

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: C. H. PRICE MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Putnam

Principal: Leah Lundy

SAC Chair: Janis Plym

Superintendent: Tom Townsend

Date of School Board Approval: Pending approval

Last Modified on: 11/5/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Leah Lundy	Hearing Impaired Education K-12, Ed Leadership, School Principal	3	9	Interlachen Elementary School was an "A" school from 2003-2009. IES made AYP the past 3 years. Price Middle School was a "C" school for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 school year and failed to make AYP.
Assis Principal	Mike Tucker	Health K-12, PE K-12, Educational Leadership	3	6	Crescent City Jr/Sr High School received the following school grades from 2007-2009: "C", "B", and "C". Price Middle School was a "C" school for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 school year and failed to make AYP.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Curriculum Resource Teacher	Cindy Bellamy	Elementary Education	1	1	Kelley Smith has been an A school for the past five years.

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	SFA training for Reading and Math	District Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	Ongoing	
2	Highly qualified professional development	Administrators and CRT	Ongoing	
3	Interns from local colleges	Principal	Ongoing	
4	New Teacher Mentor Program	District/Mentor teachers	Ongoing	
5	Price New Teacher Team	Guidance, Administration	Ongoing	
6	SREB Focus Teams	Administration, SREB consultant	Ongoing	
7	Common Core training through TIF	Administration, DDI team	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
28	7.1%(2)	21.4%(6)	21.4%(6)	50.0%(14)	25.0%(7)	96.4%(27)	14.3%(4)	0.0%(0)	67.9%(19)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Nellie Vallecillos	Kim Berry	Experience with helping teachers getting oriented to the beginning teacher process	Daily mentoring, checksheets for awareness, classroom observations, team teaching, planning together
Nancy Turner	Katie Barnard	Experience with helping teachers getting oriented to the beginning teacher process	Daily mentoring, checksheets for awareness, classroom observations, team teaching, planning together

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

Title I, Part A

Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged by Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies. Title I, Part A programs are coordinated through the District Instructional Team (IT) and includes the above mentioned personnel and the Directors of Elementary, Secondary, Exceptional Student Education, and Federal Programs. This team meets (at a minimum) monthly and establishes and monitors program evaluation for all schools to ensure all entitlement programs' resources are available and fully implemented at each school site and that all funds are used effectively and efficiently as possible. Communication throughout the year is ongoing with the building level administrators regarding progress toward these goals and objectives as stated in the grants. Coordination of these services is done in the following ways: (1) Principal meetings are scheduled monthly; (2) Periodic and scheduled validity assessments are completed during the year by the IT; (3) Email dissemination regarding technical assistance papers and guidance are made available to the school sites; (4) Training meetings are held targeting goals and objectives set by each participating school. (5) Collaborative assistance is provided by several consultants hired to address specific deficiencies demonstrated by participating schools through the comprehensive district-wide assessments completed prior to and at the outset of the year; (6) Quarterly review of periodic assessment data will be completed with the results reported to each participating school for review and needed revisions in objectives or instructional strategies are addressed.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

In addition to the services provided by Title I, part A, the district uses Part C funds to Improve the Academic Achievement of the school's migratory children. Title I, Part C initiatives are coordinated by the district Instructional Team (IT) and includes the above mentioned personnel at the school site and the Directors of Elementary, Secondary and Exceptional Student Education.

Title I, Part D

See Title I, Part A. In addition, Putnam County District Schools maintains collaborative and partner-like relationships with Family Medical and Dental Services and Putnam Health (Health services for students) to serve Homeless and Neglected and Delinquent students by providing health services. The District also partners with the Department of Juvenile Justice and Putnam County Sheriff's Department to target delinquent students and provide mentoring and counseling services that foster relationships and provide supplemental support services. Funds are also utilized to provide services at the district's Solutions Center (Alternative Center).

Title II

Title II

Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals includes Part A, Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund and Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology. Initiatives to improve the quality of instruction are directed by Local Educational Agencies. These programs are directed through the district's Curriculum and Instruction Team (IT) and includes the above mentioned personnel and the Directors of Staff Development, Elementary, Secondary, Exceptional

Education, and Federal Programs.

Title III

The school coordinates language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant students to improve their academic achievement. LEP and Immigrant education initiatives are supervised by the Putnam Department of Curriculum and Instruction. This team meets (at a minimum) monthly and establishes and monitors program evaluation for all schools to ensure that services are aligned to specific school needs and are efficiently funded without duplication.

Articulation is ongoing regarding progress toward these goals and objectives as stated in the grants.

Coordination of these services is done in the following ways:

- (1) Principal meetings are scheduled monthly;
- (2) Periodic and scheduled validity assessments are completed during the year by the IT;
- (3) Email dissemination regarding technical assistance papers and guidance are made available to the school sites;
- (4) Training meetings are held targeting goals and objectives set by each school.
- (5) Collaborative assistance is provided by several consultants hired to address specific deficiencies demonstrated by participating schools through the comprehensive district-wide assessments completed prior to and at the outset of the year;
- (6) Quarterly review of periodic assessment data will be completed with the results reported to each participating school for review and needed revisions in objectives or instructional strategies are addressed. At the school level, teachers and administrators can access LEP and Immigrant student's progress monitoring plan across multiple data sources.

Title X- Homeless

The McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvement Act provides additional services to our students classified as homeless.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Positive Behavior Support initiatives.

Nutrition Programs

The Carol White Grant supports nutrition in education in elementary and middle schools. Students participating in after school programs through SES or 21st Century are provided a nutritional snack.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Computer Keyboarding-Career EPEP

Job Training

Other

Other
Title VI: Flexibility and Accountability includes Part B, Rural Education Initiative. These programs are administered by the the Director of Professional Development.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The School-based RtI Leadership Team consists of: School administrator, CRT, guidance counselor, school psychologist,

teachers of the particular students, and other personnel as appropriate such as staffing specialists (for students with IEP's) behavior specialists, speech and language therapists and mental health counselors.

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

The RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to review individual student's intervention data. In order to comply with Federal Legislation (IDEA 2004) mandates as well as state regulations, the lead team decided to implement a standard protocol process for research-based academic interventions and a diagnostic-prescriptive process for research-based behavioral interventions. SWIS data will be utilized to monitor the need for behavioral interventions. On-going progress monitoring will be completed, graphed and analyzed at monthly follow-up school-based RtI team meetings. At these meetings, a decision to discontinue T2 support, continue and/or modify T2 interventions or provide additional T3 support will be made. RtI is a regular education initiative. The RtI team will coordinate with the ESE department, parents, and all stakeholders.

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

The RtI Leadership Team will work with the School Improvement Team to make sure that the RtI process is thoroughly integrated into the plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

- District Assessments for Reading, Math & Science
- PMP via online DATA STAR system
- FAIR for Reading
- Skyward for tracking behavior patterns and trends
- Putnam Writes via online DATA STAR system

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Putnam County School district will utilize federal, state and local services/programs to provide the highest level and most efficient services to our students. Leaders from each department have met to make sure that resources are utilized in a coordinated fashion in an effort to maximize services without overlapping. The Putnam County School District will utilize Federal Funds to provide Reading/RTI coaches and professional development for employees to enable them to provide interventions with fidelity. State funds will also be utilized to provide Reading Coaches. District funds are utilized to provide intervention resources to include programs, textbooks, and staff.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Leah Lundy, Mike Tucker, Cindy Bellamy, Faith Church, Shirley Davis, Nellie Vallecillos, and Deborah Meredith are part of the SREB Literacy Team.

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

Lead Meetings, Data/Instructional PLC meetings

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

Reading Intervention and Enrichment. Implement a school-wide read where every student and teacher reads silently for the first twelve minutes of fourth period.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/19/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*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.

All teachers at Price Middle School teach a SFA Reading Edge class during first period daily. These core reading strategies are integrated throughout the day in each teacher's content area.

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [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 need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 10% decrease in the number of students scoring below Level 3 in FCAT Reading at all grade levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 FCAT results, 51% (270) of students scored level 3 or above.	All grade levels will increase to 56% (302) proficient in 2013.

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Reading Edge, RTI, District curriculum alignment through TIF trainings	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREBcoaches	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation walkthroughs	FCAT
2	Lack of student motivation.	Increase student celebrations in order to increase motivation.	All stakeholders.	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation walkthroughs	FCAT
3	Lack of Reading Skills taught across the curriculum	Share pacing guides with all curriculum teachers. Share Reading strategies and provide staff development for teaching these skills. Teachers will attend curriculum alignment sessions	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT, SRI
4	Identification of students in sub-groups	All teachers will complete the dashboard to identify students in targeted subgroups	Hotlist will be developed and progress will be monitored.	Administrative Team, CRT, District Support Staff, & Teachers	Interim Assessments, FCAT

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 50% decrease in the number of students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in FCAT Reading at all grade levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 FCAT results, 25% (2) of students scored at level 4, 5, or 6.	All grade levels will increase 0 % proficient in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Person or	Process Used to
--	-----------	-----------------

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Reading Edge, RTI, District curriculum alignment through TIF trainings	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation walkthroughs	FCAT
2	Lack of student motivation	Increase student celebrations in order to increase motivation	All stakeholders	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation walkthroughs	FCAT
3	Lack of Reading Skills taught across the curriculum	Share pacing guides with all curriculum teachers. Share Reading strategies and provide staff development for teaching these skills. Teachers will attend curriculum alignment sessions	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT, SRI
4	Identification of students in sub-groups	All teachers will complete the dashboard to identify students in targeted subgroups	Hotlist will be developed and progress will be monitored	Administrative Team, CRT, District Support Staff, & Teachers	Interim Assessments, FCAT

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students achieving above proficiency will increase by 4%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 FCAT data, 22%(102) of students achieved Level 4 and Level 5 in Reading	The percentage of students achieving Level 4 or Level 5 in Reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT will increase to 26%(120).

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Reading Edge, RTI, District curriculum alignment	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FAIR, SRI, Cycle tests, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
2	The amount of low level questioning and student engagement.	To increase student engagement and the rigor in all core areas.	Principal, Asst. Principal, CRT, Teachers SFA/SREB coaches	Walkthroughs, lesson plans, Interim Assessments, FAIR, SRI, Cycle tests, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading will increase by 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 FCAT data, 75% (6) of students scored Level 7 or above	The percentage of students achieving Level 7 or above in Reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT will increase to 85% (7)

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Reading Edge, RTI, District curriculum alignment	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FAIR, SRI, Cycle Tests, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
2	The amount of low level questioning and student engagement	To increase student engagement and the rigor in all core areas	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Teachers, SFA/SREB coaches	Walkthroughs, lesson plans, FAIR, SRI, Cycle Tests, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students making learning gains on FCAT Reading will increase by 6%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2011-2012 FCAT results, 63% (294) of students made learning gains in Reading	The percentage of students making learning gains in Reading will increase to 69% (325).

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	FAIR, SFA Reading Edge, Curriculum alignment sessions	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FAIR, SRI, FCAT, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT
2	Student motivation.	Increase student celebrations to recognize gains in achievement.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FAIR, SRI, FCAT, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	There will be a 40% increase in the percentage of students making learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 Alternate Assessment results, 0% of students showed growth in reading.	By the end of 2012-2013 school year, 40% of students will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Lack of student	Student celebration	Staff	FCAT, SRI, FAIR,	Alternate

1	motivation. Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA, SREB, Rti, TIF trainings	Principal, AP, CRT, teacher, all stakeholders	walkthroughs, etc Same	Assessment Same
---	--	-------------------------------	---	---------------------------	--------------------

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 10% increase in the percentage of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading on FCAT..
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 FCAT data, 62%(83) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading.	The number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading on FCAT will increase to 68%(91).

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Reading Edge, RTi, district curriculum alignment	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, FAIR, SRI, Cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT
2	One on one instruction with students.	Before and after school tutoring. 21st Century Afterschool program.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, FAIR, SRI, Cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT
3	Failing courses	OdysseyWare for credit recovery	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Monitoring of grades	OdysseyWare 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%.	Reading Goal # We will reduce our achievement gap by 29% by 2016-2017.					
	Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
	47	53	57	62	67	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2011-2012 FCAT results, 54% of White and 47% of Hispanic students were making satisfactory progress in reading.	The percentage of students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase to 59% of White and 52% of Hispanic.

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	FAIR, SFA Reading Edge, Curriculum alignment sessions	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FAIR, SRI, FCAT, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT
2	Student motivation	Increase student celebrations to recognize gains in achievement	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FAIR, SRI, FCAT, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	
Reading Goal #5C:	
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 need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	
Reading Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2011-2012 FCAT results, 26% of students were making satisfactory progress in reading.	The percentage of students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase to 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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	FAIR, SFA Reading Edge, Curriculum alignment sessions	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FAIR, SRI, FCAT, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT
	Student motivation	Increase student	Principal, Assistant	Interim Assessments,	FCAT

2		celebrations to recognize gains in achievement	Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FAIR, SRI, FCAT, cycle tests, iObservation
---	--	--	---	--

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2011-2012 FCAT results, 46% of students were making satisfactory progress in reading.	The percentage of students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase to 51%.

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	FAIR, SFA Reading Edge, Curriculum alignment sessions	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FAIR, SRI, FCAT, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT
2	Student motivation	Increase student celebrations to recognize gains in achievement	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FAIR, SRI, FCAT, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
TIF Sessions for Planning and data analysis of benchmarks	6 - 8	District DDI Team	Language Arts, Reading, Science & Social Studies teachers	Monthly	Lesson Plans	DDI Team

Reading Budget:

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 20% increase in the number of students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking			
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
Based upon 2011-2012 data, 20% (1/5) of students scored proficient in Listening/Speaking					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Reading Edge, RTI, District curriculum alignment through TIF trainings	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation walkthroughs	FCAT
2	Lack of student motivation	Increase student celebrations in order to increase motivation	All stakeholders	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation walkthroughs	FCAT
3	Lack of Reading Skills taught across the curriculum	Share pacing guides with all curriculum teachers. Share Reading strategies and provide staff development for teaching these skills. Teachers will attend curriculum alignment sessions.	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT, SRI
4	Identification of students in sub-groups	All teachers will complete the dashboard to identify students in targeted subgroups	Hotlist will be developed and progress will be monitored	Administrative Team, CRT, District Support Staff, & Teachers	Interim Assessments, FCAT

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 the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 40% increase in the number of students scoring proficient in Reading

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Based upon 2011-2012 data, 0% (0/5) of students scored proficient in Reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Reading Edge, RTI, District curriculum alignment through TIF trainings	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation walkthroughs	FCAT
2	Lack of student motivation	Increase student celebrations in order to increase motivation	All stakeholders	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation walkthroughs	FCAT
3	Lack of Reading Skills taught across the curriculum	Share pacing guides with all curriculum teachers. Share Reading strategies and provide staff development for teaching these skills. Teachers will attend curriculum alignment sessions.	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FCAT, Interim Assessments, SRI, FAIR, cycle tests, iObservation	FCAT, SRI
4	Identification of students in sub-groups	All teachers will complete the dashboard to identify students in targeted subgroups	Hotlist will be developed and progress will be monitored	Administrative Team, CRT, District Support Staff, & Teachers	Interim Assessments, FCAT

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 the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 30% increase in the percentage of students scoring proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Based upon, 2011-2012 Cella results, 0% of students scored proficient in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of writing across the curriculum	Use writing in all content areas	Administration, CRT, Teachers	Putnam Writes, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
2	Minimal use of writing of writing rubrics across	Common writing rubrics used in all curriculum	Administration, CRT, Teachers	Putnam Writes, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT

CELLA 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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 10% decrease in the number of students scoring below Level 3 in FCAT Math at all grade levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 FCAT results, 48% (258) of students scored level 3 or above.	The total will increase to 54% (283) proficiency in 2012-2013.

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process.	SFA Power Teaching, district curriculum alignment, RTI	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
2	Students have limited background knowledge.	SFA Power Teaching, Daily Math problems, Math checks at lunchtime.	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
3	Basic mistakes during math computation.	Daily Math Problems for every student.	Teachers, Math Team, Administration, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
4	Identification of students in sub-groups	All teachers will complete the dashboard to identify students in targeted subgroups	Hotlist will be developed and progress will be monitored.	Administrative Team, CRT, District Support Staff, & Teachers	Interim Assessments, FCAT

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 75%(6) of students will score a 4, 5, or 6 on their Alternate Assessment test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 Alternate Assessment results, 63%(5) of students scored a level 4, 5, or 6.	There will be a 12% increase in the percentage of students scoring a 4, 5, or 6 on the 2012-2013 Alternate Assessment test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of consistency with the monitoring process	SFA Power Teaching	Administrators, CRT, Teacher, all stakeholders	Ongoing assessments and progress monitoring	Alternate Assessment result

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By the end of the 2011-2012 school year, there will be a 5% increase in the number of students scoring a Level 4 or Level 5 in FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2010-2011 FCAT data, 14%(71) of students scored a Level 4 or Level 5 in Math	The percentage of students achieving a Level 4 or Level 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT Math will increase to 19%(94).

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process.	SFA Power Teaching, district curriculum alignment	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
2	The amount of low level questioning and student engagement.	Increase the amount of high level questions the students are answering. Increase student engagement to include rigorous discussion.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 50%(4) of students will score a level 7 or above on their Alternate Assessment exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 Alternate Assessment results, 38%(3) of students scored at or above achievement level 7.	There will be a 12% increase in the percentage of students scoring at or above level 7 on their Alternate Assessment exam.

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	Consistent follow through with the monitoring process	SFA Power Teaching	SFA, Administration, CRT, Teacher, All stakeholders	Ongoing assessments and progress monitoring.	Alternate Assessment Exam

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 10% increase in the number of students making learning gains in FCAT math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Based on 2011-2012 FCAT results, 59% (317) of students made learning gains in math.	The percentage of students making learning gains in math will increase to 66% (348)
---	---

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	Consistent follow through with the monitoring process	SFA Power Teaching, district curriculum alignment	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 3b:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 50%(4) of students will show growth in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 Alternate Assessment results, 0% of students made growth in math.	There will be a 50% increase in the percentage of students making gains in math by the end of the 2012-2013 school year.

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 consistency with the monitoring process	SFA Power Teaching	SFA, Administration, CRT, Teacher, all stakeholders	Ongoing assessments and progress monitoring	Alternate Assessment exam

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 4:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the Math FCAT will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 FCAT data, 55% (74) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.	The percentage of the lowest 25% students making learning gains on the 2012-2013 Math FCAT will increase from 67% to 62% (81).

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process.	SFA Power Teaching, RTI, district curriculum alignment	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT

2	Students failing their course.	OdysseyWare for credit recovery	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	OdysseyWare grades	OdysseyWare grades
---	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	--------------------	--------------------

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 #				
		5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	39	50	55	60	65	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students making satisfactory progress in mathematics will increase by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2011-2012 FCAT results, 53% of White and 39% of Hispanic students were making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The percentage of students making satisfactory progress in mathematics will increase to 58% of White and 44% of Hispanic.

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Power Teaching, District curriculum alignment, RTI	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
2	Students have limited background knowledge	SFA Power Teaching, Daily Math problems, Math checks at lunchtime	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
3	Basic mistakes during math computation	Daily Math Problems for every student	Teachers, Math Team, Administration, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
4	Identification of students in subgroups	All teachers will complete the dashboard to identify students in targeted subgroups	Hotlist will be developed and progress will be monitored	Administrative Team, CRT, District Support Staff, & Teachers	Interim Assessments, FCAT

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
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 need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress in Mathematics will increase by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2011-2012 FCAT results, 28% of students were making satisfactory progress in Mathematics.	The percentage of students making satisfactory progress in mathematics will increase to 33%.

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Power Teaching, district curriculum alignment, RTI	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
2	Students have limited background knowledge	SFA Power Teaching, Daily math problems, Math checks at lunchtime	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
3	Basic mistakes during math computation	Daily math problems for every student	Teachers, Math Team, Administration, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
4	Identification of students in subgroups	All teachers will complete the dashboard to identify students in targeted subgroups	Hotlist will be developed and progress will be monitored	Administrative Team, CRT, District Support Staff & Teachers	Interim Assessments, FCAT

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in mathematics will increase by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2011-2012 FCAT results, 43% of students were making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The percentage of students making satisfactory progress in mathematics will increase to 48%.

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Power Teaching, District curriculum alignment, RTI	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
2	Students have limited background knowledge	SFA Power Teaching, Daily math problems, Math checks at lunchtime	Principal, Assistant Principal, District, CRT, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
3	Basic mistakes during math computation	Daily math problems for every student	Teachers, Math Team, Administration, SFA/SREB coaches	Interim Assessments, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
4	Identification of students in subgroups	All teachers will complete the dashboard to identify students in targeted subgroups	Hotlist will be developed and progress will be monitored	Administrative Team, CRT, District Support Staff & Teachers	Interim Assessments, FCAT

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students scoring a level 3 on the EOC exam will drop to 33%(8).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 Spring EOC results, 42%(10)of students scored a level 3.	There will be a 9% reduction in the percentage of students scoring proficient. They will achieve level 4 or 5 instead.

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process.	SFA Power Teaching, curricular alignment sessions through TIF	Administrators, CRT, Teacher, all stakeholders	District Interim Assessments, Ongoing progress monitoring	EOC exam

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 63%(15)of students will score a level 4 or higher on the EOC exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 Spring EOC results, 54%(13)of students scored a level 4 or higher.	There will be a 9% increase in the percentage of students scoring a 4 or higher on the 2013 Spring EOC exam.

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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	SFA Power Teaching, curriculum alignment sessions through TIF	Administrators, CRT, Teacher, all stakeholders	District Interim Assessments, Ongoing progress monitoring	EOC exam

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of 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 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 need of improvement for the following group:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:				
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 Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based 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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a:	By the end of the 2012-2013school year, the percentage of students scoring proficient on FCAT Science will increase by 7%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 FCAT data, 31% (50) of students were proficient in Science.	The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science test will increase from 35 to 42% (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	Consistency with the monitoring process	Cooperative Learning, Hands on labs, Integration of reading and writing strategies into the Science curriculum, curriculum mapping, Project Lead the Way, Discovery Science	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FCAT data, Interim assessments, iObservation	FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A- No students took the 2011-2012 Florida Alternate Assessment exam at Price	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	Consistency with the monitoring process.	Cooperative Learning, Hands on labs, Integration of reading and writing strategies into the Science curriculum, curriculum mapping, Project Lead the Way, Discovery Science	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches	FCAT data, Interim assessments, iObservation	Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By the end of the 2011-2012 school year, the percent of students achieving above proficiency on the Science FCAT will increase by 4.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based upon 2011-2012 FCAT Science data, 19%(12) of students scored above proficiency in Science.	The percentage of students scoring above proficiency on the Science FCAT will increase to 23%(36) of students.

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
	Consistent follow-	Cooperative learning,	Principal,	FCAT, iObservation	FCAT

1	through with the monitoring process	Hands-on labs, Integration of reading and writing strategies into the Science curriculum, curriculum mapping	Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teacher, SFA/SREB coaches		
---	-------------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:				
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 Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:			By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students scoring proficient on FCAT Writing will increase to 90%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Based upon 2011-2012 FCAT results, 71%(123) of students were proficient in Writing.			The percentage of students scoring proficient on FCAT Writing will increase to 90%(156).		
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	Consistent follow-through with the monitoring process	Rubrics, LGI focus skills, Teaching writing across the curriculum	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, District, Teachers, SFA/SREB coaches	Putnam Writes, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
2	Lack of writing cross curriculum.	Increase writing in all content areas. Schoolwide writing skill monthly.	Administration, CRT, Teachers, SFA/SREB coaches	Putnam Writes, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT
3	Minimal usage of Writing Rubric	All teachers will be provided with the writing rubric and training on how to use the rubric.	Administration, CRT, Teachers, SFA/SREB coaches	Putnam Writes, FCAT, iObservation	FCAT

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

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

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based 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

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:	Will have data in 2014-2015			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Will have data in 2014-2015	Will have data in 2014-2015			
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 need of improvement for the following group:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
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 Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Civics Budget:

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

End of 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 Attendance Goal # 1:	Our attendance goal is to reduce the number of students with 10 or more tardies and absences by 15%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93%	95%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
184	156
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

55			47		
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 lack of working phone numbers.	Alert Now will be used to notify parents of absences. Phone calls home	Data clerk, guidance, administration	Attendance data	Skyward
2	Student motivation to come to school.	Schoolwide attendance incentives through SFA Solutions team. Shooting Stars for students with excessive absences. Oscar Nominees Rti attendance meetings	Data clerk, guidance, administration, Solutions Attendance team.	Attendance data Grades	Skyward

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our suspension goal is to reduce our total number of in-school suspensions and out of school suspensions by 20%. Also, to reduce the total number of students that are assigned to in-school suspension or out of school suspension by 20%.				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions				
847	670				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School				
126	102				
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
622	501				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
83	67				
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 behavior interventions to use in lieu of In-School Suspension and Out-of-School suspension	Rti, Parent contacts, Faculty development of school-wide rules and consequences (S.T.A.R.)	Dean, Teachers, Guidance, Administration	Discipline data	Discipline data

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of 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:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>Provide outreach opportunities to build the communication, academic awareness and parent-teacher relationship by 50%</p>
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Based on prior year Title I parent survey, 32% of the parents of C.H. Price Students felt that the communication between home and school was good.	Provide outreach opportunities to build the communication, academic awareness and parent-teacher relationship by 50%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	
	Person or Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1) Time conflicts with school schedule and parent work schedule 2) Non-working contact phone numbers for parents 3) Limited two-way communication tools 4) Lack of a system for storing email addresses	1) Use of the communication tool AlertNow to inform the parents of important events and need to know information happening at the school. 2) This tool will also inform the school of the numbers that are no longer in service. 3) Implementation of the District-wide Parent Involvement program that provides training and a variety of possible roles parents can play at a school 4) Re-Alignment of PTSTO goals and objectives 5) Offer parenting workshops throughout the year that build skills desired to foster student growth 6) Increasing the parent use of Parent Portal through Skyward	Teachers, administrators, guidance, data entry, parents	Establishing timelines for title I surveys, Copies of sign in sheets for parent functions will be kept on file PSTO meeting minutes will reflect parental outreach goals.	Parent Survey's through Title I, AlertNow reports, sign-in sheets for all parent involvement activities, teacher contact logs

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent nights-Open House, Bingo for Books, Data nights		Title 1 funds	\$3,100.00
			Subtotal: \$3,100.00
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: \$3,100.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:		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
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:			During the 2012 - 2013 school year, we will be implementing a Health Science career academy starting with one group of 6th graders in order to help with reading achievement.		
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	Scheduling conflicts with other required classes	Schedule health class with academy Language Arts class before other classes	Administrator Guidance Counsellor	Student Schedules	FCAT

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Technology Goal:

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. Technology Goal Technology Goal #1:			By the end of the 2011-2012 school year, there will be a 50% increase in the use of the mobile MAC lab by teachers.		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
The use of the mobile MAC lab was only used by 3-5 teachers during the 2010-2011 school year.			Usage of the mobile MAC lab for instruction will increase to 10 teachers by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.		
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	Relocating carts to different classrooms	Media Specialist would sign it out and ensure that it gets to the proper classrooms	Media Specialist	Principal Observations, check-out records	Observations, FCAT

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

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

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

Budget:

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

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

End of Technology Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Involvement	Parent nights-Open House, Bingo for Books, Data nights		Title 1 funds	\$3,100.00
				Subtotal: \$3,100.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$3,100.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA	
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/25/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
No funds provided	\$0.00

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

Monthly meetings about school improvement, teacher requests, lab supplies, etc.

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

Putnam School District C. H. PRICE MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	58%	54%	88%	38%	238	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	61%	56%			117	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	56% (YES)			123	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					478	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Putnam School District C. H. PRICE MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	56%	55%	90%	37%	238	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	57%	62%			119	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	65% (YES)	61% (YES)			126	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					483	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested