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## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

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

```
High School Feedback Report
```

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

## ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ <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 <br> $2010-2011$ Grade B |  |
| Reading Mastery: 61\%, Math Mastery 39\%, |  |  |  |  |  |


| Principal | Dr. Ted Toomer | BA - Journalism Elon College MA - Elementary Education - Nova Southeastern University Ph.D - <br> Educational <br> Leadership - <br> Nova <br> Southeastern 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\% <br> AYP: 79\% Economically disadvantaged, ELL \& Black subgroups did not make AYP in Reading and Math. <br> 2008-2009 Grade A <br> Reading Mastery 62\%, Math Mastery 60\%, Science Mastery 29\%, Writing Mastery 96\%, Reading Lowest 25\%:73\% <br> Math Lowest 25\%: 73\% <br> AYP: 92\% Economically disadvantaged and Black subgroups did not make Math AYP. 2007-2008 Grade B <br> Reading Mastery 49\%, Math Mastery 66\%, Science Mastery 42\%, Writing Mastery 93\%, Reading Learning Gains 60\%, Math Learning Gains 69\%, Reading lowest 25\%:65\% <br> Math Lowest 25\%: 68\% <br> AYP: 97\% ELL did not meet AYP in Reading |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assis Principal | Debra Harrington | Speech Language Impaired, (grades K - 12) Educational Leadership, (all Levels) | 6 | 6 | Grade B <br> Increase in Reading Mastery: 67\% to 72\% Math Mastery: 72\% had decreased to 70\% and then rose to \% 72 in 2009. <br> Increase in Science Mastery: 40\% to 47\% Increase in Writing Mastery: 89\% to 94\% |
| Assis Principal | Thomas Howard | Educational Leadership, (all Levels) Elementary Education, (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 Montagnino | Degrees: Degrees: <br> M. Ed. - Ed. <br> Leadership <br> B.S. - History <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\% <br> Science Mastery 46\% Writing Mastery $86 \%$ <br> Western High School 2009-2010 Grade A <br> Reading Mastery 62 \% <br> Math Mastery 86\% <br> Science Mastery 50 \% <br> Writing Mastery $92 \%$ <br> Did not make AYP: Reading in any subgroup <br> Did not make AYP: Math -SWD <br> Western High School 2008-2009 C <br> Reading Mastery 57 \% <br> Math Mastery 84\% <br> Science Mastery 46 \% <br> Writing Mastery 89\% <br> Did not make AYP: Reading in any subgroup <br> Did not make AYP: Math <br> -SWD <br> -ELL <br> Western High School 2007-2008 A <br> Reading Mastery 61 \% <br> Math Mastery 85\% <br> Science Mastery 49 \% <br> Writing Mastery 88\% <br> Did not make AYP: Reading <br> -Hispanic <br> -SWD <br> -Eco- disadvantaged <br> Did not make AYP: Math <br> -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 Years at Current School | \# of Years as an I nstructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25\% ), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | Aileen WolfeGoldhirsh | English for <br> Speakers Of Other Languages (esol), 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 <br> Increase of 4\% points in reading for Black subgroup, Increase of $2 \%$ points for Economically Disadvantaged, and decrease of 2\% points for SWD. <br> No change in scores for Total, White, Hispanic, ELL. <br> 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, English for Speakers Of Other Languages 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\%. <br> 2008-09 Grade A <br> 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 <br> veteran teachers. | NESS Liaison | June 2013 |  |
| 3 | 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]).
$\left.\begin{array}{||c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Number of } \\ \text { staff and } \\ \text { paraprofessional } \\ \text { that are } \\ \text { teaching out- } \\ \text { of-field/ and } \\ \text { who are not } \\ \text { highly } \\ \text { effective. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Provide the } \\ \text { strategies } \\ \text { that are }\end{array} \\ \text { being }\end{array}\right\}$ implemented

[^0]
## Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)).
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Total Number } \\ \text { of }\end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c}\text { Instructional } \\ \text { Staff }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\ \text { First-Year } \\ \text { Teachers }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\ \text { Teachers } \\ \text { with 1-5 } \\ \text { Years of } \\ \text { Experience }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\ \text { Teachers } \\ \text { with 6-14 } \\ \text { Years of } \\ \text { Experience }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\ \text { Teachers } \\ \text { with } 15+ \\ \text { Years of } \\ \text { Experience }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Teachers of } \\ \text { with } \\ \text { Advanced } \\ \text { Degrees }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Highly } \\ \text { Effective } \\ \text { Teachers }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Reading } \\ \text { Endorsed } \\ \text { Teachers }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { National } \\ \text { Board } \\ \text { Certified } \\ \text { Teachers }\end{array} \\ \hline 103 & 1.0 \%(1) & 16.5 \%(17) & 52.4 \%(54) & 34.0 \%(35) & 46.6 \%(48) & 85.4 \%(88) & 14.6 \%(15) & 9.7 \%(10) \\ \hline \text { Endorsed } \\ \text { Teachers }\end{array}\right\}$

## Teacher Mentoring Program/ Plan

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee <br> Assigned | Rationale <br> for Pairing |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No data submitted | Planned Mentoring <br> Activities |  |

## 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

Housing Programs

| N/A |
| :--- |
| Head Start |
| N/A |
| Adult Education |
| N/A <br> Career and Technical Education <br> N/A <br> Job Training <br> N/A <br> Other <br> N/A |

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

## -School-based MTSS/ Rtl Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The following staff members make up the RtI team; Guidance Director(RtI Coordinator)and 7th grade counselor, Celeste Bernard, School Psychologist-J oanna 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 Rtl 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 I mplementation

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

- 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 Rtl 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 Rtl 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.
$\square$

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

## -School-Based Literacy Leadership Team <br> 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 I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

```
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.

[^1]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 High School Feedback Report

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group:
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level $\mathbf{3} \mathbf{i n}$ In the previous five years that has been a steady rise in reading. 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.
Reading Goal \#1a:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 Current Level of Performance:
$35 \%$

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 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#1b: |  | 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 Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| All students are in the | ent pre/mid/post | Classroom | Review lesson plans | FAA results |


| 1 | moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities. | assessments | Teacher, ESE <br> Specialist, <br> Assistant Principal | and use classroom walkthroughs <br> 2. Review assessment data <br> 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 2. Professional conversations witl 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. | Classroom <br> Teacher, ESE <br> Specialist, <br> Assistant Principal | 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs <br> 2. Review assessment data <br> 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 1. FAA results <br> 2. Professional conversations witl 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 | 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs <br> 2. Review assessment data <br> 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 1. FAA results <br> 2. Professional conversations wit individual teacher and SLP to monito effectiveness |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee, of improvement for the following group:
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement In the previous five years that has been a steady rise in

| Level $\mathbf{4}$ in reading. | Reading achievement among our students culminating to a <br> period of stagnant scores. The 2012 scores resulted in a <br> sharp decline over previous years. It is expected that 72\% c <br> students score at or above proficiency in FCAT 2.0 Reading. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reading Goal \#2a: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Level of Performance: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: | $37 \%$ |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 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 Reading Teachers | Teacher evaluation of daily student participation. | Varied classroom assessments. Reading Logs Student reading attitude survey. |
| 2 | One area of weakness on the 2012 Reading FCAT test was Information Text | Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities related to text features analysis, synthesizing, analyzing, evaluating, creating, and drawing conclusions. | Reading Coach, Assistant Principal | PLC feedback, student mini- assessments | FCAT Testmaker assessments and 2013 Reading FCA 2.0 |
| 3 | Advanced and Gifted students are not enrolled in a reading class. | Enrichment of reading strategies will be provided in Social Studies and Science classes as well as through implementation of | Content area teachers, Reading Coach, Assistant Principal | Weekly feedback of PLC teachers, student work samples | FCAT Testmaker assessments and 2013 Reading FCA 2.0 |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. <br> 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 Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of 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 <br> 2. Review assessment data <br> 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 1B.1. <br> 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs <br> 2. Review <br> assessment data <br> 3. Weekly <br> conversations and <br> collaborative <br> planning <br> 1B. 1. <br> 1. FAA results <br> 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. | Classroom <br> Teacher, ESE <br> Specialist, Assistant Principal | 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs <br> 2. Review assessment data <br> 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 1. FAA results <br> 2. 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 | 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs <br> 2. Review assessment data <br> 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 1. FAA results <br> 2. 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 nee 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.

| gains in reading. <br> Reading 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 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 68\% (1160) |  |  | 75\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 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, Reading Teachers | Teacher evaluation of daily student participation | Varied classroom assessments. |
| 2 | One area of weakness on the 2012 Reading FCAT test was Information Text | Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities related to text features analysis, synthesizing, analyzing, evaluating, creating, and drawing conclusions. | Reading Coach, Assistant Principal | PLC feedback, student mini- assessments | FCAT Testmaker assessments and 2013 Reading FCA 2.0 |
| 3 | One area of weakness on the 2012 Reading FCAT test was Reading Application. | Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and activities related to author's purpose, main idea, cause and effect, and summarizing. | Reading Coach, Assistant Principal | PLC feedback, student mini- assessments | FCAT Testmaker assessments and 2013 Reading FCA 2.0 |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#3b: |  |  | 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: |  |  |
| 46\% (8) |  |  | 50\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities. | Implement pre/mid/post assessments | Classroom <br> Teacher, ESE <br> Specialist, Assistant Principal | 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs <br> 2. Review assessment data | 1. FAA results <br> 2. Professional conversations witl individual teachers and SLP to monito |


|  |  |  |  | 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 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. | Classroom <br> Teacher, ESE <br> Specialist, <br> Assistant Principal | 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs <br> 2. Review assessment data <br> 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 1. FAA results <br> 2. Professional conversations witl 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 | 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthroughs <br> 2. Review assessment data <br> 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 1. FAA results <br> 2. Professional conversations witl 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 nee of improvement for the following group:

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest $25 \%$ making learning gains in reading. <br> 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 Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lack of cross- curricular focus of weak areas of Reading | The Instructional Focus Calendar will be created to include a monthly focus on specific strands/clusters of reading. | Reading Coach, Curriculum Department Heads (LA, Science, Social Studies, Math), Assistant Principal | Classroom walk- throughs, PLC Feedback, student mini assessments | FCAT Testmaker assessments and 2013 Reading FCA 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 Coach and Reading Teachers | Teacher evaluation of daily student participation. | Varied classroom assessments. <br> Reading Logs Student reading 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 <br> $2010-2011$ | $2011-2012$ | $2012-2013$ | $2013-2014$ | $2014-2015$ | $2015-2016$ | $2016-2017$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $60 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $\boxed{70 \%}$ | $\boxed{73 \%}$ | $\square$ |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5B: |  |  | In 2013, it is expected that the percentage of students in our subgroups not making satisfactory progress in reading wi decrease by $10 \%$. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 34 \%(251) \\ & : 53 \%(169) \\ & \text { nic: } 43 \%(225) \\ & : 38 \% \text { (31) } \\ & \text { ican Indian: } 46 \% ~(5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | White: 31\% <br> Black: 48\% <br> Hispanic: 39\% <br> Asian: 34\% <br> American Indian | $41 \%$ |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Less access to reading outside of the classroom. | Reinforce the media center schedule for bimonthly classroom visits to the library. | Reading Coach and Media Specialist. | Media Schedules | Review lesson plans |
| 2 | Lack of motivation on the part of the students to read. | Involve students in the Big Read, from the National Endowment for the Arts and distance learning reading events including book talks | Reading Coach Assistant Principal | Student feedback. Student reading attitude survey. | Student attitude survey. |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5C: |  |  | By 2013 it is expected that the percent of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in reading 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 Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | ELL students come from various backgrounds and different skilllevels. Some have very little exposure to English. These students need more assistance and extended learning opportunities to be successful. | Consistent opportunity to practice and develop fluency in real life situations, and differentiated instruction to meet students' individual learning needs, use of para- professional to help with the diverse | Reading Coach ELL coordinator. Assistant Principal Classroom teacher | Student portfolios will be maintained and monitored for language acquisition as well as reading proficiency. <br> Teachers will meet with each student monthly to discuss progress and set goals. | BAT assessments CWT <br> Visions Unit Tests, Teacher observations of students, portfolic assesment througl the use of rubrics. |

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l} & & \begin{array}{l}\text { population in the } \\
\text { shelteredd reading class } \\
\text { and with pull outs. } \\
\text { Students will be invited } \\
\text { to participate in } \\
\text { extended learning } \\
\text { opportunities. }\end{array} & & \begin{array}{l}\text { Classroom teacher will } \\
\text { keep pre/post work } \\
\text { samples and conference } \\
\text { with each student } \\
\text { weekly to discuss } \\
\text { progress and set goals }\end{array} \\
\hline & \begin{array}{l}\text { ELL students have } \\
\text { difficulty } \\
\text { comprehending text } \\
\text { that require critical } \\
\text { thinking and how text } \\
\text { features (graphs, } \\
\text { charts, maps) aid in } \\
\text { comprehension. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { ELL students will } \\
\text { be taught CRISS } \\
\text { strategies in their } \\
\text { content area classes to } \\
\text { help with the } \\
\text { comprehension of the } \\
\text { higher level text. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Reading Coach } \\
\text { Classroom } \\
\text { teachers. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Student portfolio and } \\
\text { work samples. } \\
\text { Teacher created quizzes } \\
\text { Formal assessments }\end{array} \\
\hline \text { The Reading Coach will }\end{array}
$$ \quad \begin{array}{l}Summative <br>
Assessments <br>
BAT I <br>

BAT II\end{array}\right]\)| FCAT |
| :--- |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> 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 Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of 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 Assistant Principal ESE <br> specialist/support facilitator. | Teachers will meet with each student monthly to discuss progress and set goals. <br> Student portfolios will be maintained and monitored for proof of progress. | BAT <br> CWT <br> Mini BATs |
|  | SWD have difficulty comprehending text | Struggling students will receive direct instruction | Reading Coach ESE support | Formal Assessments FCAT Practice Tests | Summative Assessments |



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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> 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 Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of 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 Assistant Principal | Student feedback. Student reading attitude survey. | Student attitude survey. |
| 2 | Less access to reading outside the classroom. | Reinforce the media center schedule for bimonthly classroom visits to the library. | Reading Coach and Media Specialist. | Media Schedules | Review lesson plans. |

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

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

| PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Shedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> 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 | Classroom <br> Observations, Student <br> Work, Reading PLC | 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 | Distance Learning <br> Collaborations, <br> Reading interest <br> inventory, classroom <br> observation | Reading Coach, <br> Reading <br> Department Hea <br> Assistant Princip |

## Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  | Funding Source <br> Available <br> Amount |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No Data | Description of Resources | So.00 |  |
|  | No Data | No Data | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  | Funding Source |

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non- ELL students. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/ speaking. CELLA Goal \#1: |  | By 2013, it is expected that $60 \%$ of ELL students will score proficient in CELLA listening/speaking. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/ speaking: |  |  |  |  |
| 53\% (60) |  |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| A!- A2 ELL students | ts will be | ELL Coordinator, | udent oral reports; | CELLA, IPT-II |


| 1 | know comprehend only <br> small chunks of English <br> or non at all. | enrolled in a <br> Developmental <br> Language Arts program. | Reading Coach, <br> ELL Administrator | teacher feedback |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Students need a boost <br> in English Language <br> Acquisition | Students will <br> participate in Rosetta <br> Stone twice a week to <br> supplement instruction <br> in Developmental <br> Language Arts. | ELL Coordinator, <br> Reading Coach, | Monitoring of Rosetta <br> SLL Administrator; <br> Stone use and <br> Successful completion <br> (lassroom <br> Teacher | CELLA, IPT-II |
| Tearning components. |  |  |  |  |  |


| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non- ELL students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal \#2: |  |  | By 2013, it is expected that 20\% of ELL students will score proficient in CELLA reading. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14\% (17) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | ELL students 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, Reading Coach, ELL Administrator | Regular monitor of student lexile gains and loses on Achieve 3000. | CELLA |


| 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 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31\% (37) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students 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, Reading Coach, ELL Administrator, classroom teachers | Student work samples, teacher feedback | CELLA |


| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | tal: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | tal: \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#1a: |  |  | In the previous five years that has been a steady rise in Mathematics achievement among our students culminating $\mathrm{t}_{1}$ 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: |  |  |
| 28\% (496) |  |  | $31 \%$ |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 6-8 students demonstrated a weakness in geometry and measurement. | Implementation of strand-specific FCATstyle questioning, including gridded response | Mathematics department chair, Assistant Principal | Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings | BAT, FCAT Testmaker,Teacher made tests |
| 2 | Lack of cross- curricular planning between math and science. | Current IFC will support data analysis, charting, graphing and number sense. | Math and Science Department Heads, Math and Science Teachers | Classroom walk-throughs, PLCs, student work samples | BAT, FCAT Testmaker,Teacher made tests |
| 3 | Lack of innovative instruction to improve student learning and retention. | Feedback on informal and formal observations with discussion focused on effectiveness of instructional strategies. | Mathematics Department Chair, Assistant Principal. | Classroom walkthroughs, informal and formal observations using iObserve. | Teacher-made assessments. Student grades anc BAT II scores. |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#1b: |  | 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: |  |  |
| 58\% (11) |  | 66\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive | 1.Touch Math <br> Curriculum- a <br> multisensory program to | Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist, | 1. Review lesson plans and use classroom walkthrouqhs | 1. FAA results <br> 2. Professional conversations witl |


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


| 3 |  | instruction,simple designs, low readability and plenty of practice 3.SRA Connecting Math Concepts- Direct Instruction math program <br> 4.Discreet Trial Trainersoftware with math programs for students with Autism and other learning disabilities. DT Trainer is based on Applied Behavioral Analysis. <br> 5.Edmark Millie's Math House- Software that teaches fundamental math concepts and thinking skills in a kidfriendly 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 nee, of improvement for the following group:

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#2a: |  |  | In the previous five years that has been a steady rise in Mathematics achievement among our students culminating t a period of stagnant scores. The 2012 scores resulted in a sharp decline over previous years. It is expected that $72 \%$ 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 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 6-8 students demonstrated a weakness in geometry and measurement. | Implementation of strand-specific FCATstyle questioning, including gridded response | Mathematics department chair, Assistant Principal | Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings | BAT, FCAT Testmaker,Teacher made tests |
| 2 | Lack of cross- curricular planning between math and science. | Current IFC will support data analysis, charting, graphing and number sense. | Math and Science Department Heads, Math and Science Teachers | Classroom walk-throughs, PLCs, student work samples | BAT, FCAT Testmaker, Teacher-made test |

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

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

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

## Mathematics Goal \#2b:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11\% (2) |  |  | 14\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities <br> Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond. <br> Communication skills, especially expressive communication, are impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | 1.Touch Math <br> Curriculum- a <br> multisensory program to engage students of all abilities and learning styles <br> 2.Steck Vauhgn Mastering Mathstraightforward instruction, simple designs, low readability and plenty of practice 3.SRA Connecting Math Concepts- Direct Instruction math program <br> 4.Discreet Trial Trainersoftware with math programs for students with Autism and other learning disabilities. DT Trainer is based on Applied Behavioral Analysis. <br> 5.Edmark Millie's Math House- Software that teaches fundamental math concepts and thinking skills in a kidfriendly 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 <br> 2. Review assessment data <br> 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 1. FAA results <br> 2. Professional conversations witl individual teachers to monitor effectiveness |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee। of improvement for the following group:
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.

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.

Mathematics Goal \#3a:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| :--- | :--- |
| $67 \%(1140)$ | $74 \%$ |

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Lack of innovative <br> instruction to improve | Feedback on informal and <br> formal observations with | Mathematics <br> Department Chair, | Classroom walkthroughs, <br> informal and formal | Teacher-made <br> assessments. |


| 1 | student learning and <br> retention. | discussion focused on <br> effectiveness of <br> instructional strategies. | Assistant Principal. | observations using <br> iobserve. | Student grades <br> and BAT II scores. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Poor retention of prior <br> knowledge requiring <br> excessive remediation | More efficient use of <br> instructional time and <br> greater use of effective <br> strategies | Mathematics <br> Department Chair, <br> Assistant Principal. | Classroom walkthroughs, <br> informal and formal <br> observations using <br> iObserve. | Teacher-made <br> assessments. <br> Student grades <br> and BAT II scores, |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities <br> Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond. <br> Communication skills, especially expressive communication, are impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | 1.Touch Math <br> Curriculum- a <br> multisensory program to engage students of all abilities and learning styles <br> 2.Steck Vauhgn Mastering Mathstraightforward instruction, simple designs, low readability and plenty of practice 3.SRA Connecting Math Concepts- Direct Instruction math program <br> 4. Discreet Trial Trainersoftware with math programs for students with Autism and other learning disabilities. DT Trainer is based on Applied Behavioral Analysis. <br> 5.Edmark Millie's Math House- Software that teaches fundamental math concepts and thinking skills in a kidfriendly 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 <br> 2. Review assessment data <br> 3. Weekly conversations and collaborative planning | 1. FAA results <br> 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 nee 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 Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 55\% (249) |  |  | 61\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students with deficiencies in reading comprehension skills may have increased difficulty with NGSSS word problem situations | Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core instruction plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving strategies in Florida FCAT <br> Coach and NGSSS supplemental problemsolving program | Mathematics coach and mathematics department chair, classroom teachers | Classroom teachers will review results of county assessment data during mathematics learning community meetings | County <br> benchmark assessment test (BAT) <br> administrations in September and December 2010; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS |
| 2 | Students lack a strong foundation in fundamental concepts | Greater use of manipulative materials to enhance understanding | Mathematics department chair, classroom teachers | Teachers will regularly assess understanding through the use of student response boards. | Teacher made assessments and the use of preand post-tests. |


| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by $50 \%$. |  |  | ```Middle School Mathematics Goal # By 2017, the proportion of students meeting proficiency in mathematics will increase by 50%. A drop in proficiency from baseline for the 2012 year has changed our AMO-2 trajectory.``` |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-201 |  |
|  | 60\% | 63\% | 67\% | 70\% | 73\% |  |  |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, <br> Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making <br> satisfactory progress in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#5B: | In 2013, it is expected that the percentage of students in <br> our subgroups not making satisfactory progress in <br> mathematics will decrease by 10\%. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 34\% (251) <br> Black: 53\% (169) <br> Hispanic: 43\% (225) <br> Asian: 38\% (31) <br> American Indian: 46\% (5) | White: 30\% <br> Black: 48\% <br> Hispanic: 39\% <br> Asian: 34\% <br> American Indian: 41\% |


|  |  | Person or | Process Used to |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


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

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#5C: |  |  | By 2013 it is expected that the percent of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease b) $10 \%$. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | The cognitive complexity levels of text in Math questions require stronger content area and general vocabulary. | Teachers will use strategies to decode general and content area terms in math. | ESOL Coordinator, Math Department Head, Assistant Principal | Teacher-made tests, min assessments, classroom observation and student work | BAT I and II, FCA Math, Testmaker. |
| 2 | Lack of proficiency with fundamental mathematics skills. | Remediation through spiraling of concepts during warm-ups. | Mathematics <br> Department Chair, Assistant Principal | 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 nee of improvement for the following subgroup:

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#5D: |  | By 2013 it is expected that the percent of SWD students no making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease $b$ $10 \%$. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| Students with individual | tified person | ESE specialist, | alysis of county | County |


| 1 | education plans (IEP) scheduled into mainstream academic classes may require more individualized, targeted instruction to achieve proficiency | will provide additional services, including remediation and alternative, supplemental lesson delivery | ESE support facilitators | benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings | benchmark <br> assessment test (BAT) <br> administrations in September and December 2010; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Lack of proficiency with fundamental mathematics skills. | Remediation through spiraling of concepts during warm-ups. | Mathematics Department Chair, Assistant Principal | 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 nee, of improvement for the following subgroup:

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#5E: |  |  | 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 Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of 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/J anuary 2011, as well as Saturday School program for strandspecific FCAT preparation | Title I coordinator, classroom teachers | Principal designee and classroom teachers will monitor participation levels in the tutoring and Saturday School programs | After school tutoring and Saturday School attendance log |
| 2 | Teacher lack of familiarity with alternative lesson planning/delivery methods to reach students scheduled for mainstream academic classes | Differentiated instruction | Mathematics professional learning community chair | Classroom walkthroughs | County benchmark assessment test (BAT) <br> 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, 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. |

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

[^2]| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#1: |  |  | It is expected that $99 \%$ of students score at or above proficiency in Algebra I. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 23\% (33) |  |  | 17\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 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. | Algebra teacher will differentiate instruction by readiness and apply a variety of strategies to reinforce the tenacity of student to complete a rigorous course of study | Math Department Head, Assistant Principal | Teacher-made tests, formative assessment | Algebra BAT and Algebra EOC |
| 2 | Remediation is needed for benchmarks not mastereo in prior grades. | Teachers will use spiraling assignments that review prior grades' benchmarks | Math Department Head, Assistant Principal | Use benchmark assessment data to monitor student progress | Broward Assessment Test BAT II |
| 3 | Lack of consistency in determining student progress toward mastery of benchmarks. | Teachers will use webbased programs to monitor student progress and assess weaknesses. | Math Department Head, Assistant Principal | Web- based data collection and sharing of results of common assessments. | Data from webbased assessment and BAT II |

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#2: |  |  | It is expected that 99\% of students score at or above proficiency in Algebra I. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 77\% (110) |  |  | 83\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lack of exposure to difficult test item and complex questions in chapter tests | Increased used of test item specs in the development of teachermade assessments. | Math Department Head | Student classroom assessments scores | Algebra BAT and Algebra EOC |
| 2 | Incorporation of assessed benchmark assignments into honors algebra. | Use of spiraling assignments aligned to the NGSSS. | Mathematics Department Chair, Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, PLCs and sharing of best practices | Results of BATII and EOC exams. |

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


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

| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making <br> satisfactory progress in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#3C: |
| :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | In 2013, it is expected that the percentage of students in |
| :--- |
| our subgroups not making satisfactory progress in Algebra I |
| will decrease by $33 \%$. |


| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following subgroup: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#3D: |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.

Algebra Goal \#3E:

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

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student 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 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in

Geometry.
Geometry Goal \#1:

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student 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 |


| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#2: |  |  | It is expected that $100 \%$ of students score at or above proficiency in Geometry. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 100\% (20) |  |  | 100\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Maintain enrichment and rigor of program. | Student will be continually exposed to instructional strategies that strengthen their ability to understand and respond to high complexity items. | Math Department Head | Student work, student assessment scores | Geometry BAT and Geometry 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\%. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 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.

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 Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White: 0 <br> Black: n/a <br> Hispanic: 0 <br> Asian: 0 <br> American Indian: n/a |  |  | White: 0 <br> Black: n/a <br> Hispanic: 0 <br> Asian: 0 <br> American Indian: n/a |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Maintaining course rigor and continuing to reach students of all ethnic backgrounds | Maintain high expectations and continue to infuse higher order thinking questions into teachermade assessments | Classroom teacher, Department Chair, Assistant Principal | Student grades on teacher- made assessments | Bat II and EOC scores. |

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

| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#3C: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine <br> Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |


| 3D. Students with Di satisfactory progres <br> Geometry Goal \#3D: | bilities (SWD in Geometry. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level o | Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal \#3E:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student 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 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |

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

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

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

## Mathematics 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 |  | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | No Data | $\$ 0.00$ |
| No Data | No Data |  | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |


| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $\$ 0.00$ |
|  |  |  | Subtotal: $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0}$ |
| Other | Description of Resources | Funding Source |  |
| Strategy | No Data | No Data | Available |
| Amount |  |  |  |$|$| $\$ 0.00$ |
| :--- |
| No Data |

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement In the previous five years there has been a steady rise Level 3 in science. in Science achievement among our students culminating to a period of leveled scores. It is expected that $50 \%$ of students score at or above proficiency in FCAT 2.0 Science.
Science Goal \#1a:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| :--- | :--- |
| $34 \%(209)$ | $38 \%$ |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Increase student exposure to hands-on inquiry lessons. | Teachers will continue using hands- on activities weekly, incorporating science process skills. | Science Coach and Science Department Chair, Science Teachers | Weekly PLC's and common lesson planning | Student lab reports and mini assessments. |
| 2 | Students need reinforcement of reading skills and science process writing. | Students will utilize FCAT prep skills in science classrooms using textbook ancillaries. | Science Coach and Science Department Chair, Science Teachers | Common assessments, weekly PLCs | student mini assessements, student work samples |
| 3 | Students lack adequate exposure to science inquiry in weekly instructional strategies. | Teachers will be trained to use the Interface for Scientific Learning and Natural Discovery (ISLANDS) IMACS curriculum | District Science Supervisor, Science Coach, Department Chair | Classroom Walkthroughs, IMACS management system | Student mini assessments, usage summary reports. |
| 4 | Earth and Space science is an area of weakness and students require more exposure to inquirybased lessons. | Science teachers will implement inquirybased lessons using IMACS and Gizmos as well as a variety of proven teaching strategies. | Science <br> Department <br> Head, Science <br> Coach, Assistant <br> Principal | Student engagement, classroom observations, teacher assessments | Mini- assessment, BAT, FCAT 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. <br> Science Goal \#1b: |  |  | It is expected that $50 \%$ of students will score at or above level in FAA Science. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 29\% (2) |  |  | 35\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities <br> Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond. <br> Communication skills, especially expressive communication, are impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | Implement use of science trade books to teach literacy through science | Classroom <br> Teacher, ESE Specialist, Science Coach, Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, monitor lesson plans | 1. FAA results <br> 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:

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. <br> Science Goal \#2a: |  |  | In the previous five years there has been a steady rise in Science achievement among our students culminating to a period of leveled scores. It is expected that $50 \%$ of students score at or above proficiency in FCAT 2.0 Science. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 9\% (53) |  |  | 12\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students lack adequate enrichment to maintain high levels of achievement. | 6th-8th grade students will be required to demonstrate the science process skills and research process through a completed Researched-based Science Project which will include a research paper. | Science Dept Chair, coach and science teachers | PLC, Science Fair competition, Ecybermission, ect. | Student research report and participation in school and district science fair competition. |
| 2 | Students lack adequate exposure to science inquiry in weekly instructional strategies. | Teachers will be trained to use the Interface for Scientific Learning and Natural Discovery (ISLANDS) | District Science Supervisor, Science Coach, Department Chair | Classroom Walkthroughs, IMACS management system | Student mini assessments, usage summary reports |

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

## 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 <br> in science.

It is expected that $50 \%$ of students will score at or above level in FAA Science.

Science Goal \#2b:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| :--- | :--- |
| $14 \%(1)$ | $15 \%$ |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities <br> Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond. <br> Communication skills, especially expressive communication, are impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | Implement use of science trade books to teach literacy through science | Classroom <br> Teacher, ESE Specialist, Science Coach, Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, monitor lesson plans | 1. FAA results <br> 2. Professional conversations with individual teachers to monitor effectiveness |
| 2 | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities <br> Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond. <br> Communication skills, especially expressive communication, are impaired in many cases thus impacting the students' ability to express their response. | Implement use of science trade books to teach literacy through science | Classroom <br> Teacher, ESE Specialist, Science Coach, Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, monitor lesson plans | 1. FAA results <br> 2. Professional conversations with individual teachers to monitor effectiveness |

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

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

| PD <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Responsible for <br> Monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Earth, Life <br> and Physical <br> Science <br> Inquiry <br> Methods | $6-8$ | District STEM <br> Department | One teacher from <br> each grade level | November 2012 | Implementation of <br> content strategies <br> in classrooms and <br> 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 | Implementation of <br> content strategies <br> in classrooms and <br> PLC | 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: $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0}$ |
| Technology | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Strategy | No Data | No Data | $\$ 0.00$ |
| No Data |  |  | Subtotal: $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0}$ |
|  | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Professional Development | Substitutes need for 6 teachers | Title 1 | $\$ 540.00$ |
| Strategy | Suber <br> to participate in District <br> Professional Development |  |  |
| Science and Core Literacy; <br> Science Inquiry Methods |  |  |  |

Subtotal: \$540.00

| Other | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Strategy | No Data | No Data | $\$ 0.00$ |
| No Data |  |  | Subtotal: $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0}$ |
|  |  | Grand Total: $\mathbf{\$ 5 4 0 . 0 0}$ |  |

## Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level In the previous five years have been able to demonstrate 3.0 and higher in writing. high proficiency in Writing. In 2012, there was a sharp Writing Goal \#1a: decrease in the level of proficiency for Writing. It is

Wra
2012 Current Level of Performance: expected that $91 \%$ of students score at or above proficiency in FCAT 2.0 Writing.

83\% (509)

|  | 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 <br> exposed to proficient <br> writing and be able to <br> recognize good writing. <br> Students need have <br> writing modeled for <br> them to clearly <br> understand the writing <br> process. | LA teachers will utilize <br> FCAT Writing anchor <br> papers to make sure <br> students recognize <br> proficient writing. <br> Writing will be modeled <br> by LA teachers to <br> ensure understanding of <br> 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 <br> concentration on <br> grammar conventions <br> resulted in lower <br> scores. Direct grammar <br> instruction needs to be <br> included in the teaching <br> of writing. | Instructional focus <br> calendars have been <br> re- written to include <br> direct grammar <br> instruction in LA <br> classrooms. | LA teachers, <br> Department <br> Chairs and <br> Assistant <br> Principals | Weekly PLC |  |
| Writing needs to be <br> assessed in all classes, <br> not just LA classes. <br> Writing across the <br> content areas needs to <br> occur on a regular <br> basis. | Instructional focus <br> calendars have been <br> reviewed and revised to <br> maintain continued <br> growth through <br> modeled strategies and <br> hands on scaffolding in <br> all 8th grade <br> classrooms. | Classroom <br> teachers, | Department <br> Chairs and <br> Assistant <br> Principals | Lesson Plans, <br> Student <br> portfolios, FCAT <br> Writing scores |  |
| Meektings |  |  |  |  |  |

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 4 or higher in writing. <br> Writing Goal \#1b: |  |  | It is expected that $50 \%$ of students will score at 4 or higher in FAA Writing. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 43\% (3) |  |  | 50\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | All students are in the moderate to profound range of cognitive disabilities <br> Behavioral disabilities impede instruction time and ability to respond. <br> 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. | Classroom <br> Teacher, ESE <br> Specialist, <br> Assistant Principal | Review lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, reading student writing samples | 1. FAA results <br> 2. Professional conversations with individual teachers to monitor effectiveness |

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

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

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

## Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | tal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | tal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | tal: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | tal: \$0.00 |

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.

Civics Goal \#1:

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

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{||l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \hline \text { Anticipated Barrier } & \text { Strategy } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Person or } \\
\text { Position } \\
\text { Responsible } \\
\text { for } \\
\text { Monitoring }\end{array}
$$ \& \begin{array}{l}Process Used to <br>
Determine <br>
Effectiveness of <br>

Strategy\end{array} \& Evaluation Tool\end{array}\right]\)| No Data Submitted |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |


| 2. Students scoring 4 and 5 in Civics. <br> Civics Goal \#2: | or above Ach |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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


|  |  |  | Subtotal: $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Professional Development | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Strategy | No Data | No Data | $\$ 0.00$ |
| No Data |  |  | Subtotal: $\$ 0.00$ |
|  |  | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Other | Description of Resources | No Data | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Strategy | No Data |  | Subtotal: $\$ 0.00$ |
| No Data |  |  | Grand Total: $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0}$ |
|  |  |  |  |

End of Civics Goals

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

| 1. Attendance <br> Attendance Goal \#1: |  |  | 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 Current Attendance Rate: |  |  | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |  |  |
| 94\% (1933) |  |  | 96\% |  |  |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |  |  |
| 158 |  |  | 79 |  |  |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies ( 10 or more) |  |  |
| 43 |  |  | 21 |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 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. | Guidance Director and School Social Worker | Rti team will review attendance records and track progress through pinnacle. | Data Warehouse <br> School <br> Attendance <br> Reports |

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| ubtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |

End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

| 1. Suspension | By June of 2013, the number of students internally <br> suspended will decrease by $20 \%$ from 317 to 253. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Suspension Goal \#1: | By June of 2013, the number of students externally <br> suspended will decrease by $20 \%$ from |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Total Number of In- School Suspensions | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 558 | 446 |


| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended I n-School |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended InSchool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 317 |  |  | 253 |  |  |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Out- of- School Suspensions |  |  |
| 125 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- ofSchool |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |  |  |
| 86 |  |  | 69 |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Teachers with (less than 3 years experience) in the classroom need additional training in classroom management strategies. | Monthly PLC with less experienced teachers in Classroom Management strategies | Behavior 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 <br> 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. | Grade level administrators and guidance counselors. | During weekly team meetings, the teachers, guidance counselor and administrator will review suspension data from each individual team. | End of year suspension data |

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

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

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


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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| 1. Parent I nvolvement <br> Parent I nvolvement Goal \#1: <br> *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, parentteacher conferences, parent informational meetings, SAC and SAF) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent I nvolvement: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Parent I nvolvement: |  |  |
| 65\% (1325) |  |  | 70\% (1391) |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Work schedules conflict with parents ability to attend. | Provide a variety of times and dates to accommodate more parents. | Grade Level Administrator 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. | Grade Level Administrator SAC CoChairs | Collection of sign in sheets for all activities and review at SAC and SAF meetings. | Sign in Sheets. |

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

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

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

Parent I nvolvement Budget:

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

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:

| 1. STEM | There will be in increase of STEM initiatives in our school <br> and an increase in student participation of current <br> initiatives. <br> Increase the enrollment of students in high level <br> mathematics courses like Algebra and Geometry. <br> Increase the participation of students in research- based <br> science projects. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1: |  |

|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 Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Vast majority of students lack exposure to STEM related fields in Science and Math. | 6-8 science students will complete at researched based science project | Science <br> Department Chair, Coach and 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, Assistant Principal | Teacher- made assessments designed to test pre-algebra concepts infused into the curriculum. | Algebra <br> Enrollment Counts |
| 3 | 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 competitions coordinator, math department chair. | Student interest and involvement in the math competitions club. | Student Participation 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 competitions coordinator, math department chair. | Student interest and involvement in the math competitions club. | Student Participation Counts |

## 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 <br> PLC, subject, <br> (e.g., <br> (rade level, or <br> school-wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules <br> (e.g., | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| for Monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## STEM Budget:

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

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


| No Data | No Data | No Data |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| Other | Description of Resources | Funding Source |

## 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. CTE <br> CTE Goal \#1: |  |  | Increase student enrollment in CTE courses. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lack of CTE courses | Develop a Information Technology course and an Pre-Engineering course for students to begin the pathway of career certification. | Assistant Principals | Enrollment of students in courses | Master schedule |
| 2 | Lack of instructors for CTE courses | Review teacher certification areas and/or recruit teachers to seek certification in CTE areas. | Assistant 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 and/ or PLC Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/ or PLC Leader | PD <br> Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## CTE Budget:

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

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

## Differentiated Accountability

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

Are you a reward school: j 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.

囚

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

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

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council 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 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Broward School District <br> LYONS CREEK MI DDLE SCHOOL <br> 2009-2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT 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 Learning Gains | 62\% | 65\% |  |  | 127 | 3 ways to make gains: <br> - Improve FCAT Levels <br> - Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br> - Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25\% in the School? | 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 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent Tested = } \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | B | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and \% of students tested |


[^0]:    No data submitted

[^1]:    - The Reading Coach will provide on-going school-wide training emphasizing instructional strategies for reading

[^2]:    * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)).

