_

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MIDDLETON HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Hillsborough

Principal: Owen Young

SAC Chair: Tessa Ward

Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 3/6/2013



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)
No data submitt	ed				

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.

Name Degree(s)/ Certification (s) # of Years a an Instructional Coach	Assessment Achievement Levels,
---	--------------------------------

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	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

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	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	0 0	% Reading Endorsed	I Board	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers

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 C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
THE A* Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)
-School-based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.
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?
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement

Dian. Describe now the F	
MTSS Implementation	on—
Describe the data source cience, writing, and bel	e(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, havior.
Describe the plan to trai	n staff on MTSS.
Describe the plan to sup	port MTSS.
iteracy Leadership	Team (LLT)
School-Based Litera	acy Leadership Team
dentify the school-base	d Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Describe how the school	I-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
Describe how the school	I-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
Describe how the schoo	I-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
	I-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). nitiatives of the LLT this year?
What will be the major in	nitiatives of the LLT this year?
What will be the major in	nitiatives of the LLT this year?
What will be the major in Public School Choice Supplemental Education No Attachment	nitiatives of the LLT this year?
Public School Choice Supplemental Education No Attachment Elementary Title I Spescribe plans for assist	nitiatives of the LLT this year? onal Services (SES) Notification Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Vhat will be the major in the control of the contro	nitiatives of the LLT this year? onal Services (SES) Notification Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Public School Choice Supplemental Education No Attachment Elementary Title I Spescribe plans for assist pplicable.	nitiatives of the LLT this year? onal Services (SES) Notification Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Public School Choice Supplemental Education No Attachment Elementary Title I Spescribe plans for assist pplicable. Grades 6-12 Only	nitiatives of the LLT this year? onal Services (SES) Notification Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Public School Choice Supplemental Education No Attachment Elementary Title I Supplicable. Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.	nitiatives of the LLT this year? onal Services (SES) Notification

*High Schools Only

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 High School	How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relevance to their future?	ationships between subjects and
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>		e student course selections, so that
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School	Postsecondary Transition	
Feedback Report		on annual analysis of the High School

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goal #2a:

* When using percentages	, include the number of	students the perc	entage repi	resents (e.g., 70% (35)).	
Based on the analysis o of improvement for the		t data, and refer	ence to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	tify and define areas in nee
1a. FCAT2.0: Students reading.	s scoring at Achieve	ment Level 3 ir	1		
Reading Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	mance:
	Problem-Solvi	ng Process to I	ncrease S	Student 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 the analysis o of improvement for the 1b. Florida Alternate A Students scoring at Le Reading Goal #1b:	following group: Assessment:		ence to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	tify and define areas in nee
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	mance:
	Problem-Solvi	ng Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
,					
Based on the analysis o of improvement for the		t data, and refer	ence to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	tify and define areas in nee
2a. FCAT 2.0: Student	s scoring at or abov	e Achievement			
Level 4 in reading.			1		

2012 Current Level of P	Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement				
for				Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
	No		Submitted					
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data, an	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in nee			
2b. Florida Alternate As		in						
2012 Current Level of P	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi for			on or cion Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool			
	No		Submitted					
of improvement for the for 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage	student achievement data, and Illowing group: ge of students making learn		rence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need			
gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:								
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
	No	o Data	toring Strategy Submitted					

of improvemen			eni data, and	reiere	nce to Gt	alaing Ques	ations , identify	anu	define areas in nee
3b. Florida Ali Percentage of		sessment: naking Learning	g Gains in						
reading.		g =	9						
Reading Goal	#3b:								
2012 Current	Level of Pe	rformance:		2	2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	ance:	
		Dualdana Cal	ludina Dinasa						
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to In	crease St	rudent Acr	ilevement		
Anticipated B	Barrier :	Strategy		Person Position Respon for Monito	on nsible	Process U Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eva	luation Tool
			No	Data Si	ubmitted				
Based on the a of improvemen			ent data, and	d refere	nce to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and (define areas in nee
4. FCAT 2.0: P making learni	_	of students in L reading.	owest 25%						
Reading Goal		J							
2012 Current	Level of Pe	rformance:		2	2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	ance:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	s to In	crease St	udent Ach	ilevement		
Anticipated B	Barrier :	Strategy		Person Position Responsion for Monitor	on nsible	Process L Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eva	luation Tool
			No	Data Si	ubmitted				
Based on Ambi	itious but Ac	hievable Annual	Measurable (Objectiv	ves (AMOs), AMO-2, I	Reading and M	ath Pe	erformance Target
5A. Ambitious I Measurable Ob school will redu by 50%.	jectives (AM	Os). In six year	Reading Goa	al #					2
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-20	014	2014	1-2015	2015-201	6	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f		a, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in nee	
	s by ethnicity (White, Bl can Indian) not making n reading.					
Reading Goal #5B:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfori	mance:	
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi Fesq For		on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f		a, and refe	rence to "Gi	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in nee	
5C. English Language l satisfactory progress i	_earners (ELL) not maki n reading.	ing				
Reading Goal #5C:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted		·	
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the form		a, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in nee	
5D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress i	bilities (SWD) not makin n reading.	ng				
Reading Goal #5D:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfor	mance:	

	Problem-Solving	g Process to	Increase S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis or of improvement for the		data, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in nee
5E. Economically Disa satisfactory progress	_	not making			
Reading Goal #5E:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving	g Process to	Increase S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		

 ${\it Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.}$

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 fo Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)						
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount			
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00			

			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	-		Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Reading Goa

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)). Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.					
CELLA Goal #2:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.						
	3. Students scoring proficient in writing.					
CELLA Goal #3:						
2012 Current Percent	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					
	Problem-Solvi	ing Process to I	ncrease S	student Achievemen	t	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy						
No Data Submitted						

CELLA 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 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

I			

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages	s, include the number of st	tudents the p	percentage	represents next to the p	ercentage (e.g., 70% (35)).
	of student achievement of student achievement of student achievement of students are students.		eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
1. Florida Alternate A Levels 4, 5, and 6 in r	ssessment: Students : nathematics.	scoring at			
Mathematics Goal #1	:				
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solving Pr	rocess to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
in need of improvement	for the following group: ssessment: Students athematics.	•	ı	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solving Pr	rocess to L	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
	Troblem Serving 11		on or	Tadent Nemevernen	·
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
	of student achievement of student achievement of student achievement of students are students.		eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
3. Florida Alternate A making learning gain	ssessment: Percent o	fstudents			
Mathematics Goal #3	:				
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Evr	nected Level of Perfo	rmance:

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

Based on Amb	itious but Ac	hievable Annual	Measurable (Objectiv	es (AMOs), AMO-2, F	Reading and Ma	ith Perfo	rmance Target
			Mathematics						
	ojectives (AM	ole Annual IOs). In six year nievement gap	5A :						<u> </u>
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2	014	2014	1-2015	2015-2016	5	2016-2017
		tudent achieveme owing subgroup:	ent data, and	d refere	nce to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and defi	ne areas in need
Hispanic, Asia	an, America progress in	y ethnicity (Wh in Indian) not m mathematics.							
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		2	2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to In	crease St	udent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated E	3arrier	Strategy		Persor Positic Responsion for Monito	on nsible	Process L Determin Effectiver Strategy	е	Evalua	tion Tool
			No	Data Su	ubmitted				
		tudent achievemo owing subgroup:	ent data, and	d referer	nce to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and defi	ne areas in need
EC English L	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	ornoro (FII) no	+ madding						

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	Nc	Data :	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	student achievement data, and llowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
5D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress in	ilities (SWD) not making mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #5D:						
2012 Current Level of Po	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	nce:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data :	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of sof improvement for the following the same and the same are same as a same and the same are same as a same are same are same as a same are same a	student achievement data, and llowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in nee	
E. Economically Disadva satisfactory progress in	antaged students not makir n mathematics.	ng				
Mathematics Goal E:						
2012 Current Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	nce:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	rudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

No Data Submitted

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis in need of improvemen			eference t	o "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define areas
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.					
Algebra Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to in need of improvement for the following group:				g "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define areas
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.					
Algebra Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Pro	cess to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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)).

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement			reference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.						
Geometry Goal #1:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to	Increase S	Student Achievement	t	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Po: Re: for	rson or sition sponsible nitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No Dat	a 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:					
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels and 5 in Geometry.					
Geometry Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solvin	g Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemer	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	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
No Data Submitted						

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	m(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 Developme	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 Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Florida Alternate A at Levels 4, 5, and 6	ts scoring				
Science Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemer	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	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:

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.					
Science Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data			Submitted		

Biology 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 reas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.					
Biology Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s 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					

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:				
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			

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

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						

Science 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 Developn	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 Science Goals

* When using percentage	s, include the number	of students the	percentage	represents (e.g., 70% (.	35)).
Based on the analysis of in need of improvemen			eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
1a. FCAT 2.0: Studen 3.0 and higher in writ Writing Goal #1a:	_	evement Level			
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis			eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	f student achievement data for the following group:	, and r	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", i	dentify and define areas
1b. Florida Alternate A at 4 or higher in writin	Assessment: Students sco g.	ring			
Writing Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	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				

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						

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Matorial(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
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	student achievement data, for the following group:	and r	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", ic	lentify and define areas
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.					
U.S. History Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

^{*} 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:					
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.					
U.S. History Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solvino	g Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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							

U.S. History 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
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference of improvement:	to "Guiding Ques	estions", identify and	I define areas in need
1. Attendance			
Attendance Goal #1:			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:		
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Absences (10		ents with Excessive
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		
Problem-Solving Process to	ncrease Studer	nt Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Pos for	onsible Dete	cess Used to ermine ectiveness of ategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data	Submitted		

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

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

PD 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							

Attendance 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
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension					
Suspension Goal #1:					
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In- School				
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				

			2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School		
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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							

Suspension 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 Developn	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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of in need of improvements		ata, and ref	ference to	"Guiding Questions", i	identify and define areas	
1. Dropout Prevention	1					
Dropout Prevention G	oal #1:					
*Please refer to the pe	rcentage of students w	⁄ho				
dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.						
2012 Current Dropout Rate:			2013 Expected Dropout Rate:			
2012 Current Graduat	2012 Current Graduation Rate:			2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
	Problem-Solving Pr	ocess to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data S	Submitted			

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

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

PD 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							

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

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
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement						
Parent Involvement G	Goal #1:					
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.						
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
	Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	t	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data S	Submitted			

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							

Parent Involvement 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
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis o	of school data, ident	tify and define a	reas in ne	eed of improvement:	
1. STEM					
STEM Goal #1:					
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to Ir	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
Person or Position Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible for Monitoring				Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		

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							

STEM 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
·			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:							
1. CTE							
CTE Goal #1:							
	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			

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

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:

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
			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(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based F	Program(s)/Material(s)			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Deve	elopment			
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: \$0.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance



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.

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/25/2012)

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.



No. Disagree with the above statement.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Togcher Minigrants: Matt Donn, Tolonromptor for Morning Show (\$900.00 plus chipping & handling), Jossica Conoland	

\$3,067.20

Teacher Minigrants: Matt Penn- Teleprompter for Morning Show (\$899.00 plus shipping & handling) Jessica Copeland-Travel and lodging for FFA Students (\$500) Dorothy Schroeder- 60 Math Calculators for Geometry EOC (\$706.20) Akilah GrahamAllen- Storytelling Project (\$700) Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year

SAC is sponsoring 4 teacher minigrants in order to assist in areas of school improvement that will increase student achievement, student engagement, and decrease student tardies, detentions, and absenteeism. these are resources currently not funded by other programs and will benefit MHS this 2012-2013 school year.

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

	Hillsborough School District MIDDLETON HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011							
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned			
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	28%	50%	59%	30%	167	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	42%	63%			105	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?		67% (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					387			
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested		
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested		

Hillsborough School Di MI DDLETON HI GH SCH 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing		Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	22%	55%	78%	32%	187	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	36%	68%			104	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?		67% (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					401	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					С	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested