#### \_

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: LYONS CREEK MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Dr. Ted Toomer

SAC Chair: Ashley Golding

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/12

Last Modified on: 10/23/2012



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)/<br>Certification(s) | # of<br>Years at<br>Current<br>School | # of Years as<br>an<br>Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include<br>prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide<br>Assessment Achievement Levels,<br>Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and<br>AMO Progress along with the<br>associated school year)   |
|----------|------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
|          |      |                                |                                       |                                      | Principal of C. Robert Markham Elementary  2010-2011 Grade B Reading Mastery: 61%, Math Mastery 39%, Writing Mastery 94%, Reading Learning Gains 66%, Math Learning Gains 68%, Reading Lowest 25%:67% Math Lowest 25%:50% AYP: 77% Economically disadvantage, ELL, Hispanic, & Black subgroups did not make AYP in Reading. Economically disadvantaged, ELL, and Hispanics did not |

| Principal       | Dr. Ted<br>Toomer   | BA - Journalism -<br>Elon College<br>MA - Elementary<br>Education - Nova<br>Southeastern<br>University<br>Ph. D -<br>Educational<br>Leadership -<br>Nova<br>Southeastern<br>University | 2 | 6 | make AYP in Math. 2009-2010 Grade B Reading Mastery: 66%, Math Mastery 63%, Science Mastery 40%, Writing Mastery 88%, Reading Learning gains 68%, Math Learning Gains 61%, Reading Lowest 25%:53% Math Lowest 25%: 57% AYP: 79% Economically disadvantaged, ELL & Black subgroups did not make AYP in Reading and Math. 2008-2009 Grade A Reading Mastery 62%, Math Mastery 60%, Science Mastery 29%, Writing Mastery 96%, Reading Lowest 25%:73% Math Lowest 25%: 73% AYP: 92% Economically disadvantaged and Black subgroups did not make Math AYP. 2007-2008 Grade B Reading Mastery 49%, Math Mastery 66%, Science Mastery 42%, Writing Mastery 93%, Reading Learning Gains 60%, Math Learning Gains 69%, Reading lowest 25%:65% Math Lowest 25%:68% AYP: 97% ELL did not meet AYP in Reading               |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Assis Principal | Debra<br>Harrington | Speech Language Impaired, (grades K - 12) Educational Leadership, (all Levels)   | 6 | 6 | Grade B Increase in Reading Mastery: 67% to 72% Math Mastery: 72% had decreased to 70% and then rose to %72 in 2009. Increase in Science Mastery: 40% to 47% Increase in Writing Mastery: 89% to 94%  |
| Assis Principal | Thomas<br>Howard    | Educational<br>Leadership, (all<br>Levels)<br>Elementary<br>Education,<br>(grades 1 - 6)   | 4 | 1 | 8th Grade Administrator at Sawgrass Springs Middle School from 2000-01 through 2008-09 Reading Mastery was maintained above 65% Math Mastery was maintained at a positive growth trend of 2% points over the past 4 years with 75% of the students scoring level 3 or above. Writing Mastery was maintained a growth trend of 5% points with a total of 95% of the students scoring level 3 or above. Science Mastery showed a growth of 1% point over the last 4 years.  |
| Assis Principal | Gina<br>Montagnino  | Degrees: Degrees:<br>M. Ed Ed.<br>Leadership<br>B.SHistory<br>Certifications:<br>Ed. Leadership<br>(K-12)<br>Math (5-9)<br>Social Studies<br>(6-12)<br>English (6-12)                  | 1 | 7 | Western High School 2010-2011 Grade Pending Reading Mastery 58% Math Mastery 82% Science Mastery 46% Writing Mastery 86%  Western High School 2009-2010 Grade A Reading Mastery 62 % Math Mastery 86% Science Mastery 50 % Writing Mastery 92%  Did not make AYP: Reading in any subgroup Did not make AYP: Math -SWD  Western High School 2008-2009 C Reading Mastery 57 % Math Mastery 84% Science Mastery 46 % Writing Mastery 89%  Did not make AYP: Reading in any subgroup Did not make AYP: Reading in any subgroup Did not make AYP: Reading in any subgroup Did not make AYP: Math -SWD -ELL  Western High School 2007-2008 A Reading Mastery 61 % Math Mastery 85% Science Mastery 49 % Writing Mastery 88%  Did not make AYP: Reading -Hispanic -SWD -Eco- disadvantaged Did not make AYP: Math -SWD |

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

| Subject Area | Name                       | Degree(s)/<br>Certification(s)  | # of<br>Years at<br>Current<br>School | # of Years as<br>an<br>Instructional<br>Coach | Prior Performance Record (include<br>prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide<br>Assessment Achievement Levels,<br>Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and<br>AMO progress along with the<br>associated school year)  |
|--------------|----------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Reading      | Aileen Wolfe-<br>Goldhirsh | English for<br>Speakers Of<br>Other Languages<br>(esol),<br>Endorsement       | 6                                     | 5   | 2010-2011 Grade A: SWD's increased 2% in reading and the lowest 25th% increased 12%(244) in reading. 2009-10 Grade B Increase of 4% points in reading for Black subgroup, Increase of 2% points for Economically Disadvantaged, and decrease of 2% points for SWD. No change in scores for Total, White, Hispanic, ELL. 2008-09 Grade A Black, ELL, SWD, & FRPL did not make AYP in reading and math. 2007-08 Grade A Black, Hispanic, ELL, SWD, & FRPL did not make AYP in reading and math. |
| Science      | Tanisha Scott              | Biology 6-12,<br>English for<br>Speakers Of<br>Other Languages<br>Endorsement | 4                                     | 4   | 2010-2011 Grade A: Increase in math for all AYP subgroups Black 3%, Hispanic 3% FRL 4%, ELL 12%, and SWD's 2%. 45% of 8th grade students were meeting high standards in Science. 2009-10 Grade B Increase in Science 2% points from 47% to 49%. 2008-09 Grade A Increase in Science 7% points from 40% to 47%   |

#### EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

|   | Description of Strategy  | Person<br>Responsible        | Projected<br>Completion<br>Date | Not Applicable (If not, please<br>explain why) |
|---|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Monthly Data Chats   | Grade Level<br>Administrator | On Going                        |  |
| 2 | Partnering teachers with less than 3 years experience with veteran teachers. | NESS Liaison                 | June 2013                       |  |
|   | Regular meetings of new teachers<br>with Assistant Principal                 | Assistant<br>Principal       | On Going                        |  |

#### 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 |
|--|---|
| 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<br>of<br>Instructional<br>Staff | % of<br>First-Year<br>Teachers |           | % of<br>Teachers<br>with 6-14<br>Years of<br>Experience | % of<br>Teachers<br>with 15+<br>Years of<br>Experience | % of<br>Teachers<br>with<br>Advanced<br>Degrees | % Highly<br>Effective<br>Teachers | % Reading | % National<br>Board<br>Certified<br>Teachers | % ESOL<br>Endorsed<br>Teachers |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|--------------------------------|
| 103  | 1.0%(1)                        | 16.5%(17) | 52.4%(54)   | 34.0%(35)  | 46.6%(48)                                       | 85.4%(88)                         | 14.6%(15) | 9.7%(10)                                     | 77.7%(80)                      |

#### 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

The title 1 funds are being used at 100% to cover additional personnel i.e. Science Coach, instructional paraprofessional and instructional teacher to work with low performing student from AYP subgroups, parent involvement activities and trainings and Professional Development for teachers to improve student achievement.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

#### Title II

District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs.

Title II

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are used to provide additional tutoring before and after schools and for additional instructional support during the school day.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that includes field trips, community service, and counseling.

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/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The following staff members make up the RtI team; Guidance Director(RtI Coordinator) and 7th grade counselor, Celeste Bernard, School Psychologist-Joanna Gan, Social Worker-Donna Ortiz, Family Counselor-Nicole Isreal, ESE Specialist-Louise Kopf, Guidance Counselors-6th grade Joy Gordon and 8th grade Myra Brahms, Behavior Specialist Holly Snell, Assistant Principal 6th Dr. Thomas Howard, 7th Ms. Debra Harrington, 8th Ms. Montagnino, Gen Ed Teacher (as pertinent to the case), ESE teacher (as pertinent to the case), ESE Support Facilitator, Jessica Gains, Paula Schwartz and Alison Dangelo, Reading Coach-Aileen Wolfe-Goldhirsh, Science Coach-Tanisha Scott.

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?

How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate RtI efforts? The RtI team meets weekly or 'as needed' in the ESE Specialist's office. The team reviews cases that are referred by classroom teachers through the guidance department. The team reviews the history of the student as well as the history of the documented interventions previously implemented. The team makes recommendations regarding interventions to be implemented and sets up a process for training the team of teachers, the parents and the students in addition to establishing a means for evaluating the outcome of the interventions. The teams maintains an up-to-date database including date of first referral, interventions previously implemented with outcomes, new interventions, timeline for interventions and evaluation strategies. The team will continue to monitor the student until the team determines that the student no longer requires monitoring (i.e. interventions successful, or interventions unsuccessful and more intensive interventions need to be implemented).

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?

Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? Some of the members of the RtI team are also members of the SAC (School Advisory Council) and share information, insight, and data with the SAC committee regarding needs of students, school and community. The RtI team then trains staff on the implementation of SIP goals and action steps.

#### 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.

- •Members of the team provided input, data, and insight into the RtI process
- •Members of the team provided information as to the support system they will implement

A file maker pro data base was developed to monitor and track the student once they enter the RtI process. The RtI team inputs the interventions and response to interventions for each student during the weekly RtI meetings.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

•Through the professional development plan, staff on the RtI team will be trained in the essential functions of the team, i.e. Progress Monitoring Training, Interventions and Accommodation training, etc. A PLC will also be put in place for team members to train school based staff as well. The PLC will be led by the school psychologist and the school based behavior specialist.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

#### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal, Dr. Ted Toomer

Grade Level Administrators: Debra Harrington, Gina Montagnino, and Thomas Howard, Reading Coach, Aileen Wolfe-Goldhirsh

ESE Specialist Louise Kopf

ELL Coordinators, Tanisha Scott and Ashley Golding;

Grade Level Guidance Counselors: Celeste Bernard, Myra Brahms, Joy Gordon

Media Specialist, Susan Miles

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

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT team meets monthly. The team will function as a resource under the direction and guidance of the Principal and the Reading Coach to train and implement new programs and strategies within classroom settings, will utilize teachers with a proven track record for learning gains to model instructional strategies for teachers of at risk students. The team will also work with the school's stakeholders to build support for the reading programs and initiatives set by the team. The team will engage in on going professional development, participate in professional learning communities to reflect on best practices and key instructional strategies.

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

To increase reading literacy and reading comprehension in our lowest 30th percentile. The entire student population will be assessed using the Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading test (FAIR). Which is used to determine placement into the most appropriate reading program. Students whose placement may not meet the guidelines for the programs in which they were scheduled are given an additional assessment to determine a more appropriate reading program.

#### Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

No Attachment

\*Elementary Title | Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

\*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

• The Reading Coach will provide on-going school-wide training emphasizing instructional strategies for reading

and active teaching techniques used in both content-area classrooms as well as reading classes. The instructional strategies for reading will be based on the nine high yield strategies with a strong emphasis on the top three.

• All teachers will implement the "Book of the Month" activity into their curriculum focus calender.

#### \*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?

M/A

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?

N/A

#### 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 Feedback Report</u>

N/A

#### PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

All students are in the

Reading Goals \* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)). Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in In the previous five years that has been a steady rise in Reading achievement among our students culminating to a reading. period of stagnant scores. The 2012 scores resulted in a sharp decline over previous years. It is expected that 72% c Reading Goal #1a: students score at or above proficiency in FCAT 2.0 Reading. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 35% 28% (491) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy There is a wider range of Use of CRISS strategies Reading Coach, Levels of student Classroom Walkachievement levels in the for differentiating Reading PLC engagement, student through Protocol, instruction and modifing Teachers, and mini-assessment, reading Teacher feedback advanced novel studies classes. appropriately to meet the reading coach observations student minineeds of students. administrator assessments Lack of adequate Use of demonstration Reading Coach Classroom walkthroughs Students mini knowledge to effectively classrooms. Assistant Principal Teacher feedback assessments differentiate instruction. **PLCS** Student work samples One area of weakness on Students need additional Reading Coach, PLC feedback, student FCAT Testmaker the 2012 Reading FCAT exposure to instructional Assistant Principal mini-assessments assessments and test was Reading strategies and activities 2013 Reading FCA 3 2.0 Application. related to author's purpose, main idea, cause and effect, and summarizing. 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. It is expected that 80% of students will score at or above level in FAA Reading. Reading Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 40% 32% (6) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of

Monitoring

Classroom

Implement pre/mid/post

Strategy

1. FAA results

1. Review lesson plans

| 1 | moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities.   | assessments   | Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,<br>Assistant Principal              | and use classroom walkthroughs 2. Review assessment data 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning                       | 2. Professional<br>conversations with<br>individual teachers<br>and SLP to monito<br>effectiveness      |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond.   | Classes are to be staffed<br>with highest ratio<br>possible of staff to<br>students depending upon<br>the needs of the<br>students in each class. | Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,                                     | Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs     Review assessment data     Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | FAA results     Professional     conversations with individual teachers and SLP to monito effectiveness |
| 3 | Communication skills, especially expressive communication is impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | Implement pre/mid/post assessments  | Classroom<br>Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,<br>Assistant Principal | Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs     Review assessment data     Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | FAA results     Professional     conversations with individual teachers and SLP to monito effectiveness |

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:

| Reading Goal #2a:                  | In the previous five years that has been a steady rise in Reading achievement among our students culminating to a period of stagnant scores. The 2012 scores resulted in a sharp decline over previous years. It is expected that 72% c students score at or above proficiency in FCAT 2.0 Reading. |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 32% (556)                          | 37%   |

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| _ |   |  |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|
|   |   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring             | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1 |   | Lack of motivation for students to read.   | Continue program that rewards students for their daily involvement in their reading course. Students who show increases in a variety of measures participate twice a quarter in a Chicken Soup for the Soul reading in which teachers and staff read short stories demonstrating fluency. | Reading Coach and<br>Reading Teachers                              | Teacher evaluation of daily student participation.           | Varied classroom<br>assessments.<br>Reading Logs<br>Student reading<br>attitude survey. |
| 2 | ! | One area of weakness on<br>the 2012 Reading FCAT<br>test was Information<br>Text | Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities related to text features analysis, synthesizing, analyzing, evaluating, creating, and drawing conclusions.   | Reading Coach,<br>Assistant Principal                              | PLC feedback, student<br>mini-assessments                    | FCAT Testmaker<br>assessments and<br>2013 Reading FCA<br>2.0                            |
| 3 | 1 | Advanced and Gifted students are not enrolled in a reading class.                | Enrichment of reading<br>strategies will be<br>provided in Social Studies<br>and Science classes as<br>well as through<br>implementation of   | Content area<br>teachers, Reading<br>Coach, Assistant<br>Principal | Weekly feedback of PLC teachers, student work samples        | FCAT Testmaker<br>assessments and<br>2013 Reading FCA<br>2.0                            |

| IMPA | ACT curriculum in |  |  |
|------|-------------------|--|--|
| Lanç | guage Arts.       |  |  |

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:

It is expected that 80% of students will score at or above level in FAA Reading.

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

32% (6)

40%

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring          | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities.   | Implement pre/mid/post assessments   | Classroom<br>Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,<br>Assistant Principal | 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs 2. Review assessment data 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 1B.1. 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs 2. Review assessment data 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning 1B.1. 1. FAA results 2. Professional conversations with individual teachers and SLP to monito effectiveness |
| 2 | Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond.   | Classes are to be staffed with highest ratio possible of staff to students depending upon the needs of the students in each class. | Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,                                     | Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs     Review assessment data     Weekly conversations and collaborative planning  | FAA results     Professional conversations with individual teachers and SLP to monito effectiveness  |
| 3 | Communication skills, especially expressive communication is impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | Implement pre/mid/post<br>assessments  | Classroom<br>Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,<br>Assistant Principal | Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs     Review assessment data     Weekly conversations and collaborative planning  | FAA results     Professional     conversations with     individual teachers     and SLP to monito     effectiveness  |

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:

> The percentage of students making learning gains in reading has remained steady over the last five years. It is expected that 75% of students will make a learning gain in reading.

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning

|                                | s in reading.<br>ling Goal #3a:  |   | From 2007-2009 students have made learning gains from 62% up to 71% show steady growth over the course of the years. |   |  |   |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| 2012                           | 2 Current Level of Perforn   | nance:  |  | 2013 Expected   | d Level of Performance:  |   |
| 68%                            | (1160)   |   |  | 75%   |  |   |
|                                | Pr   | oblem-Solving Process   | to I   | ncrease Studer  | nt Achievement   |   |
|                                | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | R  | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                           | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1                              | Lack of student motivation   | Continue program that reinforces effort and recognition of reading improvement and rewards students for their daily involvement in their reading course.                                | Reading Coach,<br>Reading Teachers   |   | Teacher evaluation of daily student participation                                      | Varied classroom assessments.   |
| 2                              | One area of weakness on<br>the 2012 Reading FCAT<br>test was Information<br>Text                                       | Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities related to text features analysis, synthesizing, analyzing, evaluating, creating, and drawing conclusions. | Reading Coach,<br>Assistant Principal  |   | PLC feedback, student<br>mini-assessments  | FCAT Testmaker<br>assessments and<br>2013 Reading FCA<br>2.0                          |
| 3                              | One area of weakness on<br>the 2012 Reading FCAT<br>test was Reading<br>Application.                                   | Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities related to author's purpose, main idea, cause and effect, and summarizing.                                 |  | ading Coach,<br>sistant Principal                       | PLC feedback, student<br>mini-assessments  | FCAT Testmaker<br>assessments and<br>2013 Reading FCA<br>2.0                          |
| of im<br>3b. F<br>Perc<br>read | d on the analysis of studen<br>provement for the following<br>lorida Alternate Assessmentage of students makin<br>ing. | group:<br>nent:   | efer   |   | hat 80% of students will   |   |
| 2012                           | 2 Current Level of Perforn   | nance:  |  | 2013 Expected   | d Level of Performance:  |   |
| 46%                            | (8)  |   |  | 50%   |  |   |
|                                | Pr   | oblem-Solving Process   | to I   | ncrease Studer  | nt Achievement   |   |
|                                | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | R  | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                           | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1                              | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities.  | Implement pre/mid/post assessments  | Tea<br>Sp  | issroom<br>acher, ESE<br>ecialist,<br>sistant Principal | Review lesson plans<br>and use classroom<br>walkthroughs     Review assessment<br>data | FAA results     Professional conversations with individual teachers and SLP to monito |

|   |   |   |  |   | 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning  | effectiveness   |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | and ability to respond.   | Classes are to be staffed with highest ratio possible of staff to students depending upon the needs of the students in each class. | Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,                                     | Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs     Review assessment data     Weekly conversations and collaborative planning   | FAA results     Professional     conversations with individual teachers and SLP to monito effectiveness |
|   | 3 | Communication skills, especially expressive communication is impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | Implement pre/mid/post assessments   | Classroom<br>Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,<br>Assistant Principal | <ol> <li>Review lesson plans<br/>and use classroom<br/>walkthroughs</li> <li>Review assessment<br/>data</li> <li>Weekly conversations<br/>and collaborative<br/>planning</li> </ol> | FAA results     Professional     conversations with individual teachers and SLP to monito effectiveness |

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4: | The percentage of students making learning gains in reading has remained steady over the last five years. It is expected that 71% of our lowest quartile students will make a learning gain in reading. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 65% (291)   | 71%   |

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy          | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of cross-curricular<br>focus of weak areas of<br>Reading | The Instructional Focus Calendar will be created to include a monthly focus on specific strands/clusters of reading.  |  | Classroom walk-throughs,<br>PLC Feedback, student<br>mini assessments | FCAT Testmaker<br>assessments and<br>2013 Reading FCA<br>2.0                            |
| 2 | Lack of motivation for students to read.                      | Continue program that rewards students for their daily involvement in their reading course. Students who show increases in a variety of measures participate twice a quarter in a Fed Your Mind, a reading motivation program in which teachers and staff read short stories demonstrating fluency. | Reading Teachers                                       | Teacher evaluation of daily student participation.                    | Varied classroom<br>assessments.<br>Reading Logs<br>Student reading<br>attitude survey. |

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 #

By 2017, the proportion of students meeting proficiency in reading will increas by 50%. A drop in proficiency from baseline for the 2012 year has changed our AMO-2 5A: trajectory.



| Baseline data 2010-2011 2011-2012 |  | 2012-2013 2013-2014  |  | 2014-2015   |                    | 2015-2016  | 2016-2017                               |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--------------------|--|---|--|--|
|                                   |  | 60%  | 63%  | 67%   |                    | 70%  |   | 73%  |  |
| Basec<br>of imp                   | d on the a   | analysis of stud   | ent achieveme  | ent data, and r   | efer               | ence to "Guiding   | J Ques                                  | tions", identify and   | define areas in nee  |
| 5B. S<br>Hispa<br>satist          | tudent s<br>anic, Asia   | ubgroups by ean, American larger   | ethnicity (Wh<br>ndian) not m  |   |                    |  | not ma                                  | ed that the percenta<br>aking satisfactory pro   |  |
| 2012                              | Current  | Level of Perfo   | ormance:   |   |                    | 2013 Expected  | d Leve                                  | el of Performance:   |  |
| Black:<br>Hispa<br>Asian:         | : 34% (2<br>: 53% (16<br>nic: 43%<br>: 38% (31<br>can India                        | 59)<br>(225)   |  |   |                    | White: 31%<br>Black: 48%<br>Hispanic: 39%<br>Asian: 34%<br>American Indian | ı: 41%                                  | ó  |  |
|                                   |  |  | Problem-Sol  | ving Process  | to I r             | ncrease Studer   | nt Ach                                  | ilevement  |  |
|                                   | Antic  | ipated Barrier   | Stı  | rategy  | Re                 | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring                      |   | Process Used to Determine Iffectiveness of Strategy  | Evaluation Too   |
| 1                                 |  | ess to reading<br>of the classroo  | m. center sche   | edule for bi-<br>assroom visits                                       |                    | ading Coach and<br>dia Specialist.   | Media                                   |  | Review lesson<br>plans   |
| 2                                 |  | motivation on t<br>he students to  | Big Read, f<br>National Er<br>the Arts ar  | rom the ndowment for nd distance ading events                         |                    | ading Coach<br>sistant Principal   | 1                                       | ent feedback.<br>ent reading attitude<br>ey.   | Student attitude survey.   |
|                                   |  | nalysis of stud  |  | ent data, and r   | efer               | ence to "Guiding   | ) Ques                                  | tions", identify and   | define areas in nee  |
| 5C. E<br>satist                   | nglish La  | anguage Learn<br>Progress in rea   | ners (ELL) no  | t making  |                    |  |   | d that the percent c<br>rogress in reading w   |  |
| 2012                              | Current  | Level of Perfo   | ormance:   |   |                    | 2013 Expected  | d Leve                                  | el of Performance:   |  |
| 91%                               | (61)   |  |  |   |                    | 82%  |   |  |  |
|                                   |  |  | Problem-Sol  | ving Process  | to I r             | ncrease Studer   | nt Ach                                  | nievement  |  |
|                                   | Antic  | ipated Barrier   | Stı  | rategy  | R                  | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring                      |   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Too   |
| 1                                 | various k<br>and diffe<br>Some ha<br>little exp<br>English.<br>need mo<br>and exte | oosure to<br>These student<br>ore assistance<br>ended learning<br>nities to be | to practice fluency in r situations, differentiat instruction students' in learning ne | and<br>ted<br>to meet<br>ndividual<br>reds, use of<br>ssional to help | ELL<br>Ass<br>Clas | ading Coach<br>. coordinator.<br>.istant Principal<br>ssroom<br>cher       | be m<br>moni<br>acqui<br>readi<br>Teach | ent portfolios will<br>aintained and<br>tored for language<br>sition as well as<br>ng proficiency.<br>hers will meet with<br>student monthly<br>scuss progress and | BAT assessments<br>CWT<br>Visions Unit Tests<br>Teacher<br>observations of<br>students, portfoli<br>assesment throug<br>the use of rubrics |

|   |   | population in the shelteredd reading class and with pull outs. Students will be invited to participate in extended learning opportunities.   |   | Classroom teacher will<br>keep pre/post work<br>samples and conference<br>with each student<br>weekly to discuss<br>progress and set goals |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| 2 | ELL students have difficulty comprehending text that require critical thinking and how text features (graphs, charts, maps) aid in comprehension. | ELL students will be taught CRISS strategies in their content area classes to help with the comprehension of the higher level text.  The Reading Coach will assist the General Education Teacher to reinforce basic study skills and test-taking strategies through the use of CRISS strategies.  ELL students who are struggling in their content area classes will be recommended for Saturday Academy where reinforcement of basic skills and differentiated instruction will be utilize. | Reading Coach<br>Classroom<br>teachers.   | Student portfolio and work samples. Teacher created quizzes Formal assessments   | Summative<br>Assessments<br>BAT I<br>BAT II<br>FCAT                                |
| 3 | Lack of exposure to<br>content area literacy<br>through Common Core<br>Objectives   | B1, B2, and C1 ELL<br>students will participate<br>in Achieve 3000 weekly<br>to increase lexile reading<br>levels and FCAT reading<br>proficiency.   | Reading Coach,<br>Reading Teachers,<br>ELL Coordinators,<br>Assistant Principal | Weekly/Bi-monthly<br>monitoring of student<br>participation in Achieve<br>3000.  | Pre- and Post-<br>Test, FAIR, FCAT<br>Testmaker<br>Assessment, FCAT<br>2.0 Reading |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5D: | By 2013 it is expected that the percent of SWD students no making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 10% |
|--|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 72% (141)  | 65%   |

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                            | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool          |
|---|--|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| 1 | Students have difficulty applying grade level reading skills to informational and literary text. | Differentiated instruction of content area material. | Reading Coach<br>Assistant Principal<br>ESE<br>specialist/support<br>facilitator. |  | BAT<br>CWT<br>Mini BATs  |
|   | SWD have difficulty comprehending text   | Struggling students will receive direct instruction  | Reading Coach<br>ESE support  |  | Summative<br>Assessments |

| 2 | that require critical thinking and how text features (graphs, charts, maps) aid in comprehension. | of CRISS strategies in their reading and core classes. The ESE Facilitator will assist the General Education Reading Teacher to reinforce basic skills, test-taking strategies through CRISS strategies. SWD will be recommended for Saturday Academy where reinforcement of basic skills and differentiate instruction. |  | Teacher created quizzes | BAT I<br>BAT II<br>FCAT |
|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|

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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E: | By 2013 it is expected that the percent of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 10%. |
|---|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 48% (450)   | 43%  |

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier                               | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool             |
|---|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Student motivation and lack of content knowledge. | Involve students in the Big Read, from the National Endowment for the Arts, Distance Learning Book talks, and literacy related events. Use of Edmodo or other school board approved blogs to create interest in books. | Reading Coach<br>Assistant Principal                   | Student feedback.<br>Student reading attitude<br>survey.     | Student attitude<br>survey. |
| 2 | Less access to reading outside the classroom.     | Reinforce the media center schedule for bimonthly classroom visits to the library.   | Reading Coach<br>and Media<br>Specialist.              | Media Schedules  | Review lesson<br>plans.     |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus  PD Facilitate and/or PLC Level/Subject Leader | ( 3 / | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible fo<br>Monitoring |
|---|-------|--|---------------------------------------|---|
|---|-------|--|---------------------------------------|---|

| CRISS  | 6-8 | Reading<br>Coach                              | Reading Teachers | January 2013 | Observations Student | Reading Coach,<br>Reading<br>Department Hea<br>Assistant Princip |
|--|-----|---|------------------|--------------|----------------------|--|
| DISTANCE<br>LEARNING<br>AND<br>READING<br>MOTIVATION | 6-8 | Reading<br>Coach,<br>Technology<br>Specialist | School-wide      | June 2013    | Collaborations,      | Reading Coach,<br>Reading<br>Department Hea<br>Assistant Princip |

### Reading Budget:

|                   |                | (s)/Material(s)          | Evidence-based Program  |
|-------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Availab<br>Amoui  | Funding Source | Description of Resources | Strategy                |
| \$0.0             | No Data        | No Data                  | No Data                 |
| Subtotal: \$0.    | -              |                          |                         |
|                   |                |                          | Technology              |
| Availab<br>Amoui  | Funding Source | Description of Resources | Strategy                |
| \$0.0             | No Data        | No Data                  | No Data                 |
| Subtotal: \$0.    |                |                          |                         |
|                   |                | t                        | Professional Developmer |
| Availab<br>Amoui  | Funding Source | Description of Resources | Strategy                |
| \$0.0             | No Data        | No Data                  | No Data                 |
| Subtotal: \$0.    |                |                          |                         |
|                   |                |                          | Other                   |
| Availab<br>Amoui  | Funding Source | Description of Resources | Strategy                |
| \$0.0             | No Data        | No Data                  | No Data                 |
| Subtotal: \$0.    |                |                          |                         |
| Grand Total: \$0. |                |                          |                         |

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. Stu  | 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.  By 2013, it is expected that 60% of ELL students will |                  |  |  |                 |  |
| CELLA Goal #1:  |  |                  | ,  | score proficient in CELLA listening/speaking.                |                 |  |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:  |  |                  |  |  |                 |  |
| 53%   | (60)   |                  |  |  |                 |  |
|   | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  |                  |  |  |                 |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy         | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |
|   | A!-A2 ELL students   | Students will be | ELL Coordinator,                                       | Student oral reports;  | CELLA, IPT-II   |  |

| 1 | know comprehend only small chunks of English or non at all. |   | ELL Administrator                    | teacher feedback |               |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|
|   | Acquisition   | participate in Rosetta<br>Stone twice a week to<br>supplement instruction | Reading Coach,<br>ELL Administrator; | Stone use and    | CELLA, IPT-II |

| Stude | Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. |  |   |  |                 |  |
|-------|---|--|---|--|-----------------|--|
|       | Students scoring proficient in reading.  CELLA Goal #2:                               |  |   | By 2013, it is expected that 20% of ELL students will score proficient in CELLA reading. |                 |  |
| 2012  | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:                               |  |   |  |                 |  |
| 14%   | 14% (17)  |  |   |  |                 |  |
|       | 110   | blem-Solving Process t   | . The ease stade  | T. T. C. T. C.                                       |                 |  |
|       | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring  | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                             | Evaluation Tool |  |
| 1     | ELL students lack reading comprehension and vocabulary skills.                        | Students will participate in Achieve 3000 each week with a goal to complete two articles per week. | ELL Coordinator,<br>Reading Coach,<br>ELL Administrator | Regular monitor of student lexile gains and loses on Achieve 3000.                       | CELLA           |  |

| Stude   | Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. |   |   |  |                 |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|-----------------|--|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: |   |   |   | By 2013, it is expected that 35% of ELL students will score proficient in CELLA writing. |                 |  |
| 2012  | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:                           |   |   |  |                 |  |
| 31%   | 31% (37)  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement                 |   |   |  |                 |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                            | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                             | Evaluation Tool |  |
| 1   | Students need increased opportunities to write in English.                        | ESOL endorsed content-area teachers will utilize a variety of methods for summary writing and rephrasing as opposed to copying information from a text. | ELL Coordinator,<br>Reading Coach,<br>ELL Administrator,<br>classroom<br>teachers | Student work samples,<br>teacher feedback  | CELLA           |  |

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

End of CELLA 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: In the previous five years that has been a steady rise in 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Mathematics achievement among our students culminating to mathematics. a period of stagnant scores. The 2012 scores resulted in a sharp decline over previous years. It is expected that 72% c Mathematics Goal #1a: students score at or above proficiency in FCAT 2.0 Mathematics. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 28% (496) 31% Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy 6-8 students Implementation of Mathematics Analysis of county BAT, FCAT demonstrated a strand-specific FCATdepartment chair, benchmark assessment Testmaker, Teacher weakness in geometry style test (BAT) results, as Assistant Principal made tests and measurement. questioning, including well as county gridded mathematics response assessment results during professional learning community meetings Lack of cross-curricular Current IFC will support Math and Science Classroom walk-throughs, BAT, FCAT planning between math data analysis, charting, Department Heads, PLCs, student work Testmaker, Teacher and science. graphing and number Math and Science samples made tests sense. Teachers Lack of innovative Feedback on informal and Mathematics Classroom walkthroughs, Teacher-made instruction to improve formal observations with Department Chair, informal and formal assessments. student learning and discussion focused on Assistant Principal. observations using Student grades and retention. effectiveness of iObserve. BAT II scores. instructional strategies. 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. It is expected that 80% of students will score at or above level in FAA Math. Mathematics Goal #1b: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 58% (11) 66% Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Evaluation Tool Anticipated Barrier** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy All students are in the 1. Touch Math Classroom 1. Review lesson plans 1. FAA results moderate to profound

Teacher, ESE

and use classroom

walkthroughs

Curriculum- a

multisensory program to Specialist,

range of cognitive

2. Professional

conversations with

| 1 | disabilities  | engage students of all abilities and learning styles 2. Steck Vauhgn Mastering Math- straightforward instruction, simple designs, low readability and plenty of practice 3. SRA Connecting Math Concepts- Direct Instruction math program 4. Discreet Trial Trainer- software with math programs for students with Autism and other learning disabilities. DT Trainer is based on Applied Behavioral Analysis. 5. Edmark Millie's Math House- Software that teaches fundamental math concepts and thinking skills in a kid- friendly format 6. Basic Picture Math software to help beginning, struggling, and nonreaders improve basic |   | Review assessment data     Weekly conversations and collaborative planning  | individual teachers to monitor effectiveness   |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
|   | Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond.   | math skills  1.Touch Math Curriculum- a multisensory program to engage students of all abilities and learning styles 2.Steck Vauhgn Mastering Math- straightforward instruction, simple designs, low readability and plenty of practice 3.SRA Connecting Math Concepts- Direct Instruction math program  | Classroom<br>Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,<br>Assistant Principal | Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs     Review assessment data     Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | FAA results     Professional     conversations with     individual teachers     to monitor     effectiveness |
| 2 |   | 4.Discreet Trial Trainer- software with math programs for students with Autism and other learning disabilities. DT Trainer is based on Applied Behavioral Analysis. 5.Edmark Millie's Math House- Software that teaches fundamental math concepts and thinking skills in a kid- friendly format 6.Basic Picture Math software to help beginning, struggling, and nonreaders improve basic math skills  |   |   |  |
|   | Communication skills, especially expressive communication, are impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | 1.Touch Math Curriculum- a multisensory program to engage students of all abilities and learning styles 2.Steck Vauhgn Mastering Math- straightforward   | Classroom<br>Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,<br>Assistant Principal | Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs     Review assessment data     Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | FAA results     Professional     conversations with     individual teachers     to monitor     effectiveness |

|   | instruction, simple designs, low readability and plenty of practice 3.SRA Connecting Math Concepts- Direct Instruction math program  |
|---|--|
| 3 | 4. Discreet Trial Trainer- software with math programs for students with Autism and other learning disabilities. DT Trainer is based on Applied Behavioral Analysis. 5. Edmark Millie's Math House- Software that teaches fundamental math concepts and thinking skills in a kid- friendly format 6. Basic Picture Math software to help beginning, struggling, and nonreaders improve basic math skills |

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:

| Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a: | In the previous five years that has been a steady rise in Mathematics achievement among our students culminating to a period of stagnant scores. The 2012 scores resulted in a sharp decline over previous years. It is expected that 72% c students score at or above proficiency in FCAT 2.0 Mathematics. |
|--|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:             | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 31% (551)                                      | 35%   |

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| L |   |  |                          |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--------------------------|--|--|--|
|   |   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy                 | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool                              |
|   |   | 6-8 students<br>demonstrated a<br>weakness in geometry<br>and measurement. | strand-specific FCAT-    | Assistant Principal                                    | Analysis of county<br>benchmark assessment<br>test (BAT) results, as<br>well as county<br>mathematics<br>assessment results<br>during professional<br>learning community<br>meetings | BAT, FCAT<br>Testmaker,Teacher<br>made tests |
|   | 2 | Lack of cross-curricular planning between math and science.                | data analysis, charting, | Department Heads,                                      | Classroom walk-throughs,<br>PLCs, student work<br>samples  | BAT, FCAT<br>Testmaker,<br>Teacher-made test |

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in

Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #2b:

It is expected that 80% of students will score at or above level in FAA Math.

| 2012                               | Current Level of Perfor  | mance:  | 2013 Expected   | d Level of Performance:  |   |  |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| 11%                                | (2)  |   | 14%   |  |   |  |
|                                    | Р  | roblem-Solving Process t  | to Increase Stude   | nt Achievement   |   |  |
|                                    | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring          | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  | Evaluation Too  |  |
| 1                                  | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities  Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond.  Communication skills, especially expressive communication, are impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | 1.Touch Math Curriculum- a multisensory program to engage students of all abilities and learning styles 2.Steck Vauhgn Mastering Math- straightforward instruction,simple designs, low readability and plenty of practice 3.SRA Connecting Math Concepts- Direct Instruction math program 4.Discreet Trial Trainer- software with math programs for students with Autism and other learning disabilities. DT Trainer is based on Applied Behavioral Analysis. 5.Edmark Millie's Math House- Software that teaches fundamental math concepts and thinking skills in a kid- friendly format 6.Basic Picture Math software to help beginning, struggling, and nonreaders improve basic math skills | Classroom<br>Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,<br>Assistant Principal | 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs 2. Review assessment data 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning   | 1. FAA results 2. Professional conversations wi individual teacher to monitor effectiveness |  |
| of im                              | provement for the following  | nt achievement data, and re<br>g group:<br>students making learning   |   |  |   |  |
| gains                              | in mathematics.  | stadents making tearring  | mathematics ha  | The percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics has remained steady over the last five years. I is expected that 74% of students will make a learning gain ir mathematics. |   |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |   | 2013 Expected   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |   |  |
| 57%                                | (1140)   |   | 74%   |  |   |  |
|                                    | Р  | roblem-Solving Process t  | to Increase Stude   | nt Achievement   |   |  |
|                                    | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring          | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Too  |  |
|                                    | Lack of innovative instruction to improve  | Feedback on informal and formal observations with   | Mathematics   | Classroom walkthroughs, informal and formal  | Teacher-made assessments.   |  |

|   |   | retention.            | discussion focused on effectiveness of instructional strategies. | · ·                  |                         | Student grades and BAT II scores. |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|   |   | '                     |  |                      | Classroom walkthroughs, |                                   |
| - | 2 | 5 1 5                 |  | 1                    |                         | assessments.                      |
| - | _ | excessive remediation | greater use of effective   | Assistant Principal. |                         | Student grades                    |
|   |   |                       | strategies   |                      | iObserve.               | and BAT II scores.                |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3b: | It is expected that 80% of students will score at or above level in FAA Math. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 47% (8)   | 52%   |

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| ŀ |   |  | Person or                                 | Process Used to   | <u> </u>   |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
|   | Anticipated   | Barrier Strategy   | Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |
|   | All students are moderate to pro range of cognitic disabilities  Behavioral disability to recommunication especially expresed in marthus impacting students' ability express their recommunication. | ofound Curriculum- a multisensory program engage students of a abilities and learning styles on time 2.Steck Vauhgn Mastering Math- straightforward instruction, simple designs, low readabili are and plenty of practice y cases 3.SRA Connecting Ma Concepts- Direct Instruction math prog | ty e tth ram er- s r t and                | Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs     Review assessment data     Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | FAA results     Professional     conversations with     individual teachers     to monitor     effectiveness |

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.

The percentage of students making learning gains in math has remained steady over the last five years. It is expected

| Mathematics Goal #4:  |                                  |   |   |   | that 61% of our lowest quartile students will make a learning gain in mathematics.  |  |                                    |  |   |
|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 2012  | ? Current                        | Level of Perf   | formance:   |   | :   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:                                |                                    |  |   |
| 55% (249)   |                                  |   |   | d   | 61%   |  |                                    |  |   |
|   |                                  |   | Problem-Sol   | ving Process  | toIn  | icrease Studer   | nt Ach                             | ievement   |   |
|   | Antio                            | sipated Barrie  | r St  | rategy  | 1   | Person or<br>Position<br>sponsible for<br>Monitoring               |                                    | rocess Used to Determine ffectiveness of Strategy                            | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | compreh<br>may hav<br>difficulty | s with cies in reading nension skills ve increased y with NGSSS oblem situation | for student<br>responding<br>to core ins<br>supplement<br>instruction | ts not  ts not  truction plus tal  em-solving in Florida  NGSSS tal | coad<br>mat<br>depa<br>class  | hematics<br>ch and<br>hematics<br>artment chair,<br>sroom<br>chers | reviev<br>count<br>asses<br>during | sment data<br>g mathematics<br>ng community                                  | County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2010; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS |
| 2   | foundati                         | s lack a strong<br>ion in<br>ental concepts                                     | g Greater us<br>manipulativ   | e of<br>ve materials to<br>nderstanding                             | depa  | hematics<br>artment chair,<br>sroom teachers                       | asses<br>throu                     | ers will regularly<br>s understanding<br>gh the use of<br>nt response boards | Teacher made assessments and the use of preand post-tests.  |
| Measi   | urable Ob<br>ol will red         | but Achievable<br>ojectives (AMO<br>uce their achie                             | s). In six year   | By 2017,<br>mathemat  | the<br>ics<br>elin  | will increase  | of stu                             | dents meeting pr<br>10%. A drop in pr<br>ar has changed ou                   | oficiency   |
| l   | line data<br>0-2011              | 2011-2012   | 2012-2013   | 2013-201  | 4   | 2014-201   | 5                                  | 2015-2016  | 2016-2017   |
|   |                                  | 60%   | 63%   | 67%   |   | 70%  |                                    | 73%  |   |
|   |                                  | analysis of stud  |   | ent data, and r   | efere   | nce to "Guiding  | J Ques                             | tions", identify and   | define areas in nee   |
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B: |                                  |   |   | (   | In 2013, it is expected that the percentage of students in our subgroups not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 10%.  2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |                                    |  |   |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  |                                  |   | :   |   |   |  |                                    |  |   |
| White: 34% (251) Black: 53% (169) Hispanic: 43% (225) Asian: 38% (31) American Indian: 46% (5)  |                                  |   |   | <br>  | White: 30%<br>Black: 48%<br>Hispanic: 39%<br>Asian: 34%<br>American Indian  | ı: 41%   |                                    |  |   |
|   |                                  |   | Problem-Sol   | ving Process  | to In   | icrease Studer   |                                    |  |   |
|   | 1                                |   |   |   |   | Person or  | P                                  | rocess Used to   |   |

|   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy              | Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|--|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| 1 | Students need a greater understanding of the implications of past assessment results |                       | Department Chair,                         | Evaluation of scores on<br>BATI, BAT II and NGSSS                                | Improved grades and passing rates. Increased proficiency on standardized tests and increased enrollment in advanced and honors classes. |
| 2 | fundamental mathematics  | spiraling of concepts | Department Chair,                         | Progress monitoring of pre and post tests, data chats and web-based assessments. | Interim reports an results of teachermade pre- and post- tests.   |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5C: | By 2013 it is expected that the percent of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 10%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 91% (61)  | 82%   |

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   |   | Anticipated Barrier     | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                          | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|---|-------------------------|--|--|---|---|
|   | 1 | questions require       | strategies to decode<br>general and content area | Head, Assistant  | Teacher-made tests, mini<br>assessments, classroom<br>observation and student<br>work | '   |
| 2 |   | fundamental mathematics | spiraling of concepts                            | Department Chair,<br>Assistant Principal               | pre and post tests, data chats and web-based  | Interim reports an results of teachermade pre- and post- tests. |

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

|                                    | By 2013 it is expected that the percent of SWD students no making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 10%. |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 72% (141)                          | 65%  |

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier      | Strategy                | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
|  | Students with individual | ESE-certified personnel | ESE specialist,  | Analysis of county   | County          |

|   | scheduled into<br>mainstream academic                    | will provide additional<br>services, including<br>remediation and<br>alternative,<br>supplemental lesson<br>delivery | ESE support<br>facilitators                             | test (BAT) results, as<br>well as county<br>mathematics<br>assessment results<br>during professional<br>learning community<br>meetings | benchmark<br>assessment test<br>(BAT)<br>administrations in<br>September and<br>December 2010;<br>periodic county<br>mathematics<br>assessments<br>based on NGSSS |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| 2 | Lack of proficiency with fundamental mathematics skills. |  | Mathematics<br>Department Chair,<br>Assistant Principal | pre and post tests, data chats and web-based   | Interim reports an results of teachermade pre- and post- tests.   |

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

| Mothernation Coal #FF              | By 2013 it is expected that the percent of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 10%. |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 48% (450)                          | 43%  |

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring     | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | Students may require targeted, supplemental academic instruction to achieve proficiency   | Students will be given opportunity to attend twice-weekly after school tutoring (budget permitting) beginning in December 2010/January 2011, as well as Saturday School program for strandspecific FCAT preparation | Title I<br>coordinator,<br>classroom<br>teachers           | Principal designee and classroom teachers will monitor participation levels in the tutoring and Saturday School programs | After school<br>tutoring and<br>Saturday School<br>attendance log   |
| 2 | Teacher lack of familiarity with alternative lesson planning/delivery methods to reach students scheduled for mainstream academic classes | Differentiated instruction  | Mathematics<br>professional<br>learning<br>community chair | Classroom walkthroughs   | County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2010; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS |
| 3 | Lack of proficiency with fundamental mathematics skills.  | Remediation through spiraling of concepts during warm-ups.  | Mathematics<br>Department Chair,<br>Assistant Principal    | Progress monitoring of pre and post tests, data chats and web-based assessments.   | Interim reports an results of teacher made pre- and post- tests.  |

End of Middle School Mathematics Goz

# Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

| of imp | provement for the following   | group:  |                        |   |   |   |  |  |
|--------|---|---|------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1. Stu | udents scoring at Achiev  | ement Level 3 in Algebr   | a.                     | It is expected that 00% of students score at an above                           |   |   |  |  |
| Algeb  | ora Goal #1:  |   |                        | It is expected that 99% of students score at or above proficiency in Algebra I. |   |   |  |  |
| 2012   | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:  |                        | 2013 Expected   | d Level of Performance:   |   |  |  |
| 23%    | (33)  |   |                        | 17%   |   |   |  |  |
|        | Pr  | oblem-Solving Process   | to I                   | ncrease Studer  | nt Achievement  |   |  |  |
|        | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | R                      | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring                           | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy            | Evaluation Too                                  |  |  |
| 1      | New placement requirements made students eligible for Algebra I that may not have been enrolled prior to high school. Students, therefore, may not adjust well to the rigor of an Algebra I course. |   | Hea                    | th Department<br>ad, Assistant<br>ncipal  | Teacher-made tests,<br>formative assessment                             | Algebra BAT and<br>Algebra EOC                  |  |  |
| 2      | Remediation is needed for benchmarks not mastered in prior grades.  |   | Hea                    | th Department<br>ad, Assistant<br>ncipal  | Use benchmark assessment data to monitor student progress               | Broward<br>Assessment Test<br>BAT II            |  |  |
| 3      | Lack of consistency in determining student progress toward mastery of benchmarks.   | Teachers will use web-<br>based programs to<br>monitor student progress<br>and assess weaknesses. | Неа                    | th Department<br>ad, Assistant<br>ncipal  | Web-based data collection and sharing of results of common assessments. | Data from web-<br>based assessmen<br>and BAT II |  |  |
|        | I on the analysis of studen<br>provement for the following  |   | efer                   | ence to "Guiding  | Questions", identify and o  | define areas in nee                             |  |  |
| 2. Stu | udents scoring at or abo  | ve Achievement Levels   | 4                      |   |   |   |  |  |
|        | in Algebra.<br>ora Goal #2:   |   |                        | It is expected t<br>proficiency in Al   | hat 99% of students score<br>Igebra I.                                  | e at or above                                   |  |  |
| 2012   | Current Level of Perforr  | nance:  |                        | 2013 Expected   | d Level of Performance:   |   |  |  |
| 77%    | (110)   |   |                        | 83%   |   |   |  |  |
|        | Pr  | oblem-Solving Process   | to I                   | ncrease Studer  | nt Achievement  |   |  |  |
|        | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | R                      | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring                           | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy            | Evaluation Too                                  |  |  |
| 1      | Lack of exposure to<br>difficult test item and<br>complex questions in<br>chapter tests   | Increased used of test item specs in the development of teachermade assessments.                  | Ma <sup>s</sup><br>Hea | th Department<br>ad   | Student classroom assessments scores                                    | Algebra BAT and<br>Algebra EOC                  |  |  |
| 2      | Incorporation of assessed benchmark assignments into honors algebra.  | Use of spiraling<br>assignments aligned to<br>the NGSSS.  | De                     | thematics<br>partment Chair,<br>sistant Principal                               | Classroom walkthroughs,<br>PLCs and sharing of best<br>practices        | Results of BATII and EOC exams.                 |  |  |

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

| I   | us but Achievable<br>Objectives (AMO  |  |                | 201                           |   |              |  | students takin   |                 |   |
|---|---|--|----------------|-------------------------------|---|--------------|--|--|-----------------|---|
|   | reduce their achie  |  | to maint       | ain                           | a 90% or  | high         | er pa  | gner on the lassing rate de scores being                   | espi            |   |
| Baseline da<br>2010-2017  | 2011-2012   | 2012-2013  | 2013-201       | 4                             | 2014-2015 2015-20   |              | 2015-2016  | 2016-2017  |                 |   |
|   | 0.7%  | <10%   | <10%           |                               | <10%  |              |  | <10%   |                 |   |
|   | ne analysis of stu-   |  |                | efer                          | ence to "Gu   | uiding       | Ques   | tions", identify   | and o           | define areas in nee   |
| 3B. Studen<br>Hispanic, A                                       | nt subgroups by<br>Asian, American<br>Ty progress in Al   | ethnicity (What Indian) not n                            | nite, Black,   |                               |   |              |  |  |                 |   |
| Algebra Go  | oal #3B:  |  |                |                               |   |              |  |  |                 |   |
| 2012 Curre  | ent Level of Perf   | formance:  |                |                               | 2013 Expe   | ected        | Leve   | el of Performar  | nce:            |   |
|   |   |  |                |                               |   |              |  |  |                 |   |
|   |   | Problem-So   | Iving Process  | to I i                        | ncrease St  | uden         | t Ach  | ievement   |                 |   |
|   |   |  | Р              | ersc                          | on or   | Dana         | !  |  |                 |   |
| Anticipate  | Anticipated Barrier Strategy  |  |                | Posit<br>Resp<br>for<br>Monit |   | Dete<br>Effe | cess Used to<br>ermine<br>ectiveness of<br>ategy |  | Evaluation Tool |   |
|   |   |  |                |                               | Submitted   |              |  |  |                 |   |
|   |   |  |                |                               |   |              |  |  |                 |   |
|   | ne analysis of student for the follow   |  |                | efer                          | ence to "Gu   | uiding       | Ques   | tions", identify   | and o           | define areas in nee   |
| _   | n Language Lear<br>ry progress in Al  |  | ot making      |                               | In 2013, it   | is ex        | pecte  | d that the perc  | entag           | ge of students in   |
| Algebra Go  |   | g = 2. a.  |                |                               |   | ups n        | ot ma  | king satisfactor   |                 | gress in Algebra I  |
| 2012 Curre  | ent Level of Perf   | formance:  |                |                               | 2013 Expe   | ected        | Leve   | el of Performar  | nce:            |   |
| White: 0<br>Black: 0<br>Hispanic: 39<br>Asian: 0<br>American In |   |  |                |                               | White: 0<br>Black: 0<br>Hispanic: 2<br>Asian: 0<br>American I |              | : n/a  |  |                 |   |
|   |   | Problem-So   | Iving Process  | to I                          | ncrease St  | uden         | t Ach  | ievement   |                 |   |
| An  | iticipated Barrie   | r St   | rategy         | R                             | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible<br>Monitorin              | for          |  | rocess Used to<br>Determine<br>ffectiveness of<br>Strategy |                 | Evaluation Tool   |
| enroll there differences subgr increa                           | limited prior<br>ment in algebra,<br>was no significa<br>ence among ethr<br>oups. However,<br>ased may create<br>ence seen outsid<br>gebra. | in algebra and BAT re discern if e performane ethnic sub | differences in | Cla                           | ssroom tead   |              | asses  | ner-made<br>sments, studen<br>s, BAT II result             |                 | Grades and standardized test scores consistent with school-wide averages and no significant differences by ethnic subgroup. |

| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f  | f student achievemen<br>following subgroup: | t data, and ref                            | erence to "G   | uiding Questions", iden                                      | tify and define areas in r |
|--|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| 3D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress   |   | naking                                     |  |  |                            |
| Algebra Goal #3D:  | J   |  |  |  |                            |
| 2012 Current Level of  | Performance:                                |  | 2013 Exp   | pected Level of Perfor                                       | mance:                     |
|  |   |  |  |  |                            |
|  | Problem-Solvi                               | ng Process to                              | Increase S   | tudent Achievement   |                            |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Pos<br>Res<br>for   |   | rson or<br>sition<br>sponsible<br>nitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool  |                            |
|  | '   |  | a Submitted  |  |                            |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the factorial description of t | following subgroup:<br>dvantaged students   |  | erence to "G   | uiding Questions", iden                                      | tify and define areas in r |
| Algebra Goal #3E:  |   |  |  |  |                            |
| 2012 Current Level of  | Performance:                                |  | 2013 Exp   | pected Level of Perform                                      | mance:                     |
|  |   |  |  |  |                            |
|  | Problem-Solvi                               | ng Process to                              | Increase S   | tudent Achievement   |                            |
| Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy                                    | Pos<br>Res<br>for                          | rson or<br>sition<br>sponsible<br>nitoring                   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool            |
|  |   | No Dat                                     | a Submitted  |  |                            |
|  |   |  |  |  | End of Algebra EOC         |
| Geometry End-of-( * When using percentages,  |   |  | ercentage repr   | esents (e.a. 70% (35))                                       |                            |
| Based on the analysis of   |   |  |  |  | tify and define areas      |
| in need of improvement  1. Students scoring at Geometry.   | for the following grou                      | ıp:  |  | -  |                            |
| Geometry Goal #1:  |   |  |  |  |                            |

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

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

|   | I on the analysis of studeed of improvement for the | ent achievement data, ar<br>e following group: | nd r | eference to "Gu   | iding Questions", identify                                   | y and define areas                   |  |  |
|---|---|--|------|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <ul><li>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels</li><li>4 and 5 in Geometry.</li><li>Geometry Goal #2:</li></ul> |   |  |      | It is expected that 100% of students score at or above proficiency in Geometry. |  |                                      |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  |   |  |      | 2013 Expecte  | d Level of Performance                                       | <b>)</b> :                           |  |  |
| 100% (20)   |   |  |      | 100%  |  |                                      |  |  |
|   | Prol  | olem-Solving Process t                         | :o I | ncrease Stude   | nt Achievement   |                                      |  |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier Strategy R                      |  | Re   | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring                           | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool                      |  |  |
| 1   |   |  | Ŭ    |   | Student work, student assessment scores                      | Geometry BAT<br>and Geometry<br>EOC. |  |  |

| 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 reduce their achievement gap by 50%.  Geometry Goal #  100% of the students enrolled in GEM8 Geometry Honors will make satisfactory progress.  3A: |    |           |           |           |           |  |  |  |
| Baseline data 2012-2013  |    | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |  |  |  |
|  | 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 Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3B:

In 2013, it is expected that the percentage of students in our subgroups not making satisfactory progress in Geometry will decrease by 10%.

| 2012                               | Current Level of Perfo  | rmance:                             | 2013 Evnecte  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:                          |                           |  |  |  |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Ferformance. |   |                                     | 2013 Expecte  | a Level of Ferrormane  | ٥.                        |  |  |  |
| Hispanic: 0                        |   |                                     | White: 0<br>Black: n/a<br>Hispanic: 0<br>Asian: 0<br>American India | Black: n/a<br>Hispanic: 0                                    |                           |  |  |  |
|                                    | Prob  | olem-Solving Process t              | o Increase Stude  | nt Achievement   |                           |  |  |  |
|                                    | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy                            | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring              | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool           |  |  |  |
| 1                                  |   | expectations and continue to infuse | Classroom<br>teacher,<br>Department Chair,<br>Assistant Principal   |  | Bat II and EOC<br>scores. |  |  |  |
|                                    |   |                                     |   |  |                           |  |  |  |
|                                    | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: |                                     |   |  |                           |  |  |  |
| 3C. E                              | 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making  |                                     |   |  |                           |  |  |  |

| Based on the analysis o<br>in need of improvement                                 |                     |   | reference to   | o "Guiding Questions", | identify and define areas |
|---|---------------------|---|--|------------------------|---------------------------|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. |                     |   |  |                        |                           |
| Geometry Goal #3C:  |                     |   |  |                        |                           |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  |                     |   | 2013 Exp   | ected Level of Perfor  | mance:                    |
|   |                     |   |  |                        |                           |
|   | Problem-Solving Pro | ocess to                                | Increase S   | tudent Achievement     |                           |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Res  |                     | son or<br>ition<br>ponsible<br>iitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool        |                           |
|   |                     | No Data                                 | Submitted  |                        |                           |

|  |  | eference to  | "Guiding Questions"   | , identify and define areas  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. |  |  |   |  |
|  |  |  |   |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |  |  | ected Level of Perfo  | ormance:   |
|  |  |  |   |  |
| Problem-Solving Pr   | ocess to I   | ncrease S  | tudent Achievemen   | t  |
| Strategy   | Posit<br>Resp<br>for   | ion<br>onsible   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool  |
|  | for the following subgrobilities (SWD) not man Geometry.  Performance:  Problem-Solving Pr | for the following subgroup: bilities (SWD) not making n Geometry.  Performance:  Problem-Solving Process to I  Strategy  Personal Resp for | for the following subgroup:  bilities (SWD) not making n Geometry.  Performance:  2013 Exp  Problem-Solving Process to Increase S  Person or Position Responsible | bilities (SWD) not making n Geometry.  Performance:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievemen  Person or Position Responsible for Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy |

|   | ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas need of improvement for the following subgroup: |   |  |                       |         |  |
|---|---|---|--|-----------------------|---------|--|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3E: |   |   |  |                       |         |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  |   |   | 2013 Exp   | pected Level of Perfo | rmance: |  |
|   |   |   |  |                       |         |  |
|   | Problem-Solving P   | rocess to                                 | Increase S   | Student Achievement   |         |  |
| Anticipated Barrier   | Pos<br>Res<br>for   | son or<br>sition<br>sponsible<br>nitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>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

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

| PD Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC Focus |     | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants<br>(e.g. , PLC, subject,<br>grade level, or<br>school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g.,<br>early release) and<br>Schedules (e.g.,<br>frequency of<br>meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring            | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring |
|---------------------------------------|-----|--|---|--|---|--|
| Differentiated<br>Instruction         | 6-8 | PLC facilitator                        | entire math<br>department   | Weekly PLC<br>Meetings   | conferencing,<br>lesson plan check,<br>observations | department<br>chair, assistant<br>principal            |
| Manipulatives<br>in Math              | 6-8 | Department<br>Chair                    | entire math<br>department   | Early Release<br>Training  | conferencing,<br>lesson plan check,<br>observations | department<br>chair, assistant<br>principal            |
| Common<br>Core<br>Standards           | 6-8 | PLC facilitator                        | By grade level or course (ALG GEO)  | Weekly PLC<br>Meetings   | conferencing,<br>lesson plan check,<br>observations | department<br>chair, assistant<br>principal            |

#### Mathematics Budget:

| Strategy   | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
|------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data    | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|            |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Гесhnology |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy   | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data    | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|            |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |

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

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)).

|                                    | d on the analysis of stude in need of improvemen   |   |  | Guiding Questions", ider  | ntify and define  |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| Level 3 in science.                |  |   | in Science ach to a period of  | s five years there has b<br>ievement among our stu<br>leveled scores. It is exp<br>ore at or above proficie | udents culminating<br>pected that 50%                     |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |   | 2013 Expecte   | ed Level of Performan   | ce:   |
| 34% (209)                          |  |   | 38%  |   |   |
|                                    | Prob   | lem-Solving Process t   | o Increase Stude   | ent Achievement   |   |
|                                    | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1                                  | Increase student exposure to hands-on inquiry lessons.   | Teachers will continue using hands-on activities weekly, incorporating science process skills.  | Science Coach<br>and Science<br>Department<br>Chair, Science<br>Teachers | Weekly PLC's and<br>common lesson<br>planning   | Student lab<br>reports and mini<br>assessments.           |
| 2                                  | Students need reinforcement of reading skills and science process writing.   | Students will utilize<br>FCAT prep skills in<br>science classrooms<br>using textbook<br>ancillaries.                                  | Science Coach<br>and Science<br>Department<br>Chair, Science<br>Teachers | Common assessments,<br>weekly PLCs  | student mini<br>assessements,<br>student work<br>samples  |
| 3                                  | Students lack<br>adequate exposure to<br>science inquiry in<br>weekly instructional<br>strategies.   | Teachers will be<br>trained to use the<br>Interface for Scientific<br>Learning and Natural<br>Discovery (ISLANDS)<br>IMACS curriculum | District Science<br>Supervisor,<br>Science Coach,<br>Department Chair    | Classroom Walk-<br>throughs, IMACS<br>management system   | Student mini<br>assessments,<br>usage summary<br>reports. |
| 4                                  | Earth and Space Science teachers will science is an area of weakness and students require more IMACS and Gizmos as IMACS and G |   | Science<br>Department<br>Head, Science<br>Coach, Assistant<br>Principal  | Student engagement,<br>classroom<br>observations, teacher<br>assessments                                    | Mini-assessment,<br>BAT, FCAT<br>Science                  |

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 Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b: |                     |                       | It is expected above level in                          | that 50% of students will score at or FAA Science.           |  |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:                                   |                     |                       | 2013 Expecte   | ed Level of Performan  | ce:  |
| 29% (2)  |                     |                       | 35%  |  |  |
|  | Prob                | lem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude                                       | ent Achievement  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy              | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1  |                     |                       |  | Classroom<br>walkthroughs, monitor<br>lesson plans           | 1. FAA results 2. Professional conversations with individual teachers to monitor effectiveness |

| 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: |  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Achievement Level 4 in science.  Science Goal #2a:   |  |  | in Science ach to a period of   | s five years there has be<br>ievement among our st<br>leveled scores. It is ex<br>ore at or above proficion | udents culminating<br>pected that 50%  |
| 2012   | Current Level of Perf  | ormance:   | 2013 Expecte  | ed Level of Performan   | ce:  |
| 9% (53)  |  |  | 12%   |   |  |
|  | Prob   | lem-Solving Process t  | o Increase Stude  | ent Achievement   |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1  | Students lack<br>adequate enrichment<br>to maintain high levels<br>of achievement.                 | 6th-8th grade<br>students will be<br>required to<br>demonstrate the<br>science process skills<br>and research process<br>through a completed<br>Researched-based<br>Science Project which<br>will include a research<br>paper. | Science Dept<br>Chair, coach and<br>science teachers                  | PLC, Science Fair<br>competition,<br>Ecybermission, ect.  | Student research report and participation in school and district science fair competition. |
| 2  | Students lack<br>adequate exposure to<br>science inquiry in<br>weekly instructional<br>strategies. | Teachers will be<br>trained to use the<br>Interface for Scientific<br>Learning and Natural<br>Discovery (ISLANDS)  | District Science<br>Supervisor,<br>Science Coach,<br>Department Chair | Classroom Walk-<br>throughs, IMACS<br>management system   | Student mini<br>assessments,<br>usage summary<br>reports                                   |

|  |   | IMACS curriculum   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | d on the analysis of stud   |  |  | Guiding Questions", ider                                     | ntify and define   |
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b: |   |  | 7  | that 50% of students w<br>FAA Science.                       | vill score at or   |
| 2012   | 2 Current Level of Perfo  | ormance:   | 2013 Expecte   | ed Level of Performand                                       | ce:  |
| 14%  | (1)   |  | 15%  |  |  |
|  | Prob  | lem-Solving Process t  | o Increase Stude   | ent Achievement  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                               | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1  | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities  Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond. | science trade books to<br>teach literacy through<br>science            | Classroom<br>Teacher, ESE<br>Specialist,<br>Science Coach,<br>Assistant<br>Principal | Classroom<br>walkthroughs, monitor<br>lesson plans           | 1. FAA results 2. Professional conversations with individual teachers to monitor effectiveness |
|  | Communication skills, especially expressive communication, are impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. |  |  |  |  |
|  | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities  | Implement use of science trade books to teach literacy through science |  | Classroom<br>walkthroughs, monitor<br>lesson plans           | 1. FAA results 2. Professional conversations with individual teachers to                       |
| 2  | Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond.   |  | Principal  |  | monitor<br>effectiveness   |
|  | Communication skills, especially expressive communication, are impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to                         |  |  |  |  |

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.

express their response.

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus                  | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants<br>(e.g. , PLC,<br>subject, grade<br>level, or school-<br>wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring                   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                  |
|--|------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Earth, Life<br>and Physical<br>Science<br>Inquiry<br>Methods | 6-8                    |  | One teacher from<br>each grade level  | November 2012  | Implementation of content strategies in classrooms and PLC | Science<br>Department<br>Head, Science<br>Coach, Assistant<br>Principal |
| Science and<br>Core Literacy<br>(Physical,<br>Life, & Earth) | 6-8                    | District STEM<br>Department            | One teacher from<br>each grade level  | November 2012  |  | Science<br>Department<br>Head, Science<br>Coach, Assistant<br>Principal |

#### Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/                            | Material(s)   |                |                       |
|---|---|----------------|-----------------------|
| Strategy  | Description of Resources  | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount   |
| No Data   | No Data   | No Data        | \$0.00                |
|   |   |                | Subtotal: \$0.00      |
| Technology  |   |                |                       |
| Strategy  | Description of Resources  | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount   |
| No Data   | No Data   | No Data        | \$0.00                |
|   |   |                | Subtotal: \$0.00      |
| Professional Development                              |   |                |                       |
| Strategy  | Description of Resources  | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount   |
| Science and Core Literacy;<br>Science Inquiry Methods | Substitutes need for 6 teachers<br>to participate in District<br>Professional Development | Title 1        | \$540.00              |
|   | •   | -              | Subtotal: \$540.00    |
| Other   |   |                |                       |
| Strategy  | Description of Resources  | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount   |
| No Data   | No Data   | No Data        | \$0.00                |
|   |   |                | Subtotal: \$0.00      |
|   |   |                | Grand Total: \$540.00 |

End of Science Goals

# Writing Goals

<sup>\*</sup> 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 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1a:  | In the previous five years have been able to demonstrate high proficiency in Writing. In 2012, there was a sharp decrease in the level of proficiency for Writing. It is expected that 91% of students score at or above proficiency in FCAT 2.0 Writing. |  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |  |  |  |
| 83% (509)  | 91%   |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  |   |  |  |  |

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                        | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | Students need to be exposed to proficient writing and be able to recognize good writing. Students need have writing modeled for them to clearly understand the writing process. | LA teachers will utilize FCAT Writing anchor papers to make sure students recognize proficient writing. Writing will be modeled by LA teachers to ensure understanding of the writing process. | LA teachers,<br>Department<br>Chairs and<br>Assistant<br>Principals           | Weekly PLC   | Lesson Plans,<br>Walk-throughs<br>Student<br>portfolios, FCAT<br>Writing scores |
| 2 | The higher concentration on grammar conventions resulted in lower scores. Direct grammar instruction needs to be included in the teaching of writing.                           | classrooms.  | LA teachers,<br>Department<br>Chairs and<br>Assistant<br>Principals           | Weekly PLC   | Lesson Plans,<br>Student<br>portfolios, FCAT<br>Writing scores                  |
| 3 | Writing needs to be assessed in all classes, not just LA classes. Writing across the content areas needs to occur on a regular basis.   | reviewed and revised to maintain continued   | Classroom<br>teachers,<br>Department<br>Chairs and<br>Assistant<br>Principals | Weekly PLC and Team<br>Meetings                              | Lesson Plans,<br>Student<br>portfolios, FCAT<br>Writing scores                  |

|        | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--------|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| at 4 d | lorida Alternate Assess<br>or higher in writing.<br>ng Goal #1b:   | sment: Students scorin  | It is expected   | It is expected that 50% of students will score at 4 or higher in FAA Writing.         |  |  |  |  |
| 2012   | Current Level of Perfo   | rmance:   | 2013 Expecte   | d Level of Performance  | <b>9</b> :   |  |  |  |
| 43%    | (3)  |   | 50%  | 50%   |  |  |  |  |
|        | Prol   | blem-Solving Process t  | o Increase Stude                                       | nt Achievement  |  |  |  |  |
|        | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                          | Evaluation Tool  |  |  |  |
| 1      | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities  Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond.  Communication skills, especially expressive communication, are impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | Implementing the writing process Principal, CRT daily in all grade levels. Daily writing journal. |  | Review lesson plans,<br>classroom<br>walkthroughs, reading<br>student writing samples | 1. FAA results 2. Professional conversations with individual teachers to monitor effectiveness |  |  |  |

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

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

#### Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Progr  |                          |                | Available           |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount              |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developn | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area in need of improvement for the following group: |                                     |  |  |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.   |                                     |  |  |  |
| Civics Goal #1:   |                                     |  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |  |
|   |                                     |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I  | ncrease Student Achievement         |  |  |  |

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

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position<br>Responsible | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |  |
|---------------------|----------|-------------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| No Data Submitted   |          |                         |  |                 |  |  |

| Based on the analysis of in need of improvement   |                   |                     | eference t                           | o "Guiding Questions"  | , identify and define areas |  |  |
|---|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <ul><li>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels</li><li>4 and 5 in Civics.</li><li>Civics Goal #2:</li></ul> |                   |                     |                                      |  |                             |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of   | f Performance:    |                     | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |  |                             |  |  |
|   |                   |                     |                                      |  |                             |  |  |
|   | Problem-Solvino   | g Process to I      | ncrease S                            | itudent Achievemen   | t                           |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy          | Posi<br>Resp<br>for | on or<br>tion<br>oonsible<br>itoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool             |  |  |
|   | No Data Submitted |                     |                                      |  |                             |  |  |

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

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

### Civics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                     |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |  |  |  |
| No Data                               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |  |  |  |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |  |  |  |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                     |  |  |  |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |  |  |  |
| No Data                               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |  |  |  |

|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Professional Developn | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       | -                        | -              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Civics Goals

# Attendance Goal(s)

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

|      | d on the analysis of atter<br>provement:   | ndance data, and referer   | nce to "Guiding Que  | estions", identify and defi  | ne areas in need                                  |  |  |
|------|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|      | tendance<br>ndance Goal #1:  |  | students who he from 158 to 75 average daily a but trended do 92% in April 20 through closer | In 2012-2013, our objective is to reduce the amount of students who have an excessive number of absences from 158 to 75, a 50% improvement. In 2009-2010, the average daily attendance rate began at 98% in August, but trended downward steadily throughout the year, to 92% in April 2011. We plan to prevent that decline through closer coordination amongst the school social worker, grade level administrators, and classroom teachers. |   |  |  |
| 2012 | 2 Current Attendance Ra  | ate:   | 2013 Expecte   | d Attendance Rate:   |   |  |  |
| 94%  | (1933)   |  | 96%  | 96%  |   |  |  |
| 1    | Current Number of Stuences (10 or more)  | udents with Excessive  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  |   |  |  |
| 158  |  |  | 79   | 79   |   |  |  |
| 1    | 2 Current Number of Stuies (10 or more)  | udents with Excessive  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)   |   |  |  |
| 43   |  |  | 21   | 21   |   |  |  |
|      | Prol   | olem-Solving Process t   | to Increase Stude  | nt Achievement   |   |  |  |
|      | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool                                   |  |  |
| 1    | Inconsistent communication between classroom teachers and Rtl team regarding excessive absences. | Add a more structured attendance review plan to the current Rti meetings once a month. | and School Social<br>Worker  | Rti team will review attendance records and track progress through pinnacle.   | Data Warehouse<br>School<br>Attendance<br>Reports |  |  |

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

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

#### Attendance Budget:

|                       |                          |                | Available           |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount              |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developn | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

<sup>\*</sup> 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 By June of 2013, the number of students into suspended will decrease by 20% from 317 to                             |  |  |  |  |
| Suspension Goal #1:   | By June of 2013, the number of students externally suspended will decrease by 20% from |  |  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions  | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions  |  |  |  |
| 558   | 446  |  |  |  |

| 2012         | Total Number of Stude  | ents Suspended In-Sch  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-<br>School |  |                 |  |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|-----------------|--|
| 317          |  |  | 253  | 253  |                 |  |
| 2012         | 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions   |  |  | ed Number of Out-of-Sc   | hool            |  |
| 125          |  |  | 100  |  |                 |  |
| 2012<br>Scho | Total Number of Stude  | ents Suspended Out-of-   | - 2013 Expecte of-School                                 | ed Number of Students  | Suspended Out-  |  |
| 86           |  |  | 69   | 69   |                 |  |
|              | Prol   | olem-Solving Process t   | o Increase Stude   | ent Achievement  |                 |  |
|              | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool |  |
| 1            | Teachers with (less than 3 years experience) in the classroom need additional training in classroom management strategies.   | Monthly PLC with less<br>experienced teachers in<br>Classroom Management<br>strategies   | Behavior<br>Specialist                                   | The core team and Rti will refer behavior suspensions and evaluate in class time. Core team members will also conduct CWT's and utilize the CHAMP's rubric to determine effectiveness. | Suspension Data |  |
| 2            | Some students don't have a clear understanding of all the information in the student code of conduct. They make decisions based on partial or incorrect information. | Grade level administrators and guidance counselors will review information from the student code of conduct with the student during discipline assemblies. The administrators and counselor will also meet with individual students and their teachers to provide the students with needed guidance and support. | counselors.  | During weekly team meetings, the teachers, guidance counselor and administrator will review suspension data from each individual team.   |                 |  |

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

| 1  | Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: |   |  |   |  |                 |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|-----------------|
| 1. Pa  | rent Involvement  |   |  |   |  |                 |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1:  *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. |   |   | By June 2013, 79% of the parents will attend one or more school involvement activities (PTSA meetings, parent-teacher conferences, parent informational meetings, SAC and SAF) |   |  |                 |
| 2012   | Current Level of Parer  | nt Involvement:   |  | 2013 Expecte  | d Level of Parent Invo   | Ivement:        |
| 65%  | 65% (1325)  |   |  | 70% (1391)  |  |                 |
|  | Prol  | olem-Solving Process t  | to I i   | ncrease Stude   | nt Achievement   |                 |
|  | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | 1  | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                                 | Evaluation Tool |
| 1  | Work schedules conflict with parents ability to attend.   | Provide a variety of times and dates to accommodate more parents.                     | Grade Level<br>Administrator<br>SAC CoChairs   |   | Collection of sign in sheets for all activities and review at SAC and SAF meetings.          | Sign in Sheets. |
| 2  | Unavailability of programs translated into all of the different native languages at the school.   | Attempt to provide translators in various languages at various meetings and programs. | Adr<br>SA  | ade Level<br>ministrator<br>C CoChairs                | Collection of sign in<br>sheets for all activities<br>and review at SAC and<br>SAF meetings. | Sign in Sheets. |

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | arri(3)/ Material(3)     |                | Available           |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount              |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>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 of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

There will be in increase of STEM initiatives in our school and an increase in student participation of current initiatives.

1. STEM

Increase the enrollment of students in high level mathematics courses like Algebra and Geometry.

STEM Goal #1:

Increase the participation of students in research-based science projects.

|   | Increase participation in Lego Robotics and SECME school clubs.   |  |  |   |                                    |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|---|------------------------------------|--|--|
|   | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement   |  |  |   |                                    |  |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring         | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool                    |  |  |
| 1 | Vast majority of<br>students lack exposure<br>to STEM related fields<br>in Science and Math.                              | 6-8 science students<br>will complete at<br>researched based<br>science project  | Science<br>Department Chair,<br>Coach and<br>Teachers          | Student projects  | Teacher Rubrics                    |  |  |
| 2 | Students following the advanced mathematics track in 6th and 7th grade are not adequately prepared for 8th grade Algebra. | Supplement the 7th grade advanced math curriculum with prealgebra concepts that are currently absent from the IFC          | Department Chair,<br>Assistant Principal                       | Teacher-made<br>assessments designed<br>to test pre-algebra<br>concepts infused into<br>the curriculum. | Algebra<br>Enrollment Counts       |  |  |
| 3 | Lack of student involvement in mathematics competitions team.   | Greater effort by<br>teachers of advanced<br>classes to promote the<br>math club and offer<br>incentives to<br>participate | Math<br>competitions<br>coordinator, math<br>department chair. | Student interest and involvement in the math competitions club.   | Student<br>Participation<br>Counts |  |  |
| 4 | Lack of student involvement in mathematics competitions team.   | Greater effort by teachers of advanced classes to promote the math club and offer incentives to participate                | Math<br>competitions<br>coordinator, math<br>department chair. | Student interest and involvement in the math competitions club.   | Student<br>Participation<br>Counts |  |  |

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

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

### STEM Budget:

| Strategy               | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data                | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                        |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Гесhnology             |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy               | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                        |                          | -              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developme | nt                       |                |                     |
| Strategy               | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |

| No Data  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
|          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other    |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>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)

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: |  |   |  |  |                 |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 1. CT   | E                                      |   |  |  |                 |  |  |
| CTE (   | Goal #1:                               |   | Increase stude   | Increase student enrollment in CTE courses.                  |                 |  |  |
|   | Pro                                    | blem-Solving Process t  | to Increase Stude                                      | nt Achievement   |                 |  |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier                    | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |  |
| 1   | Lack of CTE courses                    | Develop a Information<br>Technology course and<br>an Pre-Engineering<br>course for students to<br>begin the pathway of<br>career certification. | Assistant<br>Principals                                | Enrollment of students in courses                            | Master schedule |  |  |
| 2   | Lack of instructors for<br>CTE courses | Review teacher certification areas and/or recruit teachers to seek certification in CTE areas.  | Assistant<br>Principals                                | Assigning/hiring staff to teach the courses                  | Master schedule |  |  |

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
|                          | •                        |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology               |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          | -              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Development |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                    |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>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<br>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      |
| Science           | Science and Core<br>Literacy; Science<br>Inquiry Methods | Substitutes need for 6<br>teachers to participate<br>in District Professional<br>Development | Title 1        | \$540.00              |
|                   |  |  |                | Subtotal: \$540.00    |
| Other             |  |  |                |                       |
| Goal              | Strategy   | Description of<br>Resources  | Funding Source | Available Amount      |
| No Data           | No Data  | No Data  | No Data        | \$0.00                |
|                   |  |  |                | Subtotal: \$0.00      |
|                   |  |  |                | Grand Total: \$540.00 |

### 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.

No Attachment

## 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.



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

| Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
|-------------------------------------|--------|

| No data submitted                                   |                            |  |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| Describe the activities of the School Advisory Cour | ncil for the upcoming 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

| Broward School District<br>LYONS CREEK MI DDLE SCHOOL<br>2010-2011 |           |           |         |         |                           |   |  |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|--|
|  | Reading   | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade<br>Points<br>Earned |   |  |
| % Meeting High<br>Standards (FCAT<br>Level 3 and Above)            | 72%       | 72%       | 94%     | 45%     | 202                       | 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<br>Learning Gains                             | 65%       | 69%       |         |         | 134                       | 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<br>Lowest 25% in the<br>School?               | 67% (YES) | 63% (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   |           |           |         |         | 547                       |   |  |
| Percent Tested =<br>100%   |           |           |         |         |                           | Percent of eligible students tested   |  |
| School Grade*  |           |           |         |         | IΔ                        | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |  |

| Broward School District<br>LYONS CREEK MI DDLE SCHOOL<br>2009-2010 |           |           |         |         |                           |   |  |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|--|
|  | Reading   | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade<br>Points<br>Earned |   |  |
| % Meeting High<br>Standards (FCAT<br>Level 3 and Above)            | 72%       | 70%       | 91%     | 49%     | 282                       | 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<br>Learning Gains                             | 62%       | 65%       |         |         | 127                       | 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<br>Lowest 25% in the<br>School?               | 55% (YES) | 55% (YES) |         |         | 110                       | 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   |           |           |         |         | 519                       |   |  |
| Percent Tested = 100%  |           |           |         |         |                           | Percent of eligible students tested   |  |
| School Grade*  |           |           |         |         | В                         | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |  |