not makin in Geometry. | g | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3C: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | nance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No | Data : | Submitted | | |

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making | |
|---|--|
| satisfactory progress in Geometry. | |
| Geometry Goal #3D: | |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 201 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to Incre | ase St | tudent Achievement | |
| | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No | Data Subm | nitted | | |

| 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: | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------|--|-----------------|
| 3E. Economically Disa making satisfactory pr | dvantaged students not rogress in Geometry. | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3E: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perforn | nance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | is to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No | Data | Submitted | | |

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|----------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Language Arts Department, Reading Coach | All Teachers | September, 2012 | Classroom visits, Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| MTSS/RTI Implementation | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | All Teachers | All Teachers | October, 2012 | Classroom visits, Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| Infusing National Common | | | | | Classroom visits, | |

| Core Curriculum Standards in the Classroom | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Literacy Leadership Team | All Teachers | January, 2013 | Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
|---|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| Effective Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Department Chairperson | All Teachers | August 18 and 19,2012 | Classroom visits, Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| Middle Grades Mathematics Learning Community | 6 – 8 Mathematics | District Personnel Department: Division of Mathematics and Science | Department Chairperson | October 2012, November 2012, January 2013, May 2013 | Classroom visits, Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |

Mathematics Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|-----------------------|--|----------------|-------------------------|
| 4a.1 | Before and After School Tutoring will be offered in order to work with individual students to disclose mathematical misunderstandings. | School Budget | \$1,200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,200.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$1,200.00 |

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. | The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 47% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. | | | |
| Science Goal #1a: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency in level 3 by 2 percentage points to 49%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 47%(160) | 49% (168) | | | |

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | Evaluation Too |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| the area of deficiency was in the reporting category of Nature of Science. This deficiency will be addressed through a greater focus on FCAT 2.0 item specs, use of common lab and investigative formats, and continued opportunities for students to participate and design hands-on investigations both in the classroom and the field. | learning experiences to develop each student's ability to generate visualizations and representations of scientific concepts in the form of: diagrams, charts, trees, tables, graphs, pyramids, causal chains, timelines, and outlines. Utilize interactive - computerized programs | Team | assessment results by grade levels as well aslab logs and lesson plans each nine weeks to determine progress towards benchmarks. Focus calendars (schedules for labs and | intervention assessments. Summative: 201 |

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

| | The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 20% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 | |
|--|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above | proficiency. | |
| Achievement Level 4 in science. | Our goal for the 2012 school year is to increase student | |

| Science Goal #2a: | proficiency in I | proficiency in levels 4 and 5 by one percentage point to | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | 21%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Perfo | ormance: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performanc | ce: | |
| 20%(68) | 21%(71) | 21%(71) | | | |
| Prob | lem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Toc | |
| Trend data analysis indicates that a deficiency among students meeting high standards but not performing at the highest levels of achievement is Scientific Thinking (Nature of Science.) Students need to develop problem- solving and logical thinking 1 skills to achieve at the highest levels of performance in this area and this must be done actively through authentic science activities and competitions. | Provide classroom and after-school opportunities for students to design and implement inquiry- based activities and projects developing experimental designs, testing hypotheses, collecting, analyzing data and formulating conclusions, such as weekly scheduled laboratory activities, Science Fairs, SECME, and the Fairchild Challenge. Norman Webb's Depth of Knowledge (DOK) levels will be incorporated for a greater depth and breadth of learning, and to meet the requirements of academic rigor required by No Child Left Behind. | Leadership Team | Review of school-site assessment data and District Interim assessment data will be utilized to monitor student progress. The FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | Formative: District, and school-site assessment data, intervention assessments. Summative: 201 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment. | |

| | of student achievement data ement for the following gro | reference | to "Guiding Questions" | , identify and define | |
|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. | | | | | |
| Science Goal #2b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfor | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to | | | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Infusing National Common Core Curriculum Standards in the Classroom | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Literacy Leadership Team | All Teachers | January, 2012 | Classroom visits, Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| Effective Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Department Chairperson | All Science Teachers | August 18 and 19, 2012 | Classroom visits, Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Language Arts Department, Reading Coach | All Teachers | September, 2012 | Classroom visits, Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| MTSS/RTI Implementation | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | District Personnel | All Teachers | October, 2012 | Classroom visits, Classroom practice and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| Science Professional Development Targeting Instruction for Each Nine-Week Grading Period | 6 – 8 Science | The Division of Mathematicsand Science/ MDCPS | Department Chairperson | September, November, and February 2013 | Classroom visits, Classroom implementation and instructional planning | Leadership Team |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Progr | am(s)/Material(s) | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developn | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | · | 8 | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |

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

End of 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
 The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate 90% of students achieved mastery level 3 and above.

 Writing Goal #1a:
 On the 2013 FCAT Writing Test, our goal is to increase student proficiency by one percentage point to 91%.

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

 90%(313)
 91% (317)

 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 | | To improve weaknesses, Language Arts teachers will focus on the areas of organization, writing thesis statements, and voice. Write Traits and CRISS strategies which address these areas will be implemented. | Team | portfolio which includes drafts, works in progress, and completed essays. Conduct monthly conferences regarding writing portfolios. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through | Writer's Portfolio |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group: | eference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas |
|---|--|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
|---------------------|----------|-------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Responsible | 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 professiona | I development or PLC activity. |
|---|--------------------------------|
|---|--------------------------------|

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Effective Writing Skills | 6 - 8 | Language Arts, ESOL, and Reading Teachers | Language Arts, ESOL, and Reading Teachers | September 2012 to May 2013 | Monitor student writing portfolios, notebooks or journals | Leadership Team |
| Regional FCAT 2.0 Writing Scoring/Instructional Implications Trainings for English Language Arts Supervisors/ Educators | 6 - 8 | The Florida Department of Education | Language Arts Department Chairperson | October, 2012 | Monitor student writing portfolios, notebooks or journals | Leadership Team |
| Using Anchor papers and District Baseline Writing Data to Guide Instruction | 6 - 8 | Language Arts Department Chairperson | Language Arts, ESOL, and Reading Teachers | August/September 2012 | Monitor student expository and persuasive essay writing | Leadership Team |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s) | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

| | on the analysis of stude and of improvement for the | | d reference to "G | uiding Questions", identify | y and define areas | | |
|------|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics Civics Goal #1: | | | The result of the Civics District Baseline Assessment reflects that 0% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 10% | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performance | e: | | |
| 0% | | | 10% | | | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1 | Based on our item analysis of assessments background knowledge, vocabulary, and reading comprehension will continue to be a challenge. | tested End of Course Exam Benchmarks to | 0 | Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) and regular classroom assessments that focus on students' knowledge of word relationships and multiple meanings of words. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | Curriculum Resource Assessments, Quarterly and Mini- Assessments. Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 Civics District Baseline | | |
| 2 | Students are exhibiting weaknesses in patterns support main idea and character development by analyzing choice of words, style, and technique to understand how these elements influence the meaning of text. | making inferences, | MTSS/RTI Leadership Team | Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) and regular classroom assessments that focus on students' knowledge of word relationships and multiple meanings of words. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | Curriculum Resource Assessments, Quarterly and Mini- Assessments. Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 Civics District Baseline | | |

| | 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 and | udents scoring at or ab 15 in Civics. s Goal #2: | oove Achievement Leve | reflects that proficiency. Ou increase level | The result of the Civics District Baseline Assessment reflects that% of students achieved level 4 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 4 student proficiency by percentage points to% | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expecte | d Level of Performance | 9: | | | |
| 00% | | | 00% | 00% | | | | |
| | 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 | weaknesses in using primary and secondary sources. Students need to practice locating details, critically analyzing text, and | Teachers will incorporate instruction that assists students in building stronger arguments to support their answers. Students should explore and practice locating details, critically analyzing text, and synthesizing details to draw correct conclusions. Examples include: Reciprocal teaching, question-answer- relationships, note- taking skills, summarization skills, and questioning the author. | | Ongoing classroom observations and assessments that focus on student's ability to determine the validity and reliability of information within and across texts. Both students and teachers should examine rubrics and the appropriate benchmarks to ensure a complete understanding of the skills assessed. FCIM will be implemented by data analysis through curriculum council meetings and on-going data chats with departments, teachers, and students. | Resource Assessments, Quarterly and Mini- Assessments. Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 Civics | | | |

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|----------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| Effective Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Department Chairperson | All Teachers | August 18 and 19,2012 | Classroom visits, Classroom practice and Instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| Opening of Schools | | | | | Classroom visits, | |

| Curriculum and Program Update for Department Chairpersons | 6 – 8 | The Division of Social Science/ MDCPS | Department Chairperson | August, 2012 | Classroom implementaton and Instructional planning | Leadership Team |
|--|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------|--|--------------------|
| MTSS/RTI Implementation | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | District Personnel | All Teachers | October, 2012 | Classroom visits, Classroom implementaton and Instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| Infusing National Common Core Curriculum Standards in the Classroom | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Literacy Leadership Team | All Teachers | January, 2013 | Classroom visits, Classroom implementaton and Instructional planning | Leadership Team |

Civics Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | | | A it - la la |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student attendance to 97.13%. | | | | |
| 1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: | In addition, our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more), from 173 to 164. | | | | |
| | Also, our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive tardies (10 or more), from 119 to 113. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | | |
| 96.6% (1000) | 97.13% (1005) | | | | |

| | 2 Current Number of Stu ences (10 or more) | udents with Excessive | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 173 | | | 164 | | | | |
| | 2 Current Number of Stu lies (10 or more) | udents with Excessive | 2013 Expecte Tardies (10 or | d Number of Students more) | with Excessive | | |
| 119 | | | 113 | | | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | nt Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Too | | |
| 1 | Students with excessive absences and/or tardies due to illnesses. Many students are absent from school and class due to excused and unexcused reasons. | necessary visitations. | Committee | Monthly monitoring of school attendance bulletin, monitoring students on attendance contracts, and referral of students by teacher who have excessive tardies and/or absences. Monthly updates from Administration to faculty, counselors and members of the ARC. | Attendance Review Committee logs and attendance rosters. | | |
| 2 | Attendance and tardies will continue to be closely monitored to ensure students are attending school regularly and on time. Illnesses and excused absences have increased from the previous year. Students and parents are apparently unfamiliar with the District's Attendance and Tardy policies. Wrong or disconnected home phone numbers will impede the communication with the home of chronically absent or tardy students. | Connect-Ed's student phone database is up to date especially where chronically absent and/or tardy students are concerned. This will assure timely contacts with parents. Utilize the school Attendance Clerk and school Social Worker to identify those students with incomplete or inaccurate contact information. Student's attendance and tardiness will be | Attendace Review Committee | Conduct weekly meetings with the Attendance Clerk to rreview the wrong and/or disconnected phone numbers report provided by the Connect-Ed system and ensure that communication with the home of chronically absent and/or tardy students is made. Furthermore, via this meeting, ensure that the grade level counselor and Assistant Principal is meeting with identified students and correcting and/or updating their phone numbers. In addition, a daily review of the attendance report will be used to gauge the effectiveness of this intervention. Monthly monitoring of school attendance bulletin, monitoring students on attendance | average attendance (COGNOS) Attendance bulletin and electronic grade book. | | |

| | | and parent meetings will be held to review the District's and schools Attendance Policy. Develop and incentive program for students in compliance with attendance | | contracts, and referral of students by teacher who have excessive tardies and/or absences. | |
|---|--|---|-----------|--|---|
| 3 | problems. Since this is a magnet school, many students are not | conferences are conducted when students begin to show a pattern of excessive tardies. Continuous offenders may receive indoor suspension. | Committee | monitored daily. Students are counseled prior to assignment to indoor suspensions, and | success of both internal and District-mandated strategies. |

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|----------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| School Tardy Procedures | 6 - 8 All Subject Areas | Administrative Team | All Staff | August, 2012 | Review of daily attendance bulletin | Principal |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Progr | am(s)/Material(s) | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| 1.1 | Student Incentives will include Prizes, Gift Cards, Ice Cream Socials, etc. | EESAC | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$2,000.0 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |

No Data

No Data

No Data

\$0.00

Grand Total: \$2,000.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Subtotal: \$0.00

Suspension Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)). Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: 1. Suspension Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10% from 228 to 205 Suspension Goal #1: 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions 228 205 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School School 119 107 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions Suspensions 122 110 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-School of-School 86 77 Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring The total number of The school's Leadership Team Monitor the counselor's Counselor's Log administrative team and Counselors outdoor suspensions log and utilize COGNOS and COGNOS along with the grade slightly increased from suspension data to suspension the 2012 - 2013 school level counselor will determine if the total report. year. review the Student suspension rate is Code of Conduct with decreasing. Students may break students during grade District or school rules level orientations. Attendance, tardies, due to the lack of referrals, and familiarity with the Continue to utilize suspensions will be Code of Student SPOT Success monitored by Conduct. Recognition Program as counselors, magnet an incentive to promote lead teacher, and positive behavior. administrators, with 1 counseling and parental An incentive program contact as appropriate. will be put in place rewarding exemplary and model behavior.

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | | 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) | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|-----|---|---|--|---|---|
| SPOT Success | 6-8 | Leadership Team | All Instructional | Grade Level Assemblies,September 2012, Classroom visits beginning on August, 2012 through June, 2013 | Utilize classroom walkthroughs to monitor teachers' enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct. Monitor Spot Success monthly report. | Leadership Team |
| The Student Code of Conduct | 6-8 | Leadership Team | All Students | Grade Level Assemblies,September 2012, Classroom visits beginning on August, 2012 through June, 2013 | Utilize classroom walkthroughs to monitor teachers' enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct. Monitor Spot Success monthly report. | Leadership Team |

Suspension Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s) | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | ent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| | d on the analysis of pare ed of improvement: | nt involvement data, and | I reference to "Guid | ding Questions", identify | and define areas |
|--------|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1. Pa | rent Involvement | | | | |
| Parei | nt Involvement Goal #1 | 1: | Parental Involv | collected through a 201 vement survey, 90° two or more school activ | % of parents |
| partic | se refer to the percenta ipated in school activitie plicated. | | | e 2011-2012 school yea ement by 3 percentage p | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Parer | nt Involvement: | 2013 Expecte | d Level of Parent Invo | lvement: |
| 90% | | | 93% | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | year, numerous parents reported that information regarding school sponsored parent informational meetings was not | Ensure that student/parent contact information is updated by identifying students with inaccurate contact information. Utilize our Attendance Clerk to identify students with incomplete or inaccurate contact information. To the extent possible, flyers and letters sent home will be translated in English, Spanish and Creole | Leadership Team Attendance Clerk | Conduct weekly meetings with the Attendance Clerk in order to determine the efficacy of our Connect-Ed messages. | Sign-in sheets at School sponsored events. |
| 2 | | given as early as | Team and | Review sign-in sheets/logs to determine parent participation. | Parental Involvement Survey |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Bilingual FCAT Parent Night | Grades 6-8 | ELL Department Chair and Counselors | All parent sof ELL students will be invivted. | November 8, 2012 | Parent Sign-In Logs | Leadership Team |
| During the 2012 school year, South Miami Middle's enrollment, according to the District was approximately 1040 students. Volunteers will be actively solicited at New Student Orientation, Open House, Booster Meetings, EESAC Meetings, all other opportunities when parents are present. | All Grade Levels 6-8 | Volunteer Liaison, Assistant Principals Overseeing Volunteers, Booster Clubs, and PTSA | Monitor the number of volunteers, ages 21-61, who have registered through the Volunteer Portal. | June 2013 | Figures from the Volunteer Portal, and reception of the Golden School Award | Volunteer Liaison, Assistant Principals overseeing Volunteers, Booster Clubs, and PTSA. |

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | | | A. 16 1 - 1-1- |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:
One hundred percent (100%) of the students at South
Miami Middle School will participate in at least one

1. STEM

STEM Goal #1:

Miami Middle School will participate in at least one science competition (such as SECME, Fairchild Challenge or the Science Fair) during the 2012-2013 school year. This will allow for greater student engagement in the science process and thus enhance student achievement on the 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 | To effectively deliver STEM programs and curricula while enhancing student literacy of technology. | Teachers will focus on integrating STEM education into a more cohesive teaching and learning parading by incorporating problem based learning, inquiry based teaching and learning, 5E Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Cycle and digital curriculum integrated with digital teaching technologies. | Leadership Team and Science Department Chairperson | Conduct ongoing classroom assessments focusing on student's ability, to the extent possible, of becoming problem solvers, innovators, inventors, self-reliant, and logical thinkers. | Student participation in STEM Activities Formative and summative assessments with both task and non-task specific rubrics. |
| 2 | Student lack of participation in rigorous competitions and projects. | Increase school/student participation in programs such as the Fairchild Challenge, Youth Fair exhibits and the SECME Competition. | Leadership Team and Science Department Chairperson | Leadership Team and department Chairpersons will monitor tracking system of student expectation and performance. | Student participation in STEM Activities Formative and summative assessments with both task and non-task specific rubrics |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| District Science and Mathematics Conference | 6-8 Grade Math and Science | Select Math and Science Teachers | December 2012 | Classroom implementation and instructional planning | Classroom implementation and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| Florida State Science Conference | 8th Grade Science | State Personnel | Select Science Teachers | October 2012 | Classroom implementation and instructional planning | Leadership Team |
| Infusing National Common Core Curriculum Standards in the Classroom | 6 – 8 All Subject Areas | Literacy Leadership Team | All Teachers | January 2013 | Classroom implementation and instructional planning | Leadership Team |

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s) | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | hent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

| Based | I on the analysis of schoo | ol data, identify and defir | ne areas in need of | improvement: | |
|----------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1. CT CTE C | E Goal #1: | | | rade students will be info ndary education program | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student transitions to performing arts high schools and college ready programs versus technical options. | Enhance student's knowledge of career pathway models by including more Career and Technical programs in the eighth grade high school fair. Assist interested students in exploring career and technical education programs. | Leadership Team and Counselors | Success of high school fair and observation of student interest. Counselor Log | Evaluation of projects and products completed by the student, using checklists and rating scales. Follow-up interest surveys of students. |
| 2 | Limited career and technical classes in a performing arts magnet school. | All non magnet students will be enrolled in the Family and consumer Science exploratory course to learn about food preparation, nutrition, basic sewing, child and family development, safety, and effective consumerism and decision-making | Leadership Team and Counselors | Review of student schedules and exploration of alternate courses | Percent of students exposed to CTE. |

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

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

CTE Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |
| | | | |
| | | | End of CTE Goal |

Additional Goal(s) No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Pro | gram(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|----------------|--------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | 1A.2 | Improve word recognition and enhance vocabulary by completing lessons in the Wordly Wise Vocabulary Workbook. | School Budget | \$5,000.00 |
| Reading | 4A.1 | A reading interventionist will assist in developing a pull-out and tutoring program to meet the needs of non-proficient students | School Budget | \$10,000.00 |
| Mathematics | 4a.1 | Before and After School Tutoring will be offered in order to work with individual students to disclose mathematical misunderstandings. | School Budget | \$1,200.00 |
| Attendance | 1.1 | Student Incentives will include Prizes, Gift Cards, Ice Cream Socials, etc. | EESAC | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$18,200.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Develo | pment | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$18,200.00 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jm Priority

jn Focus

in NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

m Prevent

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/7/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately

balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|--------------------------|
| The SAC funds will be used to purchase student agendas, fund student recognition and incentive programs as describe throughtout the school improvement plan (Attendance, Reading Plus, SpotSuccess, etc). | ^{ed} \$5,000.00 |

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

The EESAC will continue to recommend and support strategies that promote academic and civic growth for our students. The EESAC will also monitor with fidelity the implementation of the School Improvement Plan and any adjustments that need to be made through regular progress assessments. The EESAC will use funds as needed to provide students and teachers with materials necessary to achieve SIP objectives.

AYP DATA

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

No Data Found

| Dade School District SOUTH MI AMI MI DDLE 2010-2011 | E SCHOOL | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|--|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 83% | 83% | 90% | 60% | | 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 | 71% | 76% | | | 147 | 3 ways to make gains: Improve FCAT Levels Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 71% (YES) | 69% (YES) | | | | 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 | | | | | 603 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | А | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|--|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 84% | 84% | 93% | 52% | | 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 | 72% | 81% | | | 153 | 3 ways to make gains: Improve FCAT Levels Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 69% (YES) | 71% (YES) | | | | 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 | | | | | 606 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |