Florida Department of Education



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Julia Landon College Preparatory and Leadership Development School	District Name: Duval
Principal: Ms. Sara Bravo	Superintendent: Mr. Ed Pratt-Dannals
SAC Chair: Mr. Blake Menzel	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

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)	Number of Years at Current School	Number 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	Sara Bravo	B.A. (Social Science) M.A. (Educational Leadership) Certifications include Secondary Social Science Education Educational Leadership School Principal (All levels)	4.5	4.5	Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2011-2012 (Grade A) / Increase of 136 total points in FCAT score Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2010-2011 (Grade A) / Increase of 14 total points in FCAT score Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2009-2010 (Grade A) / AYP Met Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2008-2009 (Grade A) / AYP Met Assistant Principal: Landon Middle School April 2008-2008 (Grade C) / AYP Not Met

Assistant Principal	David Cook	B.A. (Fine Arts) M.A. (Educational Leadership Technology) Certifications include Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum Educational Leadership	1.5	1.5	Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2011-2012 (Grade A)/ Increase of 136 total points in FCAT score Teacher: Kirby-Smith Middle School 2004-2011 (Grade A 2007-2011)/ 30 point increase in total FCAT score from 2010-2011)
Assistant Principal	John Galeani	B.A. (Philosophy/Applied Ethics) M.A. (Educational Leadership) Certifications include: Elementary Education Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum Exceptional Student Education Secondary Social Science Education	1.5	1.5	Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2011-2012 (Grade A)/ Increase of 136 total points in FCAT score Teacher: Sandalwood High School 2006-2011 (Grade C in 2009 to A in 2010)
Assistant Principal	Talya Taylor	B.A. (Communications) M.A. (Curriculum and Instruction K-12) Certifications include: English 5-9 Educational Leadership	.5	.5	School Reading Coach: Highlands Middle School 2011-2012 (Grade C)/ Increase of 95 total points in FCAT score School Instructional Coach: Highlands Middle School 2010-2012 (Grade D)

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 ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (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)	Number of Years at Current School	Number 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)
	N/A				

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.

Des	scription of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	
1.	Teachers at Julia Landon are asked to communicate knowledge of any potential candidates for future hire to members of the school-based leadership team.	Teachers/Leadership Team	Ongoing	
2.	Leadership team reviews the district teacher transfer list and interviews potential candidates as deemed necessary.	Leadership Team/PLC Teacher Leaders	Spring/Summer 2013	
3.	School actively participates in all district recruitment activities (as available)	Leadership Team/District Personnel	Spring 2013	
4.	Teachers currently on staff are given consistent feedback and support from the leadership team regarding instructional focus, PLC-driven collaboration, best practices and ongoing professional development. Professional development at the school-based level is embedded in PLC work. In addition to district-level PLC training, all core teachers are granted two TDE days per year to collaboratively plan with their fellow grade level instructor.	Leadership Team/PLC Teacher Leaders/District Personnel	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and 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 instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Teachers who are teaching out of field are all slated to completed their necessary certification and/or endorsement by June 30, 2013. Stacey Tuttle – Gifted Endorsement Christopher Johnson – Gifted Endorsement Bret Hollenbeck – Gifted Endorsement Mathew Schemer – Gifted Endorsement Daniel Geary – Gifted Endorsement Erin Mah – Gifted Endorsement Brianne Lundsten – Gifted Endorsement Ronica Cormier – Reading Endorsement, ESOL Endorsement and Gifted Endorsement Russell Petrick – Science 5-9 and Gifted Endorsement Sandra Platock – ESOL Endorsement George Lee – Math 5-9	All teachers were notified of their out-of-field status in early October and parent notification letters were sent home at this time. All district training and course opportunities are made available to these teachers and the topic is a standing agenda item for the monthly MINT teacher meetings (in this case for Russell Petrick). Spring out-of-field notices will involve individual meetings with the principal to ensure each teachers' understanding of the need to gain the necessary certification and/or endorsement in order to remain in their current teaching position past June 30, 2013.

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	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
37	3% (1)	27% (10)	43% (16)	11 (30%)	30% (11)	Percentage on hold pending the outcome of student growth scores	5% (2)	14% (5)	14% (5)

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	
Pamela Smith	Russell Petrick	Mentor is a National Board Certified instructor with extensive experience serving as a peer teacher. She has served all three levels of middle school students, has served as the lead science fair instructor for the past two years and has extensive experience working with Academically Talented and Gifted program students at two magnet schools in Duval County.	All mentee teachers are required to attend monthly Professional Development meetings with the Professional Development Facilitator, one administrator, and, at times, a district coach. These meetings are followed with monthly debriefs between the PDF and the mentor teachers.	
Judith Kelly	Jennifer Southwell	Mentor is currently in her third year as a guidance counselor at Julia Landon and has served all three grade levels. Mentor has worked extensively within and taken the lead on all aspects of guidance services including serving the ESE and ESOL population, testing coordination, full service referrals, credit checks and balances, high school goal planning, and progress monitoring.	All mentee teachers/guidance counselors are required to attend monthly Professional Development meetings with the Professional Development Facilitator, one administrator, and, at times, a district coach. These meetings are followed with monthly debriefs between the PDF and the mentor teachers.	

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-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.

tle I, Part A	
tle I, Part C- Migrant	
tle I, Part D	
tle II	
tle III	

Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Sara Bravo: Principal - The Principal will ensure that the MTSS team has the assets and training needed to be efficient in their tasks, The Principal will oversee the use of student data and interventions through the use of technology and weekly data meeting. The RtI database will be made available for the principal to efficiently monitor the implementation of interventions throughout the school.

Kristie Putnal: MTSS/RtI Facilitator – The MTSS facilitator will oversee the monthly MTSS team meetings as well as participating in the weekly administrative data meetings. The facilitator will act a liaison between the MTSS team and the school as a whole. Lead the development of goals and the formatting of school based paperwork will also fall under the prevue of the facilitator.

David Cook: School Administrative Liaison – The administrative liaison will act as an intermediary between the MTSS team and administration when waiting for the weekly data meeting is not appropriate. The administrative liaison is also crucial line of communication available for the parents of students with interventions. An additional goal for this year is the maintenance and update of the RtI database.

Judith Kelly/Jennifer Southwell: School Counselor Representative - The school councilors provide training to teachers on MTSS, visit PLC meetings to communicate updates on MTSS, answer questions/concerns of teachers on implementation of interventions, conduct small group work session with students and make certain that all interventions are data driven. The councilors are also highly engaged in the updating of interventions listed in the RtI database.

John Manias: ESE Representative – The ESE representative is responsible for overseeing interventions utilized with students staffed into ESE services as well as providing insight into the effectiveness of interventions

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 MTSS leadership team meets monthly to discuss items and situations broader than the scope handled daily by classroom teachers. At least one RtI leadership team representative also attends the bimonthly team meetings and weekly administrative data meetings. The monthly MTSS follow a planned agenda outlining new teacher concerns, interventions, students receiving MTSS interventions and students no longer needing interventions. Progress monitoring of students previously placed on interventions are also reviewed at the monthly leadership meeting. The school based administration is informed of the current progress of students within the RtI process at the weekly administrative data meetings. The MTSS leadership team members attend district training twice annually to receive updates and to collaborate with other schools regarding successful MTSS interventions.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS leadership team participates heavily in the creation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Key safeguards and interventions as outlined by the MTSS team are utilized by the varying content area groups in determining appropriate goals and implementation strategies for the SIP. The RtI data-based problem-solving process is reflected throughout the SIP. The RtI Leadership Team met with the Instructional Leadership Team during the development of the SIP. These two teams reviewed school-wide, teacher, and individual student data. Recommendations were made in accordance with the data.

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.

Numerous data sources are utilized throughout the school year to assess student knowledge in each content area. Sources included previous year's FCAT data, LSAs, FAIR, Benchmark tests, and computer-based coursework. Pearson's Limelight will be used to monitor students' success and progress throughout the year.

This data will be reviewed at teacher team meetings on a bimonthly basis where teacher concerns about current student issues can be discussed. These meetings rely heavily on current student data as derived from district and school-based assessments. Data will also be reviewed at the weekly administrative data meetings where concerns from team meetings can be discussed by the leadership team. These concerns will also be reviewed at the monthly MTSS meeting.

End of year data will be collected through FCAT scores, state EOCs, district EOCs, Compass Odyssey and final student report card grades.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

At this point in our school's implementation of MTSS/RtI, faculty has integrated essential pieces of the tier framework into their daily routines. This is evidenced by the ongoing discussion during bimonthly team meetings and its notation on many teachers' lesson plans. Professional development regarding MTSS updates will be provided through various means during the course of the school year including faculty meetings, team meetings, and one-on-one discussions with teachers. MTSS/RtI has been added to the PLC and team meeting agenda as well as the agenda for the bimonthly administrative data meeting.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The school's MTSS support system has been integrated into a database that can be utilized through an iPad interface. Each member of the administrative and MTSS/RtI leadership teams has an iPad linked to this database so that pertinent information and interventions can be added or monitored at any time. This provides support by allowing the MTSS team to stay informed of interventions put in place by any member of the MTSS team.

The flexibility of utilizing a mobile database to track the implementation and success of interventions allows teachers more student contact time to implement interventions on a regular basis and reduces the paperwork required on minor interventions.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) includes the five PLC teacher leaders for ELA, Math, Science Social Studies and Electives, the three Assistant Principals, the two Intensive Reading teachers and the principal.

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

The school-based LLT functions by meeting on a weekly basis to review ongoing reading and writing data. This data includes FCAT, Benchmark, FAIR, Compass Odyssey reading and SRI data. These pieces of data to taken to the bi-monthly principal's meetings with the PLC teacher leaders in addition to individual PLCs for review. This process is a standing agenda item within each PLC, at the bi-monthly PLC teacher leader meetings and at the weekly leadership team data meetings. LLT members guide individual teaching staff in making instructional modifications as a result of data analysis. Additionally, the LLT guides major initiatives and rollouts regarding school-based literacy topics.

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

The largest change that addresses literacy this school year is the focus on bottom quartile reading students across all contents including elective courses. The bottom quartile at Julia Landon is comprised of a large number of level three readers. These level three students are not enrolled in Intensive Reading and are not receiving the support they need through the core courses alone. Additionally, many of the students who are not showing gains in reading are also enrolled in Intensive Math, which is a course offered during the "skinny" or Team Time. These bottom quartile level three students are not receiving the differentiation and additional practice using reading strategies necessary to grow their reading skills. All non-PE and Health elective teachers are now implementing reading strategy-based bell ringers within their daily lesson planning to reach more of this population.

Additionally, the Intensive Reading curriculum has changed at all three grade levels to Edge, a program which allows teachers more flexibility in their planning.

Student portfolios in all ELA and Social Studies classes involve ongoing expectations of the use of reading and writing strategies for all grade levels. Students take ownership of the use of these strategies through use of the portfolios.

Public School Choice

• Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

*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 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

At Julia Landon, the teaching and implementation of reading strategies is non-negotiable. Reading strategies are an essential element of our work, and part of the practiced routines and rituals of every teacher in our building. All teachers are trained on how to teach reading strategies, how to differentiate reading strategies to meet the needs of their students and how to help embed the strategies in their content curriculum. School-wide reading strategies were chosen based on the strands of the FCAT Reading Assessment that were continuous areas of deficiency. It is the expectation that all core teachers utilize reading strategies on a weekly basis and the ELA and Social Studies teachers have embedded the school-wide reading strategies into their content area student portfolios. All ELA and Social Studies teachers also utilize the FAIR Data Spreadsheet Tool to identify the reading strategies that best suit individual students who score low or moderately low on the FAIR assessment.

All non-PE and Health Elective teachers (Spanish, Technology, Critical Thinking, Art, Drama and Leadership) use Reading Strategies-focused bell ringers on a daily basis in an effort to reach those level three students who comprise a significant portion of Julia Landon's reading bottom quartile.

The Leadership Team monitors the implementation and infusion of reading strategies school-wide through weekly pop-in visits, CAST informal and formal observations and ongoing dialogue through PLCs. These findings are reported weekly as a standing agenda item at leadership data meetings and through a leadership accessed database which provides communication to teachers and among members of the leadership team.

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(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 personall 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]).

Reading Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent					
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

1 A ECATA	I1 A	I _{1 A}	1 _{1 A}	1 4	1 A	1	
		1A. 1)Each	1A. 1)PLC leads will take a more	1A. 1)Students will be able to	1A. 1)Student Portfolios		
Students scoring at	1)"Every	portfolio	autonomous role in guiding and		1)Student Portionos		
Achievement Level 3	Danding	cover aligns	leading the work.		2) Landarship DLC/Dan In		
in reading.	Reading Teacher"	with the	leading the work.	as well as what is contained	2)Leadership PLC/Pop In weekly visits		
	Working	reading	2)The Leadership team will	within the portfolio and how	weekly visits		
	towards a	categories of	look for evidence of movement		3)CAST evaluation system		
	paradigm	vocabulary,	within the process.	the two are connected.	SICAST evaluation system		
	shift: Content		within the process.		4)District mandated		
	teachers must			2)Deeper level conversation	assessments		
		literary		within the classrooms that	assessments		
	understanding			promote student driven query.			
	that content	informational		0)751			
	is learned	text.		3)There is uniform instructional			
	through the			conversation that occurs across			
		2)Portfolios		content.			
	r .						
	[are student		4)Students use the reading			
	2)	driven		strategies in the elective areas.			
	(2) Understanding	progress					
	that the	tools. Social					
		Studies track		5)All teachers are pulling			
		Reading		their own reading data and			
		Application		understand how to use it to			
	than a teacher			drive their instruction.			
	tracking	Informational					
	device – it is a						
	student driven						
	progress	all four					
	monitoring	categories.					
	tool.						
	I	3)Question					
	3)Critical	stems, CRISS,	,				
	thinking	NHD, RAFT,					
	must be an	DBQ, and					
		SQ3R will					
		provide the					
		instructional					
	areas.	roadmap					
		for critical					
	4)Ensuring	thinking.					
	the						

maximization	4)Increase the		
PLC time to	percentage		
bridge the	of interaction		
instructional	between the		
gaps with	Social Studies		
common	department		
language.	and Language		
language.	arts to		
5)Pulling	share ideas,		
reading data	knowledge,		
from Insight/	and materials		
Inform, and	with a goal		
FAIR to drive	of common		
instruction	OI COMMION		
instruction.	ideas,		
	knowledge,		
	and materials.		
	5)Elective		
	teachers will		
	support the		
	school driven		
	initiative by		
	implementing		
	reading		
	strategies in		
	their content		
	area.		
	6)Utilization		
	of DAT		
	liaison,		
	Edge teacher		
	to set up		
	professional		
	development		
	training in		
	how to pull		
	anneariete		
	appropriate reading		
	leading		
	reports for		
	specific		
	needs and		
	instructional		

		1	1	i -	i		1
		focus from					
		Insight/ Inform, and					
		FAIR.					
Deading Coal #1 A.	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
Reading Goal #1A:	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
During the 2011-2012							
school year, 24% (173 of	d						
722) of students scored							
at Achievement Level 3							
in reading.							
<i>G</i> -							
During the 2012-							
2013 school year, it is							
expected that 26% (185							
of 715) of students are							
expected to score at							
Achievement Level 3 in							
reading.							
	In grades	In grades					
	6-8, 24%	6-8, 26%					
	(173 of 722)	(185 of 715)					
	of students	of students					
		will score at					
	Achievement						
		Level 3 in					
	reading.	reading.					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
		IA.3.	IA.5.	IA.3.	IA.J.	IA.3.	

Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Reading Goal #1B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	data for current level of	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.	2A.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	
Students scoring	1)"Every	1)Each		1)Students will be able to	1)Student Portfolios	
at or above	teacher a	portfolio	autonomous role in guiding and		1)50000000	
	Reading	cover aligns	leading the work.		2)Leadership PLC/Pop In	
Achievement Levels	Teacher"	with the	I -	2)Deeper level conversation	weekly visits	
4 in reading.	Working	reading		within the classrooms that		
	towards a	categories of	1 1 6 1 1 6	promote student driven query	3)CAST system evaluations	
	paradigm	vocabulary,		and student facilitated learning.		
	shift: Content	reading			4)District mandated	
	teachers must	application,		3)There is uniform instructional		
		literary		conversation that occurs across		
	understanding			content.		
		informational				
	is learned	text.		4)Students use the reading		
	through the			strategies in the elective areas.		
	process of	2)Portfolios		shategies in the elective aleas.		
	reading.	are student		5)All teachers are pulling		
		driven		their own reading data and		
	2)	progress		understand how to use it to		
	Understanding			drive their instruction.		
	that the	tools. Social				
		Studies track				
		Reading				
		Application				
	than a teacher					
	tracking device – it is a	Informational				
	student driven					
	progress	all four				
		categories.				
	tool.					
	1	3)Question				
	3)Critical	stems will				
	thinking	provide the				
	must be an	instructional				
		roadmap				
	of learning	for critical				
		thinking with				
	areas.	emphasis on				
		inferring,				
	4)Ensuring	analysis and				
	the	synthesizing.				

maximiz	zation		
PLC tim	ne to 4)Increase the		
bridge th	, principase the		
instructi	percentage		
llisti ucti	, or interaction [
gaps wit	tn between the		
commor	n Social Studies		
language	department		
	acpartment		
5)Pullin	and Language		
reading	arts to		
Complete	. 1 / Briare racas,		
from Ins	knowledge,		
Inform,	and I I		
FAIR to	drive with a goal		
instructi	ion. of common		
	or common		
	ideas,		
	knowledge,		
	and materials.		
	5)Elective		
	DIFFICURE		
	teachers will		
	support the		
	school driven		
	initiative by		
	implementing		
	reading		
	trataging in		
	strategies in		
	their content		
	area.		
	6)Utilization		
	of DAT		
	liaison,		
	Edge teacher		
	Edge teacher		
	to set up		
	professional		
	development		
	training in		
	how to pull		
	appropriate		
	reading		
	reading		
	reports for		l l
	specific		

	needs and instructional focus from Insight/ Inform, and FAIR.					
 Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
6-8, 66% (475 of 722) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.	Level 4 in reading. 2A.2.	2A.2.			2A.2.	
	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

3.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
rformance in	performance in					
		2B 2	2B 2	2R 2	2R 2	
Í	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	
ol ta	2 Current vel of formance:* er numerical u for rent level of formance in box.	2 Current rel of formance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. 2B.2.	2 Current rel of Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of formance in box. 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. 2B.2. 2B.2.	2 Current rel of formance:* Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. 2 D13 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. 2 B.2. 2 B.2. 2 B.2. 2 B.2.	2 Current rel of Level of Performance:* Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of formance in box. 2013 Expected Level of expected level of performance in this box. 2B.2. 2B.2. 2B.2. 2B.2. 2B.2.	2 Current rel of Level of Performance:* er numerical for expected level of ormance in this box. 2B.2. 2B.2. 2B.2. 2B.2. 2B.2. 2B.2. 2B.2.

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
data and reference to						
"Guiding Questions,"						
identify and define areas						
in need of improvement						
for the following group:						

			i	i	,	
3A. FCAT 2.0:	3A.1.	3A.1.		3A.1.	3A.1.	
Percentage of	1)"Every	1)Each		1)Students will be able to	1)Portfolios	
students making	teacher a	portfolio	autonomous role in guiding and			
learning gains in	Reading	cover aligns	leading the work.		2)Leadership PLC/Pop In	
reading.	Teacher"	with the		as well as what is contained	weekly visits	
i chame.	Working	reading	2)The Leadership team will	within the portfolio and how		
	towards a	categories of	look for evidence of movement	the two are connected.	3)CAST evaluation system	
	paradigm	vocabulary,	within the process.			
	shift: Content			2)Deeper level conversation	4)District mandated	
	teachers must			within the classrooms that	assessments	
		literary		promote student driven query.		
	understanding	analysis, and				
		informational		3)There is uniform instructional	1	
	is learned	text.		conversation that occurs across		
	through the			content.		
	process of	2)Portfolios				
	reading.	are student		4)Students use the reading		
		driven		strategies in the elective areas.		
	2)	progress				
	Understanding					
	that the	tools. Social				
		Studies track		5)All teachers are pulling		
		Reading		their own reading data and		
		Application		understand how to use it to		
	than a teacher			drive their instruction.		
		Informational				
	device – it is a					
	student driven	all four				
	monitoring tool.	categories.				
	1001.	3)Question				
	3)Critical	stems, CRISS				
	thinking	NHD, RAFT,	,			
		DBQ, and				
	integral part	SQ3R will				
		provide the				
		instructional				
	areas.	roadmap				
		for critical				
		thinking.				
	4)Ensuring	[g.				
	the					

		•	·	
maximizatio	on 4)Increase the			
PLC time to	percentage			
bridge the	of interaction			
instructional	between the			
gaps with	Social Studies			
common	department			
	department			
language.	and Language			
C/D 11.	arts to			
5)Pulling	share ideas,			
reading data	knowledge,			
from Insight	t/ and materials			
Inform, and	with a goal			
FAIR to driv	ve of common			
instruction.	ideas,			
	knowledge,			
	and materials.			
	5)Elective			
	teachers will			
	support the			
	school driven			
	initiative by			
	implementing			
	reading			
	strategies in			
	their content			
	area.			
	arca.			
	6)Utilization			
	of DAT			
	OI DAI			
	liaison,			
	Edge teacher			
	to set up			
	professional			
	development			
	training in			
	how to pull			
	appropriate			
	appropriate reading			
	reports for			
	specific			
	needs and			
	instructional			

		focus from Insight/ Inform, and FAIR.					
	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
During the 2012-2013 school year, 79% (565 of 715) of students are expected to make learning gains in reading.							
	8, 77% (556 of 722) of students made learning gains in reading.	of 715) of students will make learning gains in reading.					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	data for current level of	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

	-					
4. FCAT 2.0:	4A.1.				4A.1.	
Percentage of		1) Each		1)Students will be able to	1) Portfolios	
students in lowest	teacher a	portfolio	autonomous role in guiding and			
25% making	Reading	cover aligns			2)Leadership PLC/Pop In	
learning gains in	Teacher"	with the		as well as what is contained	weekly visits	
reading.	Working	reading		within the portfolio and how		
reading.			look for evidence of movement	the two are connected.	3)CAST evaluation system	
	paradigm	vocabulary,	within the process.			
	shift: Content			2)Deeper level conversation	4)District mandated	
	teachers must				assessments	
		literary		promote student driven query.		
	understanding			1 5		
		informational		3)There is uniform instructional		
	is learned	text.		conversation that occurs across		
	through the			content.		
	process of	2)Portfolios				
	reading.	are student		4)Students use the reading		
		driven		strategies in the elective areas.		
	2)	progress		strategies in the elective areas.		
	Understanding	monitoring				
	that the	tools. Social				
		Studies track		5)All teachers are pulling		
		Reading		their own reading data and		
	is different	Application		understand how to use it to		
	than a teacher			drive their instruction.		
	tracking	Informational				
	device – it is a					
	student driven					
	μυ	all four				
		categories.				
	tool.	2.0 .:				
	2) G ::: 1	3)Question				
	3)Critical	stems, CRISS,	,			
	thinking	NHD, RAFT,				
		DBQ, and				
		SQ3R will				
		provide the				
	in all content					
	areas.	roadmap for critical				
	4)Ensuring	thinking.				
	the					

maximization	4)Increase the		
PLC time to	percentage		
bridge the	of interaction		
instructional	between the		
gaps with	Social Studies		
common	department		
language.	and Language		
language.	arts to		
5)Pulling	share ideas,		
reading data	knowledge,		
from Insight/	and materials		
Inform, and	with a goal		
FAIR to drive	With a goal		
instruction.	ideas,		
	knowledge,		
	and materials.		
	5)Elective		
	teachers will		
	support the		
	school driven		
	initiative by		
	implementing		
	reading		
	strategies in		
	their content		
	area.		
	arca.		
	6) Utilization		
	of DAT		
	liaison,		
	Edge teacher		
	to set up		
	to set up professional		
	development		
	training in		
	how to pull		
	appropriate reading		
	reading		
	reports for		
	specific		
	needs and		
	instructional		

		1	i	1	 	i	
		focus from Insight/ Inform, and FAIR.					
Transfer of the state of the st	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	6-8, 73% (527 of 722) of bottom quartile reading students made learning gains in reading.	of bottom quartile reading students will make learning gains in reading.		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

Based on ambitious	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
but achievable Annual							
Measurable Objectives							
(AMOs), identify							
reading and mathematics							
performance target for							
the following years							

5 A T :	Danille	1)"Ever-	1)Each montfalic access alice and	1)PLC leads will take a more	1)Students will be able to	1)Students will be able to	1)Students will be able to
5A. In six years	Baseline	1)"Every		autonomous role in guiding and		articulate their portfolio	articulate their portfolio
school will reduce	data			autonomous role in guiding and leading the work.	work; what is on their	work; what is on their	work; what is on their
their achievement	2010-2011	Teacher"	application, literary analysis,	leading the work.	tracking sheet as well as	tracking sheet as well as	tracking sheet as well as
gap by 50%.	0.50/	Working		2) The Leadership team will			what is contained within the
	85%	towards a			portfolio and how the two are		
		paradigm		within the process.	connected.	connected.	are connected.
		shift: Content	2)Portfolios are student driven	within the process.	connected.	connected.	are connected.
		L 4	progress momentum tools.				
		1	Social Studies track Reading		2)Deeper level conversation		2)Deeper level conversation
			Application and Informational		within the classrooms that	within the classrooms that	within the classrooms that
		that content	Text. EDGE monitors all four		promote student driven	promote student driven	promote student driven
		is learned	categories.		query.	query.	query.
		through the	L		L	L	L
		1	3)Question stems, CRISS,		3)There is uniform	3)There is uniform	3)There is uniform
		reading.	NHD, RAFT, DBQ, and SQ3R		instructional conversation	instructional conversation	instructional conversation
		reading.	will provide the instructional		that occurs across content.	that occurs across content.	that occurs across content.
			roadmap for critical thinking.				
		(2)			4)Students use the reading	4)Students use the reading	4)Students use the reading
		that the	4)Increase the percentage		strategies in the elective	strategies in the elective	strategies in the elective
		ulat the	of interaction between the		areas.	areas.	areas.
		and purpose	Social Studies department and				
		is different	Language arts to share ideas,				
		than a teacher	knowledge, and materials		5)All teachers are pulling	5)All teachers are pulling	5)All teachers are pulling
		tracking	with a goal of common ideas,		their own reading data and	their own reading data and	their own reading data and
		device – it is a	knowledge, and materials.		understand how to use it to	understand how to use it to	understand how to use it to
		student driven			drive their instruction.	drive their instruction.	drive their instruction.
		progress	5)Elective teachers will support		dive their instruction.	dive their instruction.	difference instruction.
		monitoring	the school driven initiative by				
		tool.	implementing reading strategies				
		1	in their content area.				
		3)Critical					
		thinking	6) Utilization of DAT				
		must be an	liaison, Edge teacher to set				
		integral part	up professional development				
		of learning	training in how to pull				
		in all content	appropriate reading reports for				
		areas.	specific needs and instructional				
			focus from Insight/Inform, and				
		4)Ensuring	FAIR.				
		the					
		maximization					
		maximization	<u> </u>	l .	Į	l .	

		PLC time to bridge the instructional gaps with common language. 5)Pulling reading data from Insight/ Inform, and FAIR to drive instruction.				
Reading Goal #5A: Julia Landon's target AMO for the 2011-2012 school year was 86%. That target was met. The target AMOs for the next six years are as follows: Target AMO for 2013: 88% Target AMO for 2014: 89% Target AMO for 2015: 90% Target AMO for 2016: 91% Target AMO for 2017: 93%						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

5B. Student	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
subgroups by	1)"Every	1)Each		1)Students will be able to	1)Student portfolios	
	teacher a	portfolio	autonomous role in guiding and		l'istation pertrenes	
ethnicity (White,	Reading	cover aligns	leading the work.		2)Leadership PLC/Pop In	
Black, Hispanic,	Teacher"	with the	leading the work.		weekly visits	
Asian, American	Working	reading		within the portfolio and how	, comp visite	
Indian) not making	towards a	categories of	look for evidence of movement		3)CAST evaluation system	
satisfactory progress	paradigm	vocabulary,	within the process.		[
	shift: Content		l	2)Deeper level conversation	4)District mandated	
	teachers must				assessments	
		literary		promote student driven query.	assessments	
	understanding			promote student driven query.		
		informational		3)There is uniform instructional		
	is learned	text.		conversation that occurs across		
	through the			content.		
	process of	2)Portfolios		content.		
	reading.	are student		A) Q . 1		
		driven		4)Students use the reading		
	2)	progress		strategies in the elective areas.		
	Understanding	monitoring				
	that the	tools. Social				
		Studies track		5)All teachers are pulling		
	and purpose	Reading		their own reading data and		
		Application		understand how to use it to		
	than a teacher	and		drive their instruction.		
	tracking	Informational				
	device – it is a	Text. EDGE				
	student driven					
	progress	all four				
	_	categories.				
	tool.					
		3)Question				
	3)Critical	stems, CRISS	,			
	thinking	NHD, RAFT,				
	must be an	DBQ, and				
		SQ3R will				
		provide the				
		instructional				
	areas.	roadmap for critical				
	L	thinking.				
	4)Ensuring	minking.				
	the					

maximization	4)Increase the		
PLC time to	percentage		
bridge the	of interaction		
instructional	between the		
gaps with	Social Studies		
common	department		
language.	and Language		
language.	arts to		
5)Pulling	share ideas,		
reading data	knowledge,		
from Insight/	and materials		
Inform, and	with a goal		
FAIR to drive	of common		
instruction	OI COMMION		
instruction.	ideas,		
	knowledge,		
	and materials.		
	5)Elective		
	teachers will		
	support the		
	school driven		
	initiative by		
	implementing		
	reading		
	strategies in		
	their content		
	area.		
	6)Utilization		
	of DAT		
	liaison,		
	Edge teacher		
	to set up		
	professional		
	development		
	training in		
	how to pull		
	anneariete		
	appropriate reading		
	leading		
	reports for		
	specific		
	needs and		
	instructional		

		lc		T		1	
		focus from Insight/					
		Inform, and					
		FAIR.					
Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
During the 2011-		Performance:*					
2012 school year, one							
subgroup failed to make							
satisfactory progress in reading when compared							
to the other subgroups.							
A particular emphasis							
will be placed on black							
students, particularly those scoring in the							
bottom quartile in the							
area of reading.							
	White:6% (30 of 504)	White:5% (24 of 475)					
	01 504) Black:33% (38	Black:30% (34					
	of 115)	of 115)					
	Hispanic:17% (5 of 29)	Hispanic:15% (6 of 40)					
	Asian:2% (1 of	Asian:1% (0 of					
	73) American	55) American					
	Indian:	Indian:					
	N/A	N/A					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
	L						

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
data and reference to						
"Guiding Questions,"						
identify and define areas						
in need of improvement						
for the following						
subgroup:						

5C. English	5C.1.				5C.1.	
Language Learners		1)Each		1)Students will be able to	1)Student portfolios	
(FII) not making	teacher a		autonomous role in guiding and			
satisfactory progress	Reading	cover aligns	leading the work.		2)Leadership PLC/Pop In	
in reading.		with the			weekly visits	
in reading.				within the portfolio and how		
			look for evidence of movement	the two are connected.	3)CAST evaluation system	
		vocabulary,	within the process.			
	shift: Content			2)Deeper level conversation	4)District mandated	
	teachers must				assessments	
		literary		promote student driven query.		
	understanding			1 5		
		informational		3)There is uniform instructional		
		text.		conversation that occurs across		
	through the			content.		
	process of	2)Portfolios				
	reading.	are student		4)Students use the reading		
		driven		strategies in the elective areas.		
		progress		suareBres in the erecure areas.		
	Understanding			5)All teachers are pulling		
	that the	tools. Social		their own reading data and		
		Studies track		understand how to use it to		
		Reading		drive their instruction.		
		Application		diffe their instruction.		
	than a teacher					
		Informational				
	device – it is a					
	student driven					
		all four				
		categories.				
	tool.	3)Question				
		stems, CRISS,				
		NHD, RAFT,				
		DBQ, and				
		SQ3R will				
		provide the				
		instructional				
	areas.	roadmap				
		for critical				
		thinking.				
	4)Ensuring	Limiking.				
	the					

maximization	4)Increase the		
PLC time to	percentage		
bridge the	of interaction		
instructional	between the		
gaps with	Social Studies		
common	department		
language.	and Language		
language.	arts to		
5)Pulling	share ideas,		
reading data	knowledge,		
from Insight/	and materials		
Inform, and	with a goal		
FAIR to drive	of common		
instruction	OI COMMION		
instruction.	ideas,		
	knowledge,		
	and materials.		
	5)Elective		
	teachers will		
	support the		
	school driven		
	initiative by		
	implementing		
	reading		
	strategies in		
	their content		
	area.		
	6)Utilization		
	of DAT		
	liaison,		
	Edge teacher		
	to set up		
	professional		
	development		
	training in		
	how to pull		
	anneariete		
	appropriate reading		
	leading		
	reports for		
	specific		
	needs and		
	instructional		

						•	
		focus from Insight/					
		Inform, and					
		FAIR.					
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
During the 2011-2012	Performance:*	Performance:*					
school year, both ELL students maintained their]						
previous FCAT score							
with only a minimal							
DSS change of 8 points							
in both cases. One							
student was exited from							
the ESOL program.							
During the 2012-							
2013 school year, all							
three ELL students							
are expected to make							
satisfactory progress in reading with at							
minimum a 50 point							
DSS change in all three							
cases.							
	In grade 7,	In grades 6					
	both ELL	and 8, all					
	students made	three ELL					
		students					
	progress	will make					
	in reading with one	satisfactory progress in					
	ELL student	reading with					
	exited from	at minimum a					
		50 point DSS					
	program.	change in all					
		three cases. 5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		DC.2.	JC.2.	50.2.	DC.2.	JC.2.	

		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

	len 4	len 4	len 4	len 4	len 4	
5D. Students		5D.1.	5D.1.		5D.1.	
with Disabilities	1) "Every	1)Each		1)Students will be able to	1) Student portfolios	
(SWD) not making	teacher a	portfolio	autonomous role in guiding and		0.1 1 1: PLG/P 1	
satisfactory progress	Reading	cover aligns	leading the work.		2)Leadership PLC/Pop In	
in reading.	Teacher"	with the		as well as what is contained	weekly visits	
g.	Working	reading		within the portfolio and how	DOLGE 1	
	towards a	categories of		the two are connected.	3)CAST evaluation system	
	paradigm	vocabulary,	2)The Leadership team will			
	shift: Content		look for evidence of movement		4)District mandated	
	teachers must		within the process.	within the classrooms that	assessments	
		literary		promote student driven query.		
	understanding					
		informational		3)There is uniform instructional		
	is learned	text.		conversation that occurs across		
	through the process of	1		content.		
	reading.					
	reading.	2)Portfolios		4)Students use the reading		
		are student		strategies in the elective areas.		
	2)	driven				
	Understanding			5)All teachers are pulling		
	that the	monitoring		their own reading data and		
		tools. Social		understand how to use it to		
		Studies track		drive their instruction.		
		Reading		diffe their instruction.		
	than a teacher					
		and				
	device – it is a					
	student driven	1				
	progress	monitors				
		all four				
	tool.	categories.				
	3)Critical	3)Question				
	thinking	stems, CRISS,				
		NHD, RAFT,	1			
		DBQ, and				
	of learning	SQ3R will				
	in all content	provide the				
	areas.	instructional				
		roadmap				
	4)Emarrina	for critical				
	4)Ensuring	thinking.				
	the	J			l	

maxin	mization			
PLC t	time to 4)Increase the			
bridge	1 Jilierease the			
instru	percentage			
misu u	., printeraction [
gaps v				
comm				
langua	department			
	and Language			
5)Pull	ling arts to			
readin	1 11111111111111111111111111111111111			
from 1	J. J. Bilare lacas,			
Inform	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
EAID	m, and and materials and materials with a goal			
FAIR	with a goal			
instru	of common			
	ideas,			
	knowledge,			
	and materials.			
	and materials.			
	5)Elective			
	teachers will			
	support the			
	school driven			
	initiative by			
	implementing			
	implementing			
	reading			
	strategies in			
	their content			
	area.			
	6)Utilization			
	of DAT			
	liaison,			
	Edge teacher			
	to set up			
	io set up			
	professional			
	development			
	training in			
	how to pull			
	appropriate			
	reading			
	reports for			
	specific			
	ppecific			

Reading Goal #5D: During the 2011-2012 school year, 26% of the students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, the 26% of students with disabilities that did not make satisfactory progress in reading will drop to 23%. It is expected that 77% (17 of 23) of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in reading.	Level of Performance:*	needs and instructional focus from Insight/ Inform, and FAIR. 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
	8, 74% (22 of 30) of the students with disabilities made satisfactory	In grades 6-8, 77% (17 of 23) of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in reading.			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

5E. Economically	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1. 1.	
Disadvantaged	1)"Every	1)Each		1)Students will be able to	1)Student Portfolios	
Disauvantageu		portfolio	autonomous role in guiding and		1)Student 1 officings	
students not making	Reading	cover aligns	leading the work.		2)Leadership PLC/Pop In	
satisfactory progress	Teacher"	with the		as well as what is contained	weekly visits	
in reading.	Working	reading		within the portfolio and how	l'i cein, visite	
	towards a			the two are connected.	3)CAST evaluation system	
	paradigm	vocabulary,	look for evidence of movement			
	shift: Content		1 - 4 - 4	2)Deeper level conversation	4)District mandated	
	teachers must		1		assessments	
		literary		promote student driven query.	assessments	
	understanding	analysis, and		l		
	that content	informational		3)There is uniform instructional		
	is learned	text.		conversation that occurs across		
	through the			content.		
	process of	2) Portfolios				
	reading.	are student		4)Students use the reading		
		driven		strategies in the elective areas.		
	2)	L		strategies in the elective areas.		
	Understanding	monitoring				
	mai me	tools. Social				
	portfolio use	Studies track		5)All teachers are pulling		
	and purpose	Reading		their own reading data and		
	is different	Application		understand how to use it to		
	than a teacher tracking	and		drive their instruction.		
	daviag it is a	Informational				
	device – it is a	Text. EDGE				
	student driven	monitors				
	monitoring	all four				
	tool.	categories.				
	1001.	2) 0				
	3) Critical	3) Question stems, CRISS.				
	thinking	NHD, RAFT,	,			
		DBQ, and				
		SQ3R will				
	of learning	provide the				
	in all content	instructional				
	areas.	roadmap				
		for critical				
	4)Ensuring	thinking.				
	the]				
	maximization					

PLC tim	e to 4)Increase the			
bridge th	ne percentage	1		
instructi	onal of interaction	1		
gaps wit	h between the	1		
commor	Social Studies			
language	e. department	1		
	and Language	1		
5)Pullin	g arts to	1		
reading	data share ideas,	1		
from Ins	ight/ knowledge,	1		
Inform,	and and materials	1		
FAIR to	drive with a goal			
instructi	on. of common	1		
	ideas,	1		
	knowledge,	1		
	and materials.			
		1		
	5)Elective	1		
	teachers will	1		
	support the			
	school driven			
	initiative by	1		
	imitative by			
	implementing reading			
	strategies in			
	their content	1		
	area.			
	arca.			
	6)Utilization			
	of DAT			
	liaison,			
	Edge teacher			
	to set up			
	to set up professional			
	development			
	training in			
	how to pull			
	appropriate			
	appropriate reading			
	reports for			
	specific			
	needs and			
	incrus and			
	instructional			

Reading Goal #5E: During the 2011- During the 2012- School year, 31% economically disadvantaged students who did not make satisfactory progress in reading will drop to 29%. It is expected that 71% (62 of 88) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading. In grades 6- 8, 69% (62 of 90) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading. In grades 6- 8, 79% (62 of 88) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading. In grades 6- 8, 89% (62 of 90) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading. Selection of the selection of							•	
During the 2011- 2012 school year, 31% economically disadvantaged students who did not make satisfactory progress in reading. During the 2012- 2013 school year, the 31% economically disadvantaged students who did not make satisfactory progress in reading will drop to 29%. It is expected that 71% (62 of 88) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading. In grades 6- 8, 69% (62 of 90) of economically disadvantaged students made students will make satisfactory progress in reading.			Inform, and FAIR.					
8, 69% (62 8, 71% (62 of 90) of of 88) of economically disadvantaged students made students satisfactory progress in reading. 8, 69% (62 8, 71% (62 of 88) of economically economically disadvantaged students will make students will make progress in reading.	During the 2011-2012 school year, 31% economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, the 31% economically disadvantaged students who did not make satisfactory progress in reading will drop to 29%. It is expected that 71% (62 of 88) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory	Level of Performance:*	Level of					
		8, 69% (62 of 90) of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in reading.	8, 71% (62 of 88) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	

	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
Reading Profession	al Developm	<u>ient</u>	•	-	-	
Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities 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		Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
District PLC Work Categorizing the Curriculum	6-8 ELA Social Studies	R. Cormier B. England Leadership Team	All grade levels	Ongoing Bi-monthly early release meetings and PLC Plus district trainings four times a year Bi-monthly meetings between PLC Leads and Principal	Weekly Friday Data meetings with	ELA and Social Studies PLC Teacher Leaders Leadership Team
School-wide reading strategies	6-8 All subjects	PLC Teacher Leaders Intensive Reading Teacher Leadership Team		Ongoing standing agenda item at bi-monthly early release meetings Bi-monthly meetings between PLC Leads and Principal	Continued dialogue during PLC meetings using standing agendas Weekly Friday Data meetings with leadership team and RtI team members	All PLC Teacher Leaders Leadership Team
RtI Training	All subjects	RtI Team Leadership Team All Grade Level Team Leaders All PLC Teacher Leaders	All subjects All grades	Ongoing portion of agenda at Friday Data meetings Ongoing standing agenda item at all bi-monthly grade level team meetings	Continued dialogue during bi-monthly grade level team meetings at which the grade level administrator is always present Use of RtI database by leadership team and RtI team to continually track and monitor all students in need of additional tiered support	RtI Team Leadership Team Grade level teacher leaders PLC Teacher Leaders
Reading Budget (I		needed)		-		_
materials and exclude d						

activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide laminated reading strategies posters to every ELA, SS and Elective teacher	Laminated posters	School Operating Funds	\$400
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PLC District Training: Providing teachers the tools and knowledge needed to collaborate effectively in creating common assessments and data-driven instructional units to provide students with the best possible differentiated instruction.	PLC Training: In house through TDE training and work sessions and District Trainings held at the Schultz Center for Teaching and Leadership. Substitute teachers needed these days.	School Operating Funds	\$4,000
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Total:			

End of Reading Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

e School Mathema	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent					
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1) Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom.	The computer lab will be available to all students before school each day.	Computer lab teacher Community Education teachers Team-Up teachers Athletic coaches	IA.1. 1) The computer lab teacher will remain in constant contact with classroom teachers about student progress.	IA.1. 1) Weekly reports/updates from classroom teachers. 2) Compass Odyssey reports generated by compass odyssey teacher.	

#1 A ·	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
During the 2012-2013 school year, 17% (122 of 715) of students are expected to score at Achievement Level 3 in math.					
	6-8, 16% (114 of 722) of students scored at Achievement	In grades 6-8, 17% (122 of 715) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in math.			

	2 1.	1 4 2	1 4 2	1.4.2	1 4 2	
1A			1A.2.		1A.2.	
		1) Placement of all level 1 and			1) LSA district baseline and	
					Post Tests	
		daily intensive math classes.		during early release days for		
	th classes				PLC created exit slips and	
		Use daily FCAT bell ringers		and subject area.	quizzes	
leve			3) Math PLC lead teacher			
	k	developed by the math PLC.			Standard portfolios used in	
			4) Compass Odyssey teacher		all math classes	
		3) Give enrollment priority to		and create lesson plans		
	a	all level 1 and 2 math students		utilizing the Categorizing the	4) Compass Odyssey and	
	ļi	into the team-up program.		Curriculum process.	Gizmo reports used to	
					differentiate instruction	
	<u> </u>	4) Progress Monitor each		3) Incorporate Higher		
	1	Module through the use of PLC			5) Formal and informal	
	k	collaboratively created exit		collaboratively developed	assessments using interactive	
	S	slips and quizzes.		during PLC meetings and	white boards and iResponds	
				training into the math	-	
	4	5) Incorporate Compass		curriculum.	6) District Benchmarks	
		Odyssey and Gizmos into			,	
	li	instruction while providing		4) Self-evaluation by	7) Pearson data management	
		Differentiated Instruction		, ,	system	
	lt	to students who are falling		developed portfolios in		
		behind.			8) CAST Evaluation system	
				their work, and recycle their	ĺ	
	le	6) Analyses of data using		work.		
	lı lı	Pearson data management				
		system to drive instruction.		5) Evaluate effectiveness		
		.,		of instruction using Pearson		
				data management system		
1A	3	1A.3.	1A.3		1A.3.	
l			1) Classroom teacher		1) PLC created word	
		create word problems	1) Classicolli todolloi	will be utilized to monitor	problem rubric	
I I I			2)PLC Lead Teacher	student progress.		
		mathematical knowledge.	2,1 Le Lead Teacher	biddeni progress.		
	mina in	mamematical knowledge.				
	ler to					
	able to					
	errupt word					
l						
l prot	blems.					

	1) Insufficient time to move deeply into the curriculum	1) Skillfully design Research (Team Time)	1) Team Time teachers	1A.4. 1) Progress monitor students using Pearson data management system	1A.4. 1) Pearson data management system	
	a solid pace	classes to allow for exploration of discovery learning; increasing				
	senedule.	movement from concrete thinkers to abstract learners.				
		2) Strategically review and remediate skills from the previous year.				
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.		IB.1.	IB.1.	1B.1.	
Mathematics Goal #1B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

	data for current level of performance in	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	
	1) The	1) Progress	1) Classroom teacher	1) Attend district PLC training		
Students scoring	challenge	Monitor	1) Classiooni teacher		Post test	
at or above	of moving	each Module	2) PLC Lead Teacher	release days for collaboration		
Achievement	students	through	2) I Le Lead Teacher	by grade level and subject area.	PLC created exit slips and	
Levels 4 and 5 in		the use of		by grade level and subject area.	quizzes	
mathematics.	are already	collaboratively	1	2) Provide TDEs for teachers	quizzes	
		created exit	1		3) Standard portfolios used in	
	math while	slips and		create lesson plans utilizing the		
	deepening	quizzes.		Categorizing the Curriculum	all main classes	
	and extending				4) Compass Odyssey and	
	their	2) Incorporate		process.	Gizmo reports used to	
	knowledge.	Compass		3) Incorporate Webb's DOK	differentiate instruction	
		Odyssey and		and Higher Order Thinking		
		Gizmos into			5) Formal and informal	
		instruction			assessments using interactive	
		while		during PLC meetings and	white boards and iResponds	
		providing		training, into the math	^	
		Differentiated			6) District Benchmarks	
		Instruction to				
		students who		4) Self-evaluation by students	7) Pearson data management	
		are falling		using the PLC developed	system	
		behind.		portfolios in which students		
				recycle their work, reflect upon	8) CAST system evaluations	
		3) Analyses		their work and growth.		
		of data using			9) Florida Math League	
		Pearson data		5) Evaluate effectiveness of	Contest	
		management		instruction using Pearson		
		system				
		to drive				
		instruction.				
		4) Embed				
		Webb's DOK				
		questions into				
		daily routine.				
		Tanny routine.				
		5)				
		Participation				
		in Florida				
		Math League				
		which				
		encourages				

		problem					
		solving skills.					
THE STATE OF THE S	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
#2A:		Performance:*					
During the 2011-2012							
school year, 71% (513 of							
722) of students scored							
at or above Achievement							
Level 4 in math.							
During the 2012-							
2013 school year, it is							
expected that 73% (521							
of 715) of students are							
expected to score at or above Achievement							
Level 4 in math.							
Lever i mimani.							
		In grades					
		6-8, 73%					
		(521 of 715)					
		of students will score					
		at or above					
	Achievement						
		Level 4 in					
	math.	math.					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		1) Inadequate	1) The computer lab will be	1) Computer lab teacher	1) The computer lab teacher	1) Weekly reports/updates	
		access to	available to all students before			from classroom teachers.	
			school each day.		contact with classroom	2) 01	
		outside the classroom.	2) Access to computers for all		teachers about student progress.	Odyssey reports generated by compass	
		C1035100111.	community education, Team	3) Team-Up teachers	progress.	odyssey teacher.	
			Up and athletes in the after				
				4) Athletic coaches			

		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
abi i ioiiuu	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
or above Level 7 in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal		2013 Expected					
#2B·	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the							
goal in this box.							
		Enter numerical					
		data for					
	performance in	expected level of performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	
		20.3.	20.5.	20.3.	25.5.		
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		1	
data and reference to "Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas						1	
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							

2 A ECAT 2 0	D A 1	D 4 1	b 4 1	2 4 1	2 4 1	
3A. FCAT 2.0:	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	
Percentage of	1)All students	1 /	1) Team-up coordinator and	1)Attend district PLC training	1) LSA district baseline, and	
students making		of all level	team-up math teachers	and provide time during early	Post test	
learning gains in	accelerated	1 and 2 6 th	L	release days for collaboration		
mathematics.		and 7th grade	2)Classroom teachers	by grade level and subject area.		
inative matters.		students in			quizzes	
	level		3)Math PLC lead teacher	2) Provide TDE for teachers		
		math classes.			3)Standard portfolios used in	
			4)Compass Odyssey teacher	create lesson plans utilizing the	all math classes	
		2)Use daily		Categorizing the Curriculum		
		FCAT bell		process.	4) Compass Odyssey and	
		ringers in			Gizmo reports used to	
		all PE and		3) Incorporate Higher	differentiate instruction	
		Health classes		Order Thinking questions		
		that were		collaboratively developed	5) Formal and informal	
		developed by		during PLC meetings and	assessments using interactive	
		the math PLC.		training into the math	white boards and iResponds	
				curriculum.		
		3)Give			6)District Benchmarks	
		enrollment		4) Self-evaluation by students		
		priority to all		using the PLC developed	7) Pearson data management	
		level 1 and 2		portfolios in which students	system	
		math students		recycle their work, reflect upon		
		into the team-		their work and growth.	8)CAST system evaluations	
		up program.				
				5)Evaluate effectiveness of		
		4) Progress		instruction using Pearson		
		Monitor				
		each Module				
		through				
		the use of				
		collaboratively	7			
		created exit				
		slips and				
		quizzes in				
		addition				
		to daily				
		assessment of				
		class work/				
		homework.				
		5) Incorporate				
		Compass				
		1-0	I.	1	Į.	

#2 A ·	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 6) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction. 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
	8, 93% (671 of 722) of students made learning gains	In grades 6- 8, 94% (672 of 715) of students will make learning gains in math.			

		1) Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom.	1)The computer lab will be available to all students before school each day. 2)Access to computers for all community education, Team Up and athletes in the after	3A.2. 1)Computer lab teacher 2)Community Education teachers 3)Team-Up teachers 4)Athletic coaches 3A.3.	1) The computer lab teacher will remain in constant contact with classroom teachers about student	3A.2. 1) Weekly reports/updates from classroom teachers. 2)Odyssey reports generated by compass odyssey teacher. 3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
"Guiding Questions,"						
identify and define areas						
in need of improvement						
for the following group:	4 4 4	4 4 4		4.4.1	4.4.1	
		4A.1.	4A.1.		4A.1.	
Percentage of		1) Build	Classroom teacher	1) Progress monitor students using Pearson data management	Pearson data management avetom	
students in lowest		caring, nurturing	2) Grade Level Administrator	system	system	
25% making		classroom	2) Grade Level Administrator		2) RtI evaluation	
learning gains in			3) RtI Leadership Team	2) RtI reports generated by the		
mathematics.	at each grade	and strong	ľ	RtI Leadership Team		
	level	relationships		_		
		with students				
	2) Lack					
	of parental	2)				
		Strategically pair high need				
		students with				
		community-				
		based mentors				
		3) Contact				
		parents				
		(utilizing				
		notification letters and				
		School				
		Messenger)				
		to emphasize				
		the importance	,			
		of regular				
		and timely				
		attendance at school.				
		SC11001.				

Mathematics Goal #4: During the 2011-2012 school year, 93% (671 o 722) of bottom quartile math students made learning gains in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, 94% (672 of 715) of bottom quartile math students are expected to make learning gains in math.	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
	6-8, 93% (671 of 722) of bottom quartile math students made	In grades 6-8, 94% (672 of 715) of bottom quartile math students will make learning gains in math.			

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

la la	A.2.	4A.2	4A2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		1) Placement of all level 1 and		1) Attend district PLC	1) LSA district baseline, and	
				training and provide time	Post test	
		daily intensive math classes.	team-up main teachers	during early release days for	l Ost test	
	ccelerated		Classroom teachers		2) PLC created exit slips and	
1		2) Use daily FCAT bell ringers		and subject area.	quizzes	
		in all PE and Health classes	3) Math PLC lead teacher	and subject area.	quizzes	
				Drawida TDEs for too show	2) 54 44	
		that were developed by the math PLC.			 Standard portfolios used in all math classes 	
		main PLC.	4) Compass Odyssey teacher	to plan out Math Modules and create lesson plans	all main classes	
		2) Ci			4) C	
		3) Give enrollment priority to		utilizing the Categorizing the		
		all level 1 and 2 math students		Curriculum process.	Gizmo reports used to	
		into the team-up program.		h) I I I I	differentiate instruction	
		(A. D		3) Incorporate Higher		
		4) Progress Monitor each		Order Thinking questions	5) Formal and informal	
		Module through the use of		collaboratively developed	assessments using interactive	
		collaboratively created exit		during PLC meetings and	white boards and iResponds	
		slips and quizzes in addition to		training into the math		
		daily assessment of class work/		curriculum.	6) District Benchmarks	
		homework.				
				4) Self-evaluation by	7) Pearson data management	
		5) Incorporate Compass			system	
		Odyssey and Gizmos into		developed portfolios in		
		instruction while providing			8) CAST system evaluations	
		Differentiated Instruction		work, reflect upon their work		
		to students who are falling		and growth.		
		behind.				
				5) Evaluate effectiveness of		
		6) Analyses of data using		instruction using Pearson		
		Pearson data management				
		system to drive instruction.				
44		*	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
) Inadequate		1) Computer lab teacher	1) The computer lab teacher	1) Weekly reports/updates	
		available to all students before		will remain in constant	from classroom teachers.	
I			2) Community Education	contact with classroom		
	utside the		teachers	teachers about student	2) Odyssey reports	
1		2) Access to computers for all			generated by compass	
		community education, Team	3) Team-Up teachers	 	odyssey teacher.	
		Up and athletes in the after	b) Team of teachers			
			4) Athletic coaches			
		school study han programs.	T Tunctic coaches	l .	l	

Based on ambitious	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
but achievable Annual							
Measurable Objectives							
(AMOs), identify							
reading and mathematics							
performance target for							
the following years							
	D 11						
5A. In six years,	Baseline						
school will reduce	data 2010-						
	2011						
	2011						
gap by 50%.	92%						
	92%						
Mathematics Goal							
#5A:							
<u> </u>							
Julio I andon's torres							
Julia Landon's target							
AMO for the 2011-2012							
school year was 93%.							
That target was met.							
The target AMOs for							
the next six years are as							
follows:							
Target AMO for 2013:							
93%							
Target AMO for 2014:							
94%							
Target AMO for 2015:							
95%							
Target AMO for 2016:							
95%							
Target AMO for 2017:							
96%							
1000							
D 1 1 1 1	A 1: : . :	Ct. :	n n :::	D II I D			
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroups:							

subgroups by	at each grade	1)Collegial conversations and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team.	1) Classroom teacher 2) PLC Lead Teacher 3) Guidance Counselors 4) ESE Teacher 5) Leadership team 6) RtI Team	5B.1. 1)Formal and informal observations 2)Close monitoring of each of these students by teachers, RtI Team, counselors, and Leadership.	5B.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership.	
Mathematics Goal #5B: During the 2011- 2012 school year, one subgroup failed to make satisfactory progress in math when compared to the other subgroups. A particular emphasis will be placed on black students, particularly those scoring in the bottom quartile in the area of math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

of 504) Black: 27% (31 of 115) Hispanic: 3% (1 of 29) Asian:0% (all students made satisfactory progress) American Indian: N/A	1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	5B.2. 1) Placement of all level 1 and 2 6 th and 7 th grade students in daily intensive math classes. 3) Give enrollment priority to all level 1 and 2 math students into the team-up program.	1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2) Classroom teachers 3) Math PLC lead teacher 4) Compass Odyssey teacher	developed portfolios in which students recycle their work and reflect upon their progress and growth. 2)Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	5B.2. 1) LSA district baseline, and post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmark Assessments 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST Evaluation system	
	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
data and reference to						
"Guiding Questions,"						
identify and define areas						
in need of improvement						
for the following						
subgroup:						

5C. English	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1	
Language Learners	1)Non-	1)Ensure all	1)Classroom teacher	1) Attend district PLC training	1) LSA district baseline, and	
	English	teachers have	17014001001111101101	and provide time during early	Post test	
(ELL) not making	speaking	sufficient	2)PLC Lead	release days for collaboration	1 050 1050	
patisfactory progress	parents	training to	[,	by grade level and subject area.	2) PLC created exit slips and	
in mathematics.	r		3)Guidance Counselor		quizzes	
	2)Lack of	ELL learners.	[, - , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	2) Provide TDE for teachers	1	
	training for		4)ESE Teacher	to plan out Math Modules and	3) Standard portfolios used in	
	teachers	2)Seat	ľ	create lesson plans utilizing the		
	on proper		5)Leadership team	Categorizing the Curriculum		
	accommodatio	to center	<u> </u>		4) Compass Odyssey and	
	ns for English	instruction	6)RtI Team		Gizmo reports used to	
	Language			3) Incorporate Higher	differentiate instruction	
		3)Create		Order Thinking questions		
	in their	student-			5) Formal and informal	
	classroom.	centered		during PLC meetings and	assessments using interactive	
		leaning		training into the math	white boards and iResponds	
		strategies that		curriculum.		
		best meets the			6) District Benchmark	
		needs of each		4) Self-evaluation by students	Assessments	
		ELL student		using the PLC developed		
		and provide		portfolios in which students	7) Pearson data management	
		alternative		recycle their work and reflect	system	
		instruction		upon their progress.	9) CAST F -1 -4:	
		whenever need	1	5) Evaluate effectiveness of	8) CAST Evaluation system	
		arises.		instruction using the Pearson		
		4) Give verbal		data management system.		
		and written		data management system.		
		information				
		and				
		explanation				
		along with				
		visual				
		presentations.				
		ſ				
		5)Auditory				
		plus written				
		directions in a				
		brief format.				
		[
		6)Assign				
		buddies and				

		peer tutors.			
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected			
#5C:	Level of	Level of			
	Performance:*	Performance:*			
During the 2011-					
2012 school year, both ELL students made					
satisfactory progress in					
mathematics. One ELL					
student raised her math					
FCAT score from a level					
1 to a level 3. The other					
ELL student raised his					
math FCAT score from a					
level 4 to a level 5.					
Desire a 4h a 2012					
During the 2012- 2013 school year, all					
three ELL students					
are expected to make					
satisfactory progress in					
math with each raising					
their math FCAT score					
one level or higher.					
	In grade 7,	In grades 6			
	both ELL	and 8, all three			
	students made	ELL students			
	satisfactory	will make			
		satisfactory			
		progress in			
		math with			
	one or two math FCAT	each raising their math			
	math FCA I levels.	FCAT score			
	10 v 013.	one level or			
		higher.			

		1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	daily intensive math classes. 2) Give enrollment priority to all level 1 and 2 math students into the team-up program. 3) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 6) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.	Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers Classroom teachers Math PLC lead teacher Compass Odyssey teacher	developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 2) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST system evaluations	
		5C.3.	5C.3.		5C.3.	5C.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Studer	ents			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	
with Disab	Dillucs		· ·	1)Classroom teacher	1)Formal and informal	1)Feedback from teachers,	
(SWD) not		identification			observations	RtI Team, counselors and	
satisfactor	rv nrogress	of RtI Tier		2)RtI Team		Leadership.	
in mathem	natics	- 4114 1161 5	monitoring of		2)Close monitoring of each		
in machen	natics.			3)Guidance Counselor	of these students by teachers,		
			with PLC		RtI Team, counselors, and		
			team, grade		Leadership.		
		•	level team and				
		support	RtI Team.				
			2)Seat student close to the front of the room.				
			3)Assign buddies and peer tutors.				

Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Curre Level of Performance	Level of			
During the 2011-2012 school year, 11% (3 of 30) of the students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in				
math. During the 2012-2013 school year, the 11% of students with disabilities				
that did not make satisfactory progress in reading will drop to 10%. It is expected that				
90% (20 of 23) of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in math.				
In grades 8, 89% (2 of 30) of t students w disabilitie.	8, 90% (20 ne of 23) of the students with			
made satisfactor progress i math.	will make y satisfactory			

		1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	 Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. Give priority to all level 1 and 2 math students enrolling in the team-up program. Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction. 	5D.2. 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2) Classroom teachers 3) Math PLC lead teacher 4)Compass Odyssey teacher	Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	5D.2. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4)Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6 District Benchmark assessments 7)Pearson data management system 8)CAST Evaluation system 5D.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5E. Economically			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	
Disadvantaged	1) Proper	 Collegial 	Classroom teacher	1)Formal and informal	1) Feedback from teachers,	
students not making	identification	conversation			RtI Team, guidance	
satisfactory progress	or Ku Tier	and	2) RtI team		counselors and the	
in mathematics.	-	monitoring of		2) Close monitoring of each	Leadership Team.	
in mathematics.	students	student data		of these students by teachers,		
		with PLC		RtI Team, counselors, and		
	2) Lack of	team, grade	I .	Leadership.		
	parental	level team and				
	support	RtI Team.				
		2) Seat				
		student close				
		to the front of				
		the room.				
		2) Ai				
		3) Assign				
		buddies and				
		peer tutors.				
		ļ				

			i	i	1	<u> </u>	
#5E:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
During the 2011-2012							
school year, 19% (23							
of 122) economically							
disadvantaged students							
did not make satisfactory	7						
progress in math.							
During the 2012-							
2013 school year, the							
19% of economically							
disadvantaged students							
who did not make							
satisfactory progress							
in reading will drop to 18%. It is expected							
that 82% (72 of 88)							
of economically							
disadvantaged students							
will make satisfactory							
progress in math.							
	In grades 6-	In grades 6-					
	8, 19% (23	8, 18% (72					
		of 88) of					
	economically	disadvantaged					
	students made	students					
		will make					
	progress in	satisfactory					
	math.	progress in					
		math.					

5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
1) All student	s 1) Placement of all level 1 and	1) Team-up coordinator and	1) Self-evaluation by	1) LSA district baseline, and	
are placed in	2 6th and 7th grade students in	team-up math teachers	students using the PLC	Post test	
accelerated	daily intensive math classes.	1	developed portfolios in		
math classes		2) Classroom teachers	which students recycle their	2) PLC created exit slips and	
at each grade	2) Give enrollment priority to		work, reflect upon their work	quizzes	
level		3) Math PLC lead teacher	and growth.	<u></u>	
	into the team-up program.			3) Standard portfolios used in	
		4)Compass Odyssey teacher	2) Evaluate effectiveness of	all math classes	
	3) Incorporate Compass		instruction using Pearson		
	Odyssey and Gizmos into		data management system	4) Compass Odyssey and	
	instruction while providing			Gizmo reports used to	
	Differentiated Instruction			differentiate instruction	
	to students who are falling				
	behind.			5) Formal and informal	
				assessments using interactive	
	4) Analyses of data using			white boards and iResponds	
	Pearson data management				
	system to drive instruction.			District Benchmarks	
				7) Pearson data management	
				system	
			1	8) CAST system evaluations	
5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
1) Inadequate		1) Computer lab teacher		1) Weekly reports/updates	
access to	available to all students before		will remain in constant	from classroom teachers.	
technology	school each day.	2) Community Education	contact with classroom		
outside the		teachers	teachers about student	Odyssey reports	
classroom.	2) Access to computers for all		progress.	generated by compass	
	community education, Team	3) Team-Up teachers		odyssey teacher.	
	Up and athletes in the after				
	school study hall programs.	4) Athletic coaches			

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals (this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent					
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring at Achievement	1) Computer	1) Provide	1.1. 1) Classroom teacher	1.1. 1) Progress monitor students	1.1. 1) Pearson management	
Level 3 in Algebra 1.	successfully complete Algebra EOC	access to online LSAs as a means to practice		using Pearson data management system	system	

			·	1	•	
		2013 Expected Level of				
		Performance:*				
During the 2011-2012	r criormanec.	r criormanec.				
school year, 9% (7 of						
78) of 7th graders scored						
at Achievement Level 3						
in Algebra I.						
50% (72 of 143) of						
8th graders scored at						
Achievement Level 3 in						
Algebra I.						
During the 2012-2013						
school year, 8% (9 of						
111) of 7 th graders are						
expected to score at						
Achievement level 3 in						
Algebra I.						
49% (64 of 132) of 8 th						
graders are expected to						
share at Achievement						
Level 3 in Algebra I.						

Level 3 in Algebra I. In grade 8 50% (72 of 143) of students scored at	8) (10 of 111) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra I. In grade 8, 52% (69 of 132) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in				
	1.2 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	 Placement of all level 1, 2 and 3 students in intensified algebra class. Give priority to all level 1 and 2 math students enrolling in the team-up program. 	 Classroom teachers Math PLC lead teacher Compass Odyssey teacher 	developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 2) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2. Students scoring	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
at or above	1) The	1) Progress		1) Provide time during early	1) LSA district baseline, and	
	challenge	Monitor		release days for collegial	Post test	
Achievement Levels	of moving			collaboration.		
4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	students	through	2) The head reacher	condociation.	2) PLC created exit slips and	
		the use of		2) Provide TDE for teachers	quizzes	
		collaborativ		to plan out Math Modules and	quizzes	
		ely created		create lesson plans utilizing the	3) Standard portfolios used	
		exit slips and			in all math classes	
	deepening	quizzes.		process.		
	and extending			•	4) Compass Odyssey and	
	their	2)		3) Incorporate Webb's DOK	Gizmo reports used to	
	knowledge.	Incorporate		and Higher Order Thinking	differentiate instruction	
		Compass		questioning techniques,		
		Odyssey and			5) Formal and informal	
		Gizmos into			assessments using interactive	
		instruction		training, into the math	white boards and iResponds	
		while		curriculum.		
		providing			District Benchmarks	
		Differentiated		4) Self-evaluation by students		
		Instruction to		using the PLC developed	7) Pearson data management	
		students who			system	
		are falling		recycle their work, reflect upon		
		behind.		their work and growth.	8) CAST system evaluations	
		3) Analyses		5) Evaluate effectiveness of	O Florido Made Loca	
		of data using		instruction using Pearson	9) Florida Math League	
		Pearson data		instruction using rearson	Contest	
		management				
		system				
		to drive				
		instruction.				
		4) Embed				
		Webb's DOK				
		questions into				
		daily routine.				
	I	L.				
	I	5)				
		Participation				
	I	in Florida				
		Math League				
		which				

		encourages			
		problem			
		solving skills.			
Algebra Goal #2:	2012 Current	2013 Expected			
	Level of	Level of			
	Performance:*	Performance:*			
school year, 91% (71 of					
78) of 7 th graders scored					
at or above Achievement					
Levels 4 and 5 in					
Algebra I.					
50% (71 of 143) of 8 th					
graders scored at or					
above Achievement					
Levels 4 and 5 in					
Algebra I.					
During the 2012-2013					
school year, 92% (102					
of 111) of 7th graders					
are expected to score at					
or above Achievement					
Levels 4 and 5 in					
Algebra I.					
53% (70 of 132) of 8th					
graders are expected					
to score at or above					
Achievement Levels 4					
and 5 in Algebra I					
G					

	91% (71 of 78) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra I. In grade 8, 50% (71 of 143) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5	Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra I. In grade 8, 53% (70 of 132) of students will score at or above Achievement					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	

3A. In six years,	Baseline	1)PLC	1)PLC develops FCAT bell	1)Student portfolios become	1)Student portfolios begin to	1)Student portfolios begin to	1)Student partfalias begin to
school will reduce	data 2010-	develops					travel with students through
		FCAT bell			the grade levels each year		the grade levels each year
their achievement	2011	ringers used		tools	line grade levels each year	the grade levels each year	the grade levels each year
gap by 50%.	92%	by every math	2)ELA PLC develops FCAT	tools			
	92/0			2)Math LSAs will be more	2)Math LSAs become the	2)Math LSAs become the	2)Math LSAs become the
		all elective			way of assessment for all	way of assessment for all	way of assessment for all
		teachers	to develop reading strategies	vetting eliminating the need	math teachers school and	math teachers school and	math teachers school and
			within all students	for additional assessments by	district wide	district wide	district wide
		2)Utilize		teachers			
			3) Progress Monitor each				
							3)Webb's DOK questions
				DOK questions into daily	become part of the daily	become part of the daily	become part of the daily
			slips and quizzes.	routine	lesson planning and board		lesson planning and board
		enrich math	4) In	4) In annual the mannantage of	configurations in all math	configurations in all math	configurations in all math
		skills		4)Increase the percentage of interaction between the Science	classes	classes	classes
		3)The use			4)Math and Science PLCs	4)Math and Science PLCs	4)Math and Science PLCs
		of skillful					meet collaboratively once a
			students who are falling behind.		quarter to continue increase		quarter to continue increase
		by the math		g	of STEM goals	of STEM goals	of STEM goals
			5)Analyses of data using			3	3
			Pearson data management				
		levels of	system to drive instruction,				
		responses	specifically through the				
		from the	comparative LSA assessements				
		students					
		A) II	6) Embed Webb's DOK				
		4)Have students	questions into daily routine.				
			7) Participation in Florida				
			Math League which encourages				
		problems	problem solving skills.				
		that expand	proofem sorving skins.				
		upon their					
		mathematical					
		knowledge					
		5)Progress					
		monitor					
		through					
		each module					
		of study					

allowing		
students		
to recycle		
their work		
and reflect		
upon their		
mathematical		
knowledge		
and growth		
6)Skillfully		
design		
Research		
(Team Time)		
classes to		
allow for the		
exploration		
of discovery		
learning		
to increase		
movement		
from concrete thinkers		
tninkers		
to abstract		
learners		
7) D (in . 1		
7)Routinely		
assign		
Compass		
Odyssey to		
all students		
providing		
differentiated		
instruction		
to students		
who are		
falling behind		
or students		
who need		
enrichment		
and more		
difficult		
assignments		

Algebra 1 Goal #3A:		8)Integrate Gizmos throughout the curriculum encouraging a hands-on approach to learning				
Julia Landon's target AMO for the 2011-2012 school year was 93%. That target was met. The target AMOs for the next six years are as follows: Target AMO for 2013: 93% Target AMO for 2014: 94% Target AMO for 2015: 95% Target AMO for 2016: 95% Target AMO for 2016:						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

	f	1	1	I :	I	
3B. Student	3B.1.			3B.1.	3B.1.	
subgroups by	1)Inadequate		1) Classroom teacher	1)Formal and informal	1)Feedback from teachers,	
ethnicity (White,	access to	conversation		observations	RtI Team, counselors and	
Black, Hispanic,	technology	and	2)PLC Lead Teachers		Leadership.	
Asian, American		monitoring of		3)Close monitoring of each		
Indian) not making	classroom			of these students by teachers,		
satisfactory progress		with PLC		RtI Team, counselors, and		
satisfactory progress	2)Accelerated	team, grade	4)ESE Teacher	Leadershi Team		
in Algebra 1.		level team and				
	students in all	RtI Team.	5)Leadership team			
	grades					
		2)Seat student	6)RtI Team			
		close to the				
	literacy/skills					
	necessary to	room.				
	successfully					
	complete	3)Assign				
		buddies and				
	of Course	peer tutors.				
	exam					
Algebra 1 Goal #3B:	2012 Current	2013 Expected				
	Level of	Level of				
During the 2011	Performance:*	Performance:*				
2012 school year, all						
subgroups of students						
enrolled in Algebra						
I made satisfactory						
progress. 95% (210 of						
221) of students enrolled						
in Algebra I made						
satisfactory progress.						
During the 2012-2013						
school year, all student						
subgroups enrolled						
in Algebra will make						
satisfactory progress						
in Algebra I with a						
decrease in the non-						
satisfactory numbers						
within both the white						
and black subgroups.						

	The numbers	The numbers					
	below reflect	below reflect					
	the students	the students					
		who will					
		not make					
		satisfactory					
		progress.					
	progress.	progress.					
	White:6% (A of	White: 5% (8 of					
		171)					
	Black:8% (8 of	Black:7% (3 of					
		44)					
	Hispanic 0% (5	Hispanic:1% (1					
	of 5)	of 14)					
	Asian:0% (21 of	Asian: 0% (11					
	21)	of 11)					
		American					
	Indian: N/A	Indian: N/A					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
December and	A	Cturet a seri	Danasa an Danidian	Donner Handto Doton	Evaluation Tool		
Based on the analysis of student achievement	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation 1001		
data and reference to	Darrici		Responsible for Worldfillig	Lifectiveness of Strategy			
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:							

3C. English	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1	
Language Learners			1) Classroom teacher	1) Attend district PLC training	1) LSA district baseline and	
(ELL) not making		teachers have			Post test	
satisfactory progress				release days for collaboration		
satisfactory progress	parents	training to		by grade level and subject area.	2) PLC created exit slips and	
in Algebra 1.			3) Guidance Counselor	, ,	quizzes	
	2) Lack	ELL learners.		2) Provide TDE for teachers	<u> </u>	
	of training		4) ESE Teacher	to plan out Math Modules and	3) Standard portfolios used	
	for teachers	2) Seat		create lesson plans utilizing the	in all math classes	
			5) Leadership team	Categorizing the Curriculum		
	accommodatio				4) Compass Odyssey and	
	ns for English	instruction	6)RtI Team		Gizmo reports used to	
	Language			3) Incorporate Higher	differentiate instruction	
		3) Create		Order Thinking questions		
		student			5) Formal and informal	
	classroom.	centered			assessments using interactive	
		leaning		training into the math	white boards and iResponds	
		strategies that		curriculum.		
		best meets the			6) District Benchmarks	
		needs of each		4) Self-evaluation by students		
		individual ELL student			7) Pearson data management	
					system	
		and provide alternative		recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth.	8)CAST system evaluations	
		instruction		men work and growth.	8)CAST system evaluations	
		whenever		5) Evaluate effectiveness of		
		need arises.		instruction using Pearson		
		4) Give				
		verbal and				
		written				
		information				
		and				
		explanation				
	I	along with visual				
		presentations.				
		presentations.				
		5) Auditory				
		plus written				
		directions in a				
	I	brief format.				

		6) Assign buddies and peer tutors.					
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: During the 2011-2012 school year, there were no ELL students enrolled in Algebra I. During the 2012-2013 school year, it is expected that 100% (1 of 1) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra I earning a score of 3 or higher on the Algebra I EOC.	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	ELL students enrolled in Algebra I	100% (1 of 1) ELL students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra I by earning a score of 3 or higher on the Algebra I EOC.					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	identification of RtI Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 2)Lack of parental support	1)Collegial conversation and monitoring of		1)Formal and informal	3D.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership.	

 Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
and 8, 100 % (2 of 2) of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory	In grades 7 and 8, 100% () of Students with Disabilities will made satisfactory progress in Algebra I.			

5D.2. 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	daily intensive math classes. 3) Give priority to all level 1	team-up math teachers 2)Classroom teachers 3)Math PLC lead teacher 4)Compass Odyssey teacher	Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	3D.2. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST system evaluations 3D.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	outside the classroom 2) Proper identification of Rtl Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 3)Lack of parental support	3E.1. 1 Collegial conversation and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team. 2) Seat student close to the front of the room. 3)Assign buddies and peer tutors.		1)Formal and informal observations	3E.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadershp.	

Algebra 1 Goal #3E:	2012 Current	2013 Expected			
	Level of	Level of			
During the 2011-2012	Performance:*	Performance:*			
school year, 17% (39					
of 222) of Algebra					
students were part					
of the Economically					
Disadvantaged					
subgroup. 79% (31 of					
39) of these students					
made satisfactory					
progress in Algebra I.					
			1		
During the 2012-2013			1		
school year, 22% (42					
of 192) of Algebra					
students are part of					
the Economically					
Disadvantaged					
subgroup. 80% (34 of					
42) of these students					
will make satisfactory					
will make satisfactory					
progress in Algebra I.					
	In grades	In grades	·		
	7 and 8,	7 and 8,	1		
	79% (31 of	80% (34 of	·		
	39) of the	42) of the	1		
	Economically	Economically	1		
		Disadvantag			
		ed subgroup	·		
	made	will make	·		
		satisfactory	1		
			1		
	progress in	progress in	1		
	Algebra I.	Algebra I.			

placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	 Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. Give enrollment priority to all level 1 and 2 math students into the team-up program. 	1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2) Classroom teachers 3) Math PLC lead teacher 4) Compass Odyssey teacher	Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 2)Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals (this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)

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

Geometry EOC	Problem-			
Goals	Solving			
	Process to			
	Increase			
	Student			
	Achievem			
	ent			

			i	i		İ	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
		1.1.			11.		
at Achievement	1) Computer	1) Provide	1)Classroom teacher	1)Progress monitor students	1)Pearson management		
Level 3 in Geometry.	literacy/skills	routine		using Pearson data management	system		
	piecessary to	access to		system			
		online LSAs	2)Testing Coordinator				
	complete	as a means					
	Algebra EOC	to practice					
			3)Computer Lab Teacher				
Geometry Goal #1:		2013 Expected	1				
Geometry Godi 111.	Level of	Level of					
During the 2011-2012	Performance:*	Performance:*					
school year, 0% of							
students scored at the							
Achievement Level 3 in							
Geometry.							
During the 2012-							
2013 school year, it is							
expected that 0% of							
students will score at the							
Achievement Level 3 in							
Geometry.							
Geometry.							
1							
	In grade 8, 0%	In anda					
		8, 0% of					
	scored at the						
	Achievement						
1		Achievement					
		Level 3 in					
		Geometry.					

		are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 2) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.		developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 2) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmark assessments 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST Evaluation system	
		1.3.		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

			i	i	,	
9	2.1.	2.1.		2.1.	2.1.	
at or above	1) The	1) Progress		1) Provide time during early	1) PLC created exit slips and	
Achievement Levels	challenge	Monitor		release days for collegial	quizzes	
4 and 5 in Geometry.	of moving		2) PLC Lead Teacher	collaboration.		
and 5 in Geometry.	students	through			2) Standard portfolios used in	
		the use of			all math classes	
	are already	collaborativ		and Higher Order Thinking		
	proficient in	ely created		questioning techniques,	3) Compass Odyssey and	
	math while	exit slips		collaboratively developed	Gizmo reports used to	
	deepening	and quizzes		during PLC meetings and	differentiate instruction	
	and extending	in addition		training, into the math		
	their	to daily		curriculum.	4) Formal and informal	
	knowledge.	assessment of			assessments using interactive	
	_	class work/		3) Self-evaluation by students	white boards and iResponds	
		homework.		using the PLC developed	· .	
				portfolios in which students	5) District Benchmark	
		2)		recycle their work, reflect upon	assessments	
		Incorporate		their work and growth.		
		Compass			6)Pearson data management	
		Odyssey and		4)Evaluate effectiveness of	system	
		Gizmos into		instruction using Pearson data		
		instruction		management system	7)CAST Evaluation system	
		while				
		providing			8)Florida Math League	
		Differentiated			Contest	
		Instruction to				
		students who				
		are falling				
		behind.				
		3) Analyses				
		of data using				
		Pearson data				
		management				
		system				
		to drive				
		instruction.				
	I	l				
	I	4) Embed				
		Webb's DOK				
		questions into				
	I	daily routine.				

		5) Participation in Florida Math League which encourages problem solving skills					
Geometry Goal #2: During the 2011-2012 school year, 100% (79 of 79) students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% (87 of 87) students are expected to score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100% (79 of 79) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. 2.2.	2.2.		2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
but achievable Annual						
Measurable Objectives						
(AMOs), identify						
reading and mathematics						
performance target for						
the following years						

	ln 11	I) DI C	1) 9: 1 : : : : : : 1	1) 0: 1 : : : : : :	120: 1 : :01: 1 : :	1) 0: 1 : : : : : :	
3A. In six years,	Baseline	1)PLC	1)Student portfolios become	1)Student portfolios begin to		1)Student portfolios begin to	
school will reduce	data 2011-	develops	more student driven through	travel with students through the		travel with students through	
their achievement	2012	FCAT bell		grade levels each year	the grade levels each year	the grade levels each year	
gap by 50%.		ringers	tools				
	92%	used by PE					
		and Health	2)Math LSAs will be more	2)Math LSAs become the way	2)Math LSAs become the	2)Math LSAs become the	
		teachers		of assessment for all math	way of assessment for all	way of assessment for all	
			vetting eliminating the need	teachers school and district	math teachers school and	math teachers school and	
		2)ELA PLC	for additional assessments by	wide	district wide	district wide	
		develops	teachers				
		FCAT reading					
		bell ringers	3)Increase the use of Webb's		3)Webb's DOK questions	3)Webb's DOK questions	
		used by	DOK questions into daily	become part of the daily		become part of the daily	
		all non-PE	routine	lesson planning and board	lesson planning and board	lesson planning and board	
		and Health		configurations in all math	configurations in all math	configurations in all math	
		electives	4)Increase the percentage of	classes	classes	classes	
		to develop	interaction between the Science				
		reading		4)Math and Science PLCs meet		4)Math and Science PLCs	
		strategies	knowledge and materials to	collaboratively once a quarter	meet collaboratively once a	meet collaboratively once a	
		within all	increase STEM goals			quarter to continue increase	
		students		goals	of STEM goals	of STEM goals	
		3) Progress					
		Monitor					
		each Module					
		through					
		the use of					
		collaborativ					
		ely created					
		exit slips and					
		quizzes.					
		(4)					
		Incorporate					
		Compass					
		Odyssey and					
		Gizmos into					
		instruction					
		while					
		providing					
		Differentiated	1				
		Instruction to					
		students who					

	are falling behind.			
	5)Analyses			
	of data using			
	Pearson data			
	management			
	system			
	to drive			
	instruction,			
	specifically			
	through the			
	comparative LSA			
	assessements			
	ussessements			
	6) Embed			
	Webb's DOK			
	questions into			
	daily routine.			
	7)			
	Participation in Florida			
	Math League			
	which			
	encourages			
	problem			
	solving skills.			

Geometry Goal #3A: Julia Landon's target AMO for the 2011-2012 school year was 93%. That target was met. The target AMOs for the next six years are as follows: Target AMO for 2013: 93% Target AMO for 2014: 94% Target AMO for 2015: 95% Target AMO for 2016: 95% Target AMO for 2017:						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

3B. Student	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
subgroups by		1)Collegial	1)Classroom teacher	1)Formal and informal	1)Feedback from teachers,	
ethnicity (White,	access to	conversation		observations	RtI Team, counselors and	
Black, Hispanic,			2)PLC Lead Teacher		Leadership Team	
Asian, American		monitoring of		2)Close monitoring of each		
Indian) not making	classroom	student data		of these students by teachers,		
		with PLC		RtI Team, counselors and		
satisfactory progress	2)Accelerated	team, grade	4)ESE Teacher	Leadership Team		
in Geometry.		level team and				
	students in all	RtI Team.	5)Leadership team			
	grades		0.00			
	2) 0	2)Seat student	6)RtI Team			
		close to the				
	literacy/skills					
		room.				
	successfully	3)Assign				
		buddies and				
	Geometry End of Course					
	Exam	peer tutors.				
	Exam					
Geometry Goal #3B:	2012 Current	2013 Expected				
•	Level of	Level of				
During the 2011-2012	Performance:*	Performance:*				
school year, 100% of the						
students subgroups made	,					
satisfactory progress in						
Geometry.						
During the 2012-2013						
school year, 100% of						
the student subgroups						
are expected to make						
satisfactory progress in						
Geometry.						

		_					
	White: 100%	White: 100%					
	(73 of 79)	(64 of 87)					
	Black: 100% (2	Black: 100% (8					
	of 79)	of 87)					
	Hisnanic 100%	Hispanic: 100%					
	(1 of 79)	(3 of 87)					
	Agion: 100% (2	Asian: 100% (3					
	of 79)	of 87)					
		American					
	Indian: N/A	Indian: 100% (1					
		of 1)					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
		[[[
1							
Based on the analysis	Antioin-t1	Ctmat	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
	Anticipated	Strategy	Person of Position		Evaluation 1001		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:							
3C. English	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1		
Language Learners							
(ELL) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in Geometry.							
Geometry Goal #3C:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
Stemony Sour 1150.	Level of	Level of					
Decrine 4h - 2011 2012	Performance:*	Performance:*					
During the 2011 2012							
school year, there							
were no ELL students							
enrolled in Geometry.							
During the 2012-2013							
school year, there are no							
ELL students enrolled in							
Geometry.							
 							
1							
					l	l	

					3C.2. 3C.3.	3C.2. 3C.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	identification of RtI Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 2)Lack of parental support		3)Guidance Counselors	1)Formal and informal	3D.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership.		

Geometry Goal #3D: During the 2011-2012 school year, 100% (1 of 1) of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory progress in Geometry. During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% (1 of 1) Students with Disabilities is expected to make satisfactory progress in Geometry.	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	8, 100% (1 of 1) of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory progress in Geometry.	Disabilities will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.					
			3D.2. 3D.3.			3D.2. 3D.3.	
						טט.ט.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	access to technology outside the classroom 2)Proper identification of RtI Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 3)Lack of parental support	1)Collegial conversation		1)Formal and informal	3E.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership Team		
Geometry Goal #3E: During the 2011-2012 school year, no students enrolled in Geometry were Economically Disadvantaged. During the 2012-2013 school year, no students enrolled in Geometry are Economically Disadvantaged.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	N/A 3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	

	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
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)		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
District PLC Work Categorizing the Curriculum	Math PLC All Grades	K. Putnal Leadership Team	MJ1, MJ2, and Algebra	Ongoing Bi-monthly early release meetings and quarterly PLC Plus district trainings for 6 th grade teachers Bi-monthly meetings between PLC Leads and Principal	Continued dialogue during PLC meetings with standing agendas, weekly Friday Data Meetings with Leadership Team and RtI Team members	Math PLC Lead Teacher and Leadership Team

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.		
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)		

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PLC District Training: Providing teachers the tools and knowledge needed to collaborate effectively in creating common assessments and data-driven instructional units to provide students with the best possible differentiated instruction.	PLC Training: In house through TDE training and work sessions and District Trainings held at the Schultz Center for Teaching and Leadership. Substitute teachers needed these days.	School Operating Funds	\$4,000.00
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary I	Problem-			
and Middle	Solving			
Science Goals P	Process to			
	Increase			
	Student			
A	Achievem			
	ent			

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
data and reference to						
"Guiding Questions,"						
identify and define areas						
in need of improvement						
for the following group:						

1A. FCAT 2.0:	1A.1	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
Students scoring at	1) The	1) Utilization	1)All Science Teachers	1) Pearson Limelight student	1) Benchmark Assessments	
Achievement Level 3	Science	of Research		data reports on LSAs and		
in science.	FCAT is	(Team Time)	2)Science PLC Teacher Leader	Benchmarks.	2) District LSAs	
in science.	cumulatively	class to				
	based on	strategically	3)Science PLC administrative	2) Evaluation of student data	3) PLC developed exit slips	
	skills from 6th	reinforce/	Liaison	from iResponse reports.		
	through 8th	review			4) CAST Evaluation system	
	grade.	previous	4)Team Up Teachers	3) Teacher evaluation of	ľ	
		grade level	<u>'</u>	Compass Odyssey and Gizmo	5) Leadership classroom	
	2) The	curriculum.	5)Community Education	reports.	drop-ins	
	Science		Teachers		1	
	FCAT is only	2). Science		4) Student analysis of data	6) Student reflections	
		PLC will		including pretests, posttests and	ĺ	
	to 8th grade.	continue to		exit slips.	7) Student portfolios	
		categorize		_		
	3) The Distric			5) Continuous monitoring of		
	Science	and analyze		student data within and across		
	Benchmark	student data		grade levels during bi-monthly		
	is only	within and		PLC meetings.		
	administered	across grade				
	to 8th grade	levels.		6) Teacher/student conferences		
	students.			utilizing student goal setting		
		3) Modeling		documents to build student		
	4) Students	and		awareness and responsibility		
		impleme		for learning.		
	Reading and	ntation of				
	Math class	test taking		7) PLC developed student self -	-	
		strategies and		reflection/recycle correlated to		
	Research	student self-		classroom assessments.		
	(Team Time)	assessment				
	class with	across grade		8) Evaluate exit slip data		
	science	levels.		looking for statistical		
	teacher.			differences between those		
		4) Students		in science Research Class		
		in all grade		and those who do not have		
		levels take		Research class (students		
		a school-		enrolled in Intensive Math)		
		staff created				
		benchmark,				
		aligned to				
		appropriate				
		FCAT Specs.				

5) Students	
will take	
district	
baseline and	
posttest LSAs	
for each unit	
according	
according to district	
timeline.	
cimemic.	
6) Analysis	
of ongoing	
Benchmark	
data (both	
District and	
School-	
level) using	
the Pearson	
database	
system to	
determine RtI	
for those not	
on target	
on target.	
7) Incorporate	
5E model	
SE Model	
into weekly instruction.	
instruction.	
8) Give	
enrollment	
priority to	
level 1 and	
2 math and	
Z IIIath and	
ELA students into Team	
In program	
Up program	
where they	
will receive	
assistance	
on Science	
instruction/	

		homework.			
		9) Targeted			
		science			
		assistance given to			
		students			
		enrolled in			
		Community			
		Education			
		Program.			
		10) Small			
		group pull			
		out in class			
		and selective grouping will			
		be utilized			
		in class to			
		reinforce			
		Research (Team			
		Time) class			
		materials.			
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of			
During the 2011-2012	Performance:*	Performance:*			
school year, 38% (83 of					
220) of students scored					
at Achievement Level 3					
in Science.					
During the 2012-2013					
school year, 40% (87					
of 219) of students are					
expected to score at Achievement Level 3 in					
Science.					

	In grade 8, 40% (87		
	of 219) of		
students	students		
scored at	will score at		
Achievement	Achievement		
Level 3 in	Level 3 in		
Science.	Science.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
1) Students	1) Utilize daily bellringers, exit		1) Teacher analysis of	1) Benchmark assessments	
	slips, collaborative assessments		FCAT Explorer, Gizmos and		
		2) Science PLC Lead Teacher	Compass Odyssey data.	and LSAS	
	within daily instruction.	2) Science i LC Lead Teacher		2) FCAT Explorer, Gizmos	
stamina in	within daily instruction.	3) Science PLC Administrative		and Compass Odyssey	
	2) Embedding Webb's DOK	Liaison	student work to determine	and Compass Odyssey	
	into science curriculum.	Liaison		3) Lab rubrics	
F	into science curriculum.		reading strategies.	5) Lab lublics	
science	3) Incorporate use of Science		reading strategies.		
			2) Taashan analasis af		
	Reading Strategies into		3) Teacher analysis of		
	instruction.		Benchmark and LSA data.		
2) Students	4) Painfanaina aantanta siiissa		4) Dans landian and		
	4) Reinforcing content writing		4) Peer evaluation and		
	skills, using F.R.I.E.S. writing		Teacher evaluation of labs/		
	strategy, emphasizing writing		hands on activities.		
	with evidence.				
level III and			5) Continuous monitoring		
	5) Probing students to respond		of student data within and		
	to higher order thinking		across grade levels during bi-		
	questions with evidence to		monthly PLC meetings.		
	support their reasoning during				
	analysis of labs and hands on		6) PLC Teachers will		
	activities.		collaborate to share best		
			practices, enhance lesson		
	6) 8 th grade students utilize		content, and reflect on		
	vocabulary strategy based on		previous lessons.		
	Frayer Model, visualization and				
	making connections to deepen				
	their understanding of content				
	vocabulary.				
	7) Utilization of Science				
	Reading Strategies.				

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

1A.3. 1) Student need to increase ability in analysis o data, grapi and scient models.	student use of and comfort with models, graphs and data including but not limited to iResponse, interactive white board, Compass Odyssey and	2) Science PLC Lead Teacher 3) Science PLC Administrative Liaison.	Student Lab Reports 3) Informal assessment of knowledge through iResponse and interactive whiteboard usage.	IA.3. 1) iReponse and interactive whiteboard usage 2) Gizmos/Compass Odyssey/FCAT Explorer 3) LSAs 4) Benchmarks 5) Teacher generated Rubrics for Labs/Hands Activities 6) Science Project Rubric 7) Guiding questions for student self reflection differentiated by assignment. 8) Exit Slips	
--	--	--	--	--	--

	1A.4	1) Seek	1) PLC Lead Teacher	1) PLC will send representative	1 Fandback from SAC Transurar	<u> </u>	
	1) Limited	fundraising	1) PLC Lead Teacher	to SAC mosting	1. Feedback from SAC Treasurer		
		lundraising	2 9 1	to SAC meeting			
	technology	opportunities	2) Science teachers				
	inside the	through SAC					
	classroom	committee.					
	inhibits						
	access to						
	most current						
	science						
	content.						
	2) Absence						
	of scientific						
	equipment						
	at each						
	grade level						
	inhibits full						
	implementat						
	ion of hands						
	on science						
	learning.						
1B. Florida	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
science.	2012 G	2012 5 1					
Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
F4	Performance:*	Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	- CHOIMANCE.	CHOIHance.					
goui in inis vox.							
		Enter numerical					
	data for current level of	data for expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
1		115.2.	16.2.	10.2.	11.2.	10.2.	

		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
		1) Analysis		1) Pearson Insight/Inform	1) Benchmark Assessments		
Students scoring	Science	of ongoing		student data reports on LSAs	1) Benchmark Assessments		
at or above	FCAT is	Benchmark			2) District LSAs		
Achievement Levels	cumulatively		2) Science i LC Lead Teacher	and Benchmarks.	2) District LSAs		
4 and 5 in science.	based on	District and	3) Science PLC Administrative	2) Evaluation of student data	3) PLC developed exit slips		
	skills from 6th		Liaison.	from iReponse reports.	b) i Le developed exit slips		
	through 8 th	level) using	Liaison.		4) CAST system evaluation		
	grade.		4) Community Education	3) Teacher evaluation of	a) CAST System evaluation		
	grade.	database	teachers		5) Leadership classroom		
	2) The	system to	ledeners	reports	drop-ins		
	Science	target students			arop ms		
	FCAT is only			4) Student analysis of data	6) Student reflections		
		growth.		including pretests, posttests and			
	to 8th grade.	B			7. Student portfolios		
		2) Utilization			·		
		of Research		5) Continuous monitoring of			
	Science	(Team Time)		student data within and across			
	Benchmark	class to		grade levels during bi-monthly			
	is only	strategically		PLC meetings			
		enhance					
	to 8 th grade	and deepen		6) Teacher/student conferences			
	students.	previous		utilizing student goal setting			
		grade level		documents to build student			
		curriculum.		awareness and responsibility			
				for learning.			
		3) Science					
		PLC will		7) PLC developed student self –	1		
		continue to		reflection/recycle correlated to			
		categorize curriculum		classroom assessments.			
		and analyze					
		student data					
		within and					
		across grade					
		levels.					
		10 (013.					
		4) Modeling					
		and					
		impleme					
		ntation of					
		test taking				1	
		strategies and					

student self-		
assessment		
across grade		
levels.		
10 V 015.		
5) Students		
in all grade		
levels take		
a school-		
staff created		
benchmark		
assessments		
aligned to		
appropriate		
FCAT Specs.		
6) Students		
will take		
district pretest		
and posttest		
LSAs for each		
unit according		
to district		
timeline.		
7) Incorporate		
7) Incorporate 5E model		
into weekly		
instruction.		
moti detion.		
0 \ Targeted		
8.) Targeted		
science		
assistance		
given to		
Community		
Education		
program		
students.		

During the 2011-2012 school year, 53% (117 of 220) of students scored	Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*			
at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science.					
During the 2012-2013 school year, 55% (120 of 219) of students are expected to score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science.					
	53% (117 of 220) of students	In grade 8, 55% (120 of 219) of students will score			
	or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5	at or above Achievement			

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2A.2.	2A.2	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
1) Students		1) All Science teachers	1) Teacher and peer	1) Teacher generated rubrics	
	instruction including but not			aligned to standards.	
		2) Science PLC Lead teacher	generated questions and		
	for break out/reinforcement		assignments.	2) Guiding questions for	
need to be	sessions; 'Menu' style projects;			student self reflection on	
challenged to			2) Student analysis though	projects.	
deepen and			self- reflection.		
	2) Students create their own			3) Benchmarks and LSAs	
knowledge	assessment questions using		3) Continuous monitoring		
of content	Webb's DOK, aligned to units			4) Exit Slips	
	of study.		across grade levels during bi-		
level rigor.			monthly PLC meetings.		
	3) Embedding Webb's DOK				
2) Students	and higher order questioning		4) Teacher analysis of		
need to	into science curriculum.		Pearson Insight/Inform		
increase			student data reports on LSAs		
	4) Students are pushed		and Benchmarks.		
to decode	to deepen their analysis				
	of a concept by engaging		5) PLC teachers will		
IV DOK	in extended research and		collaborate to share best		
questions.	application of topics.		practices, enhance lesson		
			content and reflect on		
	5) Students utilize technology		previous lessons.		
	in their study of science content				
	including but not limited to		6) Teacher analysis of exit		
	student MAC computers, flip		slip data.		
	cameras and interactive white				
	board.				

	í	1	to a contract to the contract				
		2A.3	2A.3	2A.3	2A.3	2A.3	
		1) Limited		1) PLC Lead teacher	1) PLC will send	1) Feedback from SAC	
		technology	opportunities through SAC		representative to SAC	Treasurer.	
		inside the		2) Science teachers	meeting.		
		classroom			I seems.		
		inhibits					
		access to					
		most current					
		science					
		content.					
		2) Absence					
		of scientific					
1							
1		equipment					
1		at each					
1		grade level					
1		inhibits full					
1		implementat					
		ion of hands					
		on science					
		learning.					
		learning.					
		1					
2R Florida	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
2B. Florida	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment:	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at	2B.1.	2В.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment:	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2012 Current	2013Expected	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in	2012 Current Level of	2013Expected Level of	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B:	2012 Current	2013Expected	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2012 Current Level of	2013Expected Level of	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of	2013Expected Level of	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of	2013Expected Level of	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of	2013Expected Level of	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in		2B.1. 2B.2.	2B.1. 2B.2.	2B.2.	
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.				2B.2.	

	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2	2B.3.	
End of Elementary a Science Professional		hool Science	Goals	I			I
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
Categorizing the Curriculum	Science 6-8	R. Wilhelm Leadership Team	Science PLC Members	Bi-Monthly Early Release Dates	Continued Dialogue standing agendas a Mentoring within	t each meeting.	PLC Teacher Lead Leadership Team
Science Budget (Insert r	ows as needed)						
Include only school-ba activities/materials and funded activities/mater Evidence-based Progra	sed funded exclude district ials.						
Strategy		Descriptio	n of Resources	Funding Source	Funding Source		
	Subtota	al:					
Technology							

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
One in-house TDE day per nine weeks		School Operating Funds	\$2,000.00
for each grade level of the Science PLC			
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent					
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:	Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

				i e	i ·	
1A. FCAT:	1A.	1A.1.		1A.1.	1A.1.	
Students scoring at	1)"Every	1) Each	1)PLC leads will take a more	1)Through the portfolio,	1)Student Portfolios	
Achievement Level	teacher a	portfolio	autonomous role in guiding and			
3.0 and higher in	Writing	cover aligns	leading the work.		2)Leadership PLC/Pop In	
writing.	Teacher"	with the			weekly visits	
writing.	Working	writing	2)The Leadership team will	evaluate their progress in		
	towards a	categories	look for evidence of movement	writing.	3)CAST assessment system	
	paradigm	of focus,	within the process.			
	shift: Content			2)Expansive writing within	4)District mandated	
	teachers must			the classrooms that promote	assessments	
		conventions		creative and expressive writing		
	understanding			through CRISS, NHD, RAFT,		
	that writing	2)Portfolios		DBQ, and SQ3R.		
	is an integral					
	component of	driven		3)There is uniform instructional		
	how students	progress		conversation that occurs across		
	are able to	monitoring		content.		
	articulate	tools. Social				
	their thinking	Studies		4)All students use the JLCP		
	and their	and EDGE		Extended Response rubric to		
	understanding	monitor all		guide the writing process.		
	ŀ	four writing		guide the writing process.		
		categories.		5.4111		
	2)			5)All teachers are pulling		
	Understanding	3)Question		their own writing data and		
	that the	stems, CRISS.	,	understand how to use it to		
	portfolio use	NHD, RAFT,		drive their instruction.		
	and purpose	DBQ, and				
	is different	SQ3R,				
	than a teacher	and Cosay				
	tracking	assessments				
	device – it is a	will				
	student driven	provide the				
	progress monitoring	instructional				
	_	roadmap for				
	tool.	analytical	1			
	3)Analytical	and reflective	1			
	and reflective	writing.				
	writing must					
	be an integral	4)Increase the				
	part of	percentage				
	learning in all	of interaction				
	learning in an					

content areas	between the			
	Social Studies			
4)Continued	department			
alignment	and Language			
(common	arts to			
writing	share ideas,			
language/	knowledge,			
common	and materials			
rubric)	with a goal			
between	of common			
Social Studie	la a			
	knowledge,			
department	and materials.			
and the	and materials.			
English	5) 411 / 1			
Language	5)All teachers			
Arts/Edge	will support			
department.	the school			
	driven			
5)Folding	initiative by			
in common	implementing			
writing	the Julia			
language/	Landon			
common	College Prep			
rubric	Extended			
between all	Response			
other content	Rubric in their			
areas (Math,				
Science, and				
Electives).	6)Utilization			
,	of DAT			
6)Pulling	liaison,			
writing data	Edge teacher			
from Insight/	_			
r C 1	professional			
EAID to drive	e development training in			
instruction.	training in			
msuuction.	how to pull			
	appropriate			
	writing			
	reports for			
	specific			
	writing			
	· · ·	•		

		targets and instructional focus from Insight/ Inform.					
During the 2011-2012 school year, 99% (218 of 220) of students scored at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing. During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% (219 of 219) of students are expected to score at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	of 220) of students scored at Achievement Level 3.0	In grade 8, 100% (219 of 219) will score at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
		1A.3.	IA.5.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.		1B.1.	1B.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.		

Witting Gour Wild.		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	data for current level of performance in	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
District LSA Writing Workshops	Grade 8	District ELA coaches	Wells and Knighton	October 2012	Wells and Knighton will share training information within November 2012 PLC meeting	ELA PLC Teacher Lead Leadership Team
	-	_				

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/		

materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
WriteScore Program	WriteScore Assessment System is purchased for all District Timed Writing Assessments across each grade level, four times over the course of the year.	School Operating Funds	\$8549.96
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Writing Goal

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem- solving Process to Increase Attendan ce						
-----------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of attendance data and	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
reference to "Guiding							
Questions," identify and							
define areas in need of							
improvement:							
1. Attendance	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	1)Parent	1)Contact	1)Attendance clerk		1)Oncourse Attendance		
	provided	parents		weekly at Friday Data	Report		
	transportation	utilizing	2)Grade level assistant	Meetings.	1 ^		
			principals				
		website	F				
		and School					
			3)Social Worker				
		emphasize the					
		importance of					
			4)School webmaster				
		timely school					
		attendance.					
Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Attendance	Attendance Rate:*					
The expected attendance	Kate: *	Kate: *					
rate for the 2012-2013							
school year is 99%							
(717).							
The expected number of							
students with excessive							
absences for the 2012-							
2013 school year is less							
than 1% (7)							
unan 170 (7)							
The expected number of							
students with excessive							
tardies for the 2012-							
2013 school year is less							
than 6% (39)							
	99% (713 of	99% (717 of					
		724)					
1	140)	[/ /4]	I		ĺ	I	

Number of Students with Excessive Absences	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
6% (41 of 720)	(student and parent) attitude and	1.2. 1)Contact parents of students that have accumulated five (5) or more absences per nine week period to emphasize the importance of attendance.	1.2. 1)Attendance clerk 2)Grade level assistant principals	1.2. 1)Oncourse Attendance Report	
	1.3. 1)Inconsistent teacher	sent to specific teachers by administrative attendance	1.3. 1)Administrative Attendance liaison 2)All Teachers	1.3. 1)Oncourse Attendance Report	

Attendance Professional Development

Professio	onal			
Developm	nent			

(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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Decrease the number of student morning tardies for the 2012-2013 school year.	Student upload into the ID Badging Software System	School Operating Budget	\$300.00
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem- solving Process to Decrease Suspension			,		
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

	1	1	1	Ť.	1	
1. Suspension	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
	1)Less experienced		1)Leadership Team	1)Weekly review of school	1)Data from School	
	teachers' lack of	training for less		discipline results during	Environmental Safety	
	familiarity with	experienced		Friday Data Meetings.	Incident Report	
	C.H.A.M.P.s.	teachers.				
			2)RtI Team	2)Bi-monthly review of	2)School-wide	
	2)Less experienced			team-based discipline plan	Genesis Discipline	
	teachers' lack of	2)Mentor teachers		effectiveness.	Reports	
	familiarity working	and team leaders			1	
	with disciplinary	work with less				
	issues.	experienced				
		teachers to provide				
		strategies for				
		working with	3)Foundations Team			
	3)Inconsistent	disciplinary issues.		3)Monthly review of school-		
	implementation			wide discipline plan and	3)RtI Database	
	of the team-based			ongoing discipline data by	System	
	discipline plans.	3)Standing agenda		Foundations Team.		
	p		4)Mentor teachers			
		monthly team	. yarremer temeners			
		meetings to address	3	4)Weekly review of RtI		
		implementation		behavioral interventions		
		of team-based		using RtI database system by	,	
		discipline plan.		the RtI team during Friday		
		discipline plan.		Data Meetings.		
		4)Ongoing use		Bata Meetings.		
		of RtI database				
		system by				
		administration				
		and guidance to				
		document and track	_			
		behavioral RtI				
		interventions.				
		interventions.				
		5)Standing agenda				
		item for all weekly				
		administrative				
		leadership				
		meetings to address				
		and track discipline				
		data school-wide.				
		uata School-wide.				
		()Dair identified				
		6)Pair identified	1			

		students with a			
		mentor from Faith-			
		Based partner.			
		Buseu purtifer.			
		7) Ctan din a			
		7)Standing			
		agenda item			
		for all monthly			
		Foundations Team			
		meetings to address			
		school-wide			
		discipline plan and			
		ongoing discipline			
		data			
		data			
g	2012 T 4 127	2012 F			
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number	2013 Expected			
	of In -School Suspensions	Number of In- School			
The expected	Suspensions	Suspensions			
number of In-School		Suspensions			
suspensions for the					
2012-2013 school year					
is 40.					
The expected number					
of students suspended					
of students suspended					
in-school for the 2012-					
2013 school year is 30.					
The expected number					
of out-of-school					
(ATOSS) suspensions					
for the 2012-2013					
school year is 14.					
5 th 6 of y can 15 1 1.					
The expected number					
of students suspended					
or students suspended					
out-of-school (ATOSS)					
for the 2012-2013					
school year is 14.					
	41	40			

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	Number of Students Suspended In -School					
33	30					
2012 Total Number of Out-of- School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
15	14					
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
15	14					
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

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	Grade Level/	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g., Early		Person or Position Responsible for
and/or PLC Focus	Subject	and/or	(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or	Release) and Schedules (e.g.,	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Monitoring
	J	PLC Leader	school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		8

Student Code of Conduct Training	All	District Personnel	Grade Level Assistant Principals and Principal	Assistant Principals meet bi-monthly. A standing agenda item is a grade level review of student code of conduct violations. The entire leadership team meets weekly and a standing agenda item is also a brief review of school-wide student code of conduct violations.	Leadership Team/Principal

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Suspension Dudget (misert rows as	T			
Include only school-based funded				
activities/materials and exclude district				
funded activities /materials.				
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Technology				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	

Subtotal:		
Total:		

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Triffer asing percer	mages, merade	the manneer or s	tadents the percentage	represents next to the p	01001111150 (0.5. 707)	0 (33)).	
Dropout	Problem-						
Prevention	solving						
Goal(s)	Process to						
	Dropout						
	Prevention						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Dropout	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Prevention							
Dropout Prevention Goal #1:		2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.							

data for dropou	Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.					
	* Graduation Rate:*					
data for	Enter numerical data for expected in graduation rate in this box.					
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Total:				

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section. Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem- solving Process to Parent Involveme nt						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

1. Parent Involvement	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Tarent involvement			1)PTSA Board members	1)PTSA administrative	1)2012-2013 School	
		Messenger		liaison tracks the number	Climate Survey	
		call to notify		of parent responses on a	compared to the 2011-	
		all parents of		daily basis during the survey	2012 School Climate	
				window	Survey	
		survey.	liaison			
	the parents/	,				
		2)Note the				
		importance				
		of the survey				
			3)Grade level team			
			leaders			
		and include				
		information				
		about the				
		survey in the				
		monthly parent				
		newsletter.				
		2)] [4:1: 4]				
		3)Utilize the high volume				
		of car riders in				
		the morning				
		and afternoons				
		to distribute		ĺ		
		the survey to				
		parents and				
		guardians.				

#1.	Level of Parent	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*			
During the 2011-2012 school					
year, the school climate survey indicates an overwhelming					
satisfaction in the area of					
school experiences with 88%					
(48 of the 55 parents surveyed) reporting that the school					
provides a positive experience					
for them while on campus.					
During the 2012-2013 school					
year, it is expected that 90% of					
parent responses will agree or					
strongly agree that the school provides positive experiences					
for parents on the 2012-2013					
School Climate Survey.					
		On the 2012- 2013 school			
	school climate				
	survey, 88%	it is expected			
		that 90%			
	of parents surveyed agree	of parents			
		will agree or			
	agree that	strongly agree			
		that the school provided			
		positive			
	experiences for	experiences for			
	parents.	parents.			

1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
1)Lack of	1)PTSA Board members	1)PTSA Board members		1)PTSA tracking document	
knowledge	conduct research on	,		used to document parent	
	existing successful parent		at each monthly PTSA		
	involvement programs		parent involvement	F	
parent wants	at schools with similar		event		
the school to	demographics.				
offer		2)PTSA administrative			
		liaison			
	monthly parent-	inison			
	involvement programs in				
	addition to one quarterly				
	weekend event.				
1.3.		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
1)	1)PTSA will continually	1)PTSA Board members		1)PTSA tracking document	
Breakdown in	update their informational			used to document parent	
communication	website which is easily		each monthly PTSA	participation	
	accessed through the		parent involvement	participation	
and school	school website		event.		
regarding		2)PTSA Administrative	CVCIII.		
parent		liaison			
involvement	be sent home through a	naison			
system	combination of flyers,				
System	School Messenger phone				
	calls and the monthly				
	parent newsletter				
	F	3)All teachers			
		DJAII teachers			
	3)All PTSA events will				
	be posted on the school	4) A 11			
		4)All parents			
	school year				

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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
DCCPTA 2012 Fall Leadership Workshop and Community Resources Fair	N/A	Duval County Council of PTA	All PTSA parents at JLCP	September 2012	Debrief to be conducted at the October 2012 PTSA Board meeting	PTSA President

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district				
funded activities /materials.				
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Technology				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Total:				

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Teachers will endeavor to create collaborative projects between Science and Math at each grade level. These projects will enable students to see the interconnected nature of Science and Math as it relates to engineering.	engineering as a formal or academic concept.	1.1. 1)Utilize science theory and specific science concepts to design projects with construction elements. Students can use mathematics to analyze their projects as well as interpret data from trials.	1.1. 1)Core teachers in the 6 th , 7 th and 8 th grade levels as well as PLC leads.	individual areas of content as	1.1. 1)Teacher assessments and reflection as well as data derived from state/district assessments.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2. 1.3.	1.2.

STEM Professional Development

		i	1	
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
Engineering and real world application of Science and Math concepts	6, 7, 8	Science PLC Lead Math PLC Lead	All Science and Math teachers	Bi-Monthly PLC meetings	Leadership team oversight PLC lead oversight	All PLC leads and administrative liaisons

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded			
activities/materials and exclude district			
funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt					
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

1	ì				
	1.1.			1.1.	
	1)Recruit	1)All teachers	1)Ongoing and continuous	1)Compass Odyssey	
	students who		monitoring of all students'		
Progression	scored a level 1	2)Compass Odyssey	grades at weekly Friday Data	2)RtI Database system	
Plan mandating	or 2 in reading	teacher	meetings		
that students	or math for			3)Oncourse	
admitted into	Team Up and	3)Leadership Team	2)Monitor computer lab sign		
quarterly	Community	•	in logs	4)Student Portfolios	
	Education	4)RtI Team		'	
	where they will	,	3)Personal goal setting for		
			students within all core		
		Teachers	content portfolios		
	technology.				
coursework		6)Team Up Teachers	4)Analysis of ongoing		
	2)Mid-year	o) ream of reachers	Learning Recovery and		
		7)Athletic Coaches	Course Recovery data at		
	with Assistant		weekly Friday data meetings		
	Principals and		weekiy i maay data meetings		
	parents for		5)Ongoing use of RtI		
	any child with		database system at weekly		
	a grade point		Friday data meetings by		
	average below		Leadership Team and		
	a 2.0 at the end		Guidance counselors		
	of the second		duidance counseiors		
	nine week		6)Analysis of emerging		
	grading period.		student grades through		
3)Lack of	grading period.		Oncourse on a bi-monthly		
	3)Use of FCAT		basis at Friday data meetings		
	Math bell		basis at Filday data illeetings		
home	ringers in PE				
	and Health				
	and Health classes.				
	ciasses.				
	ANTI- CECAT				
	4)Use of FCAT				
	Reading bell				
	ringers in all				
	other Elective				
	courses.				
	5)Tl 1				
	5)Three-day				
	Learning				
	Recovery				
	program held				

at t	the end of		
eac	ch nine week		
gra	ading period		
for	r all students		
eli	igible.		
	agiote.		
6)(Credit		
	ecovery		
Pro	ogram		
beg	eginning at		
the	e start of the		
	urth nine		
we	eek grading		
per	eriod for		
all	students		
	danger of		
rete	tention due		
to	failure of an		
ent	tire course.		
7)(Compass		
// Od	dyssey		
	mputer		
loh	o open and		
lau	railable for		
	udents each		
mo	orning for		
tor	rty-five		
mı	inutes prior		
to t	the start of		
sch	hool.		
8)1	Mandatory		
stu	udy hall for		
all	athletes		
dui	ring each		
ath	hletic season.		
ath	hletic season.		

Additional Goal #1:	2012 Current	2013 Expected			
I	Level :*	Level :*			
For the past four consecutive					
school years, a particular					
emphasis has been placed					
on learning and credit					
recovery utilizing an in-school					
Compass Odyssey lab rotation					
cycle. This system has been					
effectively used to promote					
students to the next grade					
level. During the 2011-2012					
school year there was a .35%					
(1 student) retention rate at the					
6 th grade level, a 0% retention					
rate at the 7th grade level and					
a .45% (1 student) retention					
rate at the 8 th grade level.					
During the 2012-2013 school					
year, it is expected that 99%					
(707 of 715) of students will					
promote to the next grade					
level.					

	99.5% (287 of 288) of students	In grades 6-8, it is expected that 99% (707) students will promote to the next grade level.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
Additional Goal #1: School safety: During the 2011-2012 school year, students and staff evacuated the building and were accounted for at at the evacuation site in 20 minutes. During the 2012-2013 school year, students and staff will improve on the 2011-2012 evacuation response time of 20 minutes by 10%.	Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	1.1. 1)Communication between varying teachers traversing the blocks to the secondary evacuation site can be difficult. If a student is not in the correct class during the transition this must be corrected and the student located and accounted for at the secondary site holding area.	1.1. 1)All pertinent personnel will have radios to aid in communication. Teacher evacuation clipboards will have full class rosters and Administrators/Team Leads will have full grade level student rosters. Role will be taken accurately prior to leaving primary evacuation areas at the school. Inaccuracies in student counts will then be reviewed upon arrival at the secondary holding site.	1.1. 1)Leadership Team 2)Teacher Leaders	1.1. 1)Administrative observations and communication during the evacuation drill.	1.1. 1)Accuracy of attendance rosters 2)Evacuation time keeping

During the	During the					
	2012-2013					
school year,	schoolyear, a					
students and	10% decrease					
staff evacuated						
	frame will					
and were	occur with a					
accounted	total elapsed					
for at the	time of 18					
evacuation site						
in 20 minutes.						
	sounding of					
	the alarm and					
	announcing					
	evacuation to					
	all students and					
	staff accounted					
	for at the					
	evacuation site.					
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
	T1)he	1)Utilize resources from	1)Leadership Team	1)Administrative	1)Reflection on the	
	reduction	our Faith-based partner,		observations and	effectiveness on the usage of	
	of police		2)Faith-based partner staff	monitoring of	non-police assets in crossing	
		fire station to ensure		timelines during the	thoroughfares	
			3)Local law enforcement and	evacuation drill		
		thoroughfares.	fire/rescue		2)Evacuation time keeping	
	that fewer			2)Review and		
	officers may			reflection on the		
	be available to			degree of success in		
	assist with road			accounting for all		
	closures.			students and staff		
				members quickly and		
				accurately.		

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide a month-long Saturday School Learning and Credit Recovery program for students at risk of retention	One or two teachers hired to instruct and facilitate	SAI Funds	Pending
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			

Total:		

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section. Reading Budget	
Reading Dudget	Total:\$4,400.00
CELLA Budget	·
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total: \$4,000.00
Science Budget	
	Total: \$2,000.00
Writing Budget	
	Total: \$8,549.96
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total: \$300.00
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
-	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total: Pending
	10mm 10mmg

2012-2013 School Im	provement Plan	(SIP)-Form	SIP-1

Grand Total: \$19,249.96

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
□Priority	□Focus	□Prevent

Are you reward school? □Yes □No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

• Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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 members 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 □ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

The School Advisory Council at Julia Landon meets monthly with the principal and two teachers who all serve as members along with one assistant principal who serves as SAC secretary and is a non-voting member. The focus of SAC is to assist the principal in continuous review of school goals and progress and to advise any next steps that may need to occur. Each month new data regarding student learning gains are reviewed. The monthly SAC agenda allows for determinations to be made regarding SAC monies and how these monies should be allocated toward teacher requests, PLC requests and instructional materials. Additionally, the School Improvement Plan is broken into segments with a portion reviewed each month to determine fidelity of implementation. Other data reviewed includes disciplinary data, parent involvement data and school climate survey data. The school budget is also reviewed with SAC.

Each month one school highlight will be shared with SAC by way of students. Some examples include students sharing Global Leadership videos, students acting a portion of dramatic scene or students explaining how they used math strategies in their social studies classroom.

The following are the 2012-2013 SAC members:

2010-2011 SAC Members

- 1. Sara Bravo, Principal
- 2. Blake Menzel, SAC President, 8th grade parent
- 3. Carolyn Rubin, Vice-Chair, 7th grade parent
- 4. Jean Spiwak, 8th grade teacher
- 5. Mary Gaj, 6th grade teacher
- 6. Lisa Marie Winslow, parent
- 7. Renata Henderson, parent
- 8. Melissa Long, parent
- 9. TeRona Feacher, parent
- 10. Ebru Bilgili, parent
- 11. Lori Lunitz, parent
- 12. Wayne Young, parent
- 13. Matt Hemphill, parent
- 14. Kim Bednarek, parent
- 15. Gary Webber, Community partner, parent
- 16. Kim Wheeler, parent
- 17. Mark Maclean, parent
- 18. Faye Hamilton, parent
- 19. BJ Ibach, parent

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Small items requested by Grade Level Teams and/or PLCs	\$297.00