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## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

| School Grades Trend Data |
| :--- |
| Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/ Statewide Assessment Trend Data |
| High School Feedback Report |

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

## ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | \# of Years at Current School | \# of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25\% ), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Principal | Michelle Lewis | -Bachelors in Finance - Masters in Educational Leadership <br> -Certifications in Business Education (612), Principal (K12) | 1 | 8 | SY 2006-2007 <br> Grade C, AYP N - 72\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High <br> SY 2007-2008 <br> Grade C, AYP N - 77\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High <br> SY 2008-2009 <br> Grade C, AYP N - 72\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High <br> SY 2009-2010 <br> Grade B, AYP - 77\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High <br> SY 2010-2011 <br> Grade B, AYP - 79\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High <br> SY 2011-2012 <br> Grade TBD, AYP- TBD\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High |
|  |  |  |  |  | SY 2006-2007 <br> Grade B, AYP N - 87\% of criteria met. <br> Belleview High |


| Assis Principal | Melissa Lindmean | -Bachelors in Social Science Education - Masters in Educational Leadership -Certifications in Social Science (6-12), ESOL (612), Educational Leadership | 1 | 1 | SY 2007-2008 <br> Grade A, AYP N - 85\% of criteria met. <br> Belleview High <br> SY 2008-2009 <br> Grade C, AYP N - 79\% of criteria met. <br> Belleview High <br> SY 2009-2010 <br> Grade B, AYP - 90\% of criteria met. <br> Belleview High <br> SY 2010-2011 <br> Grade A, AYP - 77\% of criteria met. <br> Belleview High <br> SY 2011-2012 <br> Grade TBD, AYP- TBD\% of criteria met. <br> Belleview High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assis Principal | Shameka Murphy | General Science (6-12), <br> Educational Leadership | 1 | 1 | SY 2006-2007 <br> Grade C, AYP N - 72\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High <br> SY 2007-2008 <br> Grade C, AYP N - 77\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High <br> SY 2008-2009 <br> Grade C, AYP N - 72\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High <br> SY 2009-2010 <br> Grade B, AYP - 77\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High <br> SY 2010-2011 <br> Grade B, AYP - 79\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High <br> SY 2011-2012 <br> Grade TBD, AYP- TBD\% of criteria met. <br> Dunnellon High |

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ <br> Certification(s) | \# of <br> Years at <br> Current <br> School | \# of Years as <br> an <br> Instructional <br> Coach | Prior Performance Record (include <br> prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide <br> Assessment Achievement Levels, <br> Learning Gains, Lowest 25\%), and <br> AMO progress along with the <br> associated school year) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Instructional <br> Coach | Meredith <br> Scott | Bachelor's <br> Reading/ <br> Reading <br> Certification | 4 | 4 | 2010-2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery <br> $70 \%$, Math Mastery 72\%; Science Mastery <br> $46 \%$. AYP: 72\%, White, African-American, <br> and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading. |
| White, African-American, Economically |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disadvantaged, and SWD did not meet AYP |  |  |  |  |  |
| in Math. |  |  |  |  |  |

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

|  | Description of Strategy | Person <br> Responsible | Projected <br> Completion <br> Date | Not Applicable (If not, please <br> explain why) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Conduct a school orientation. | Administrative <br> Team | August 2012 |  |
| 2 | Teacher mentor program for teachers new to the <br> professional and new to the school | Administrative <br> Team | On-Going |  |
| 3 | Provide training in direct alignment with the district/state on <br> Common Core. Also include training on Classroom <br> Management Strategies, Technology in the Classroom, and <br> Using Data to Improve Instruction | Administrative <br> Team | On-Going |  |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% [35]).

| Number of <br> staff and <br> paraprofessional <br> that are <br> teaching out- <br> of-field/ and <br> who are not <br> highly <br> effective. | Provide the strategies <br> that are being <br> implemented to <br> support the staff in <br> becoming highly <br> effective |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3 out of 57 teachers are |  |
| currently teaching out-of- |  |
| field. | All teachers are currently <br> or will be enrolled in <br> certification classes to <br> receive proper <br> certification. |

## Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)).

$\left.$| Total Number <br> of <br> Instructional <br> Staff | \% of <br> First-Year <br> Teachers | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with 1-5 <br> Years of <br> Experience | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with 6-14 <br> Years of <br> Experience | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with 15+ <br> Years of <br> Experience | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with <br> Advanced <br> Degrees | \% Highly <br> Effective <br> Teachers | \% Reading <br> Endorsed <br> Teachers | National <br> Board <br> Certified <br> Teachers |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | Endorsed |
| :---: |
| Teachers | \right\rvert\,

## 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alexan Johnson | J ennifer Franco | Beginning Guidance Counselor | Weekly meetings to collaborate about guidance programs, classroom visits, counseling sessions, and progress monitoring of students. |
| Michael Hill | Joshua Church | Beginning Teacher 1-3 years | LMS will partner with the district to pilot a new Teacher Induction Program this year. The focus activities will be developed around the MCIES rubrics and will provide "new" teachers an opportunity to work with a peer teacher throughout the year |
| Barbara Kepner | Candace Ingram | Beginning Teacher 1-3 years | LMS will partner with the district to pilot a new Teacher Induction Program this year. The focus activities will be developed around the MCIES rubrics and will provide "new" teachers an opportunity to work with a peer teacher throughout the year. |
| Teresa Moses | Sharda Smith | Beginning Teacher 1-3 years | LMS will partner with the district to pilot a new Teacher Induction Program this year. The focus activities will be developed around the MCIES rubrics and will provide "new" teachers an opportunity to work with a peer teacher throughout the year. |
| Amy Ryffel-Kragh | Monica J acobs | Beginning Teacher 1-3 years | LMS will partner with the district to pilot a new Teacher Induction Program this year. The focus activities will be developed around the MCIES rubrics and will provide "new" teachers an opportunity to work |

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only
Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A
Liberty Middle School does not receive Title 1 funds.

Title I, Part C- Migrant
$\square$
Title I, Part D
$\square$
Title II
Title II, Part A: District provides staff development activities to improve basic educational programs and to assist administrators and teachers in meeting highly qualified status.

Title II, Pard D: District receives supplemental funds for improving their basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs, technology in the classrooms to increase instructional strategies that enhances literacy and math skills in struggling students. (For Middle and High Schools, funds are used to purchase SuccessMaker licenses and provide professional development for SuccessMaker).

## Title III

Part A: Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services on an as-needed basis to improve education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless
District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

## Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Dropout prevention and academic intervention programs are funded through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) and Supplemental Academic Instruction categorical funds. School districts have flexibility in how SAI funds may be expended as long as dollars are used to help students gain at least a year of knowledge and not be left behind.

## Violence Prevention Programs

Liberty Middle School partners with the Marion County Sheriff's Office and a School Resource Officer to provide a secure campus and implementation of intervention activities.

## Nutrition Programs

Economically disadvantaged students receive free or reduced price breakfast and lunch from Federal funding.

## Housing Programs

$\square$

## Head Start

$\square$

## Adult Education

$\square$
$\square$
J ob Training
$\square$
Other
$\square$

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

-School- based MTSS/ Rtl Team<br>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.<br>Assistant Principal of Curriculum- Melissa Lindeman- academic data and teacher input<br>Assistant Principal of Discipline- Shameka Murphy--behavior and attendance data<br>Guidance Counselors-Alexan Johnson/J ennifer Franco -student support data<br>Exceptional Student Ed Support Facilitator- Kelly Robinson-additional ESE support data<br>Behavior Specialist- Dan Craggs<br>Psychologist- Melissa McCain- gathers data for possible ESE support/consult and intervention<br>Resource Compliance Specialist- Alicyn Rewis-gathers data for possible ESE support/consult and intervention<br>Dean- Jessica McCleery- shares data relating to success of existing 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 Rtl team will meet bi-monthly to engage in the following activities:
Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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

The RtI Leadership Team assisted in the development of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The team provided data on: Tier 1,2 , and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

## -MTSS I mplementation

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

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), Monthly District Demand Writings, Success Maker Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA), District Benchmark Assessments
End of year: FAIR, FCAT
Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Teachers at Liberty Middle School have been trained on the RtI Model and will continue to receive professional development during teachers' common planning time and data team meetings held twice a month.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Support of the MTSS is in part driven by PBS (Positive Behavior Support) and Pride Paws with additional support provided through things like check-in and check-out.

```
Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)
[School- Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Michelle Lewis-Principal
Melissa Lindeman-Assistant Principal
Shameka Murphy-Assistant Principal
Meredith Scott-District Instructional Coach
J essica McCleery-Dean
Jennifer Franco- Guidance Counselor
Alexan Johnson- Guidance Counselor
Terri Adams - Media Specialist
Barbara Kepner- LA Teacher
Kelly Lawniczak- Social Studies Teacher
Sandra Crusher- Science Teacher
Bonnie Weekes- Science Teacher
Pam Schaeffer- Science Teacher
Claudia Markham-Ahl- Science Teacher
Darlene Nowery-Math Teacher
```

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
The LLT meets monthly at Liberty Middle School to discuss items of importance from our annual school-wide read to novels in Language Arts classes. We also discuss the Media Center's needs.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
To collaborate about our upcoming school-wide read The Revealers. To develop curriculum to reinforce the book and keep students engaged.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

## *Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

## N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only
Sec. $1003.413(b)$ F.S.
For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.
All teachers at Liberty Middle School will utilize reading strategies previously learned through workshops and staff development. The instructional coach, the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT), and/or the staff development team will support and provide assistance and professional development to all teachers by modeling these strategies and facilitating collaborative groups when requested. Lesson plans and Classroom Walk Through (CWT) will provide evidence on area reading strategy implementation and will provide a means for monitoring, while implementing the Common Core Literacy standards as well.
*High Schools Only
Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.
How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

N/A

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

N/A

## Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.

In grades 6-8, 60\% (at least 610) of the students will be proficient in reading based on the FCAT reading test.
Reading Goal \#1a:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:
$60 \%$ (610) of students will be proficient on the reading FCAT.
54\% (551) of Liberty Middle School students in grades 6-8 were proficient on the reading FCAT.

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited student experience reading complex nonfiction texts in core classes. | Implement critical reading skills in all courses. Teachers will participate in ongoing common core trainings this school year. | Principal <br> Assistant Principals CC Lead Teachers | Monitor lesson plans and assessments. <br> Classroom walkthroughs. | Grades <br> FCA <br> FCAT <br> QWAs <br> Close Reading <br> Assignments |
| 2 | Individualized or differentiated instruction for all students. | Intensive classes provided for reading and math; PBS- Positive Behavior Support to increase student motivation; seamless school- wide expectations across grade levels | Classroom teachers, administrative team, Reading Coach | Analysis of student achievement data, SuccessMaker data, classroom observations and walkthroughs | Grades <br> FCA <br> FCAT <br> QWAs <br> MCIES |
| 3 | Excessive absences, mobility of students | provide intensive reading courses for level 1 and 2 students and progress monitor level 3 reading students, SuccessMaker | Administrators, Reading Coach, Teachers | Bi- monthly reading department readings facilitated by the reading coach to provide frequent progress monitoring of data | Focus Calendar Assessments (FCA), <br> SuccessMaker Reports, District Benchmark Assessments, FAIR testing |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#1b: | All students ( $100 \% ; 5$ of 5) will score a level 4, 5, or 6 in FAA <br> Reading |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Level of Performance: |
| $100 \%$ (3) students scored a 4, 5, or 6 in FAA Reading | $100 \%$, all students will score a level 4, 5, or 6 in FAA Reading |


|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Size of class and number <br> of preps per teacher <br> (19). | Time for teacher to plan <br> outside of the <br> instructional day. <br> Paraprofessional support <br> to assist in day-to-day <br> classroom activities. | Assistant Principal | Classroom observations <br> and walkthroughs, along <br> with feedback from <br> teacher. | MCIES |

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement <br> Level $\mathbf{4}$ in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#2a: |
| :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) |
| :--- |
| in reading will increase by 5\% on the FCAT at each grade |
| level as measured by 2013 FCAT reading results. |

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

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

| Reading Goal \#2b: |
| :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: |
| $0 / 3$ students scored at or above achievement level 7 in FAA |
| Reading |

$40 \%(2 / 5)$ students will score at or above achievement level 7 in reading.

## 2013 Expected Level of Performance:

$60 \%$ of students will score at or above achievement level 7 in reading

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Size of class and number <br> of preps per teacher <br> (19). | Time for teacher to plan <br> outside of teh <br> instructional day. <br> Paraprofessional support <br> to assist in day-to-day <br> classroom activities. | Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs; <br> behavior specialist, <br> feedback from teacher | MCIES |

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#3a: |  |  | $86 \%$ (911) of students in grades 6 - 8 will make learning gains based on the FCAT reading assessment. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 61\% (635) of students in grades 6-8 made learning gains based on the 2012 reading assessment. |  |  | 86\% (911) of students in grades 6 - 8 will make learning gains based on the FCAT reading assessment. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited student experience with reading complex nonfiction text using deep reading strategies in all core classes | Implement critical reading skills in all courses. Teachers will participate in ongoing Common Core training throughout the school year. | Principal <br> Asst Principals <br> Common Core Lead <br> Teachers (CCLTs) | Monitor lesson plans and assessments. <br> Classroom walkthroughs. | Grades <br> FCAs <br> FCAT <br> QWAs |
| 2 | Individualized or differentiated instruction of all students | Intensive classes provided for reading and math; PBS- Positive Behavior Support to increase student motivation; seamless school-wide expectations across grade levels | Classroom teachers, administrative team, Reading Coach | Analysis of student achievement data, SuccessMaker data, Classroom observations and walkthroughs. | Grades <br> FCAs <br> FCAT <br> QWAs |
|  | Excessive absences, mobility | Provide intensive reading courses (read 180), SRA, Corrective Reading, SuccessMaker | Administrators, teachers | Bi- monthly reading department meetings, frequent progress monitoring of data. | Focus Calendar Assessments (FCA), <br> SuccessMaker Reports, District Benchamrk Assessment (DBMA), FAIR |

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Percentage of students making Learning Gains in
reading.
$60 \%(3 / 5)$ of students will make learning gains in Reading
Reading Goal \#3b:

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

40\% (2/5) of student taking the FAA made learning gains in reading as measured by 2012 results.

60\% (3/5) of alternatively assessed students will make learning gains in Reading

| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |  |
| 1 | Large class sizes and a <br> large number of preps <br> taught throughout the <br> school day (19). | Time for teacher to plan <br> outside of instructional <br> day. Paraprofessional <br> support for day-to-day <br> classroom activities | Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, <br> behavior specialist, <br> feedback from teachers | MCIES |  |  |

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25\% making learning gains in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#4: |  |  | $75 \%$ of the lowest $25 \%$ of students will make learning gains in reading on the FCAT. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 64\% of the lowest 25\% made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT reading assessment. |  |  | $75 \%$ of the lowest $25 \%$ of students will make learning gains in reading on the FCAT. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Timely identification of students scoring in the bottom quartile. | 1. The bottom $25 \%$ of students will be identified based on 2012 FCAT reading scores. <br> 2. Students will be scheduled into Intensive Reading classes based upon FCAT scores, SRA decoding results, and FAIR data. <br> 3. In addition to using the above information, the placement of Students with Disabilities into reading classes will be done to align with the requirements of each students Individual Education Plan. <br> 4. Instruction will be delivered as described and required by our district reading plan (direct instruction). <br> 5. Support will be provided through Reading Paraprofessionals. 6. Supplemental instruction will include Successmaker, My Reading Coach, and Reading Counts. <br> 7. Instruction will be monitored through data collection (FCA, Benchmark, PMRN, Successmaker, FAIR), analysis, and reviews with teachers. | Principal <br> Asst Principals <br> Instructional Coach <br> Counselors | Effectiveness will be monitored throughout year using Classroom Walk Throughs, Reading Notebook Reviews, Data Reviews (FCA, Benchmark, FAIR, PMRN). <br> Growth will also be monitored quarterly based on established indivikdual growth goals. <br> Final effectiveness will be determined by using the 2013 FCAT SSS Reading scores. | On- going evaluation tools include FCA scores, FAIR testing, Successmaker data <br> 2013 FCAT SSS Reading |


| 2 | Excessive absences, <br> Mobility | Provide intensive <br> intervention reading <br> ocurses (Read 180, SRA, <br> Corrective Reading, <br> SuccessMaker) | Administrators, <br> Teachers | Bi-monthly reading <br> department meetings, bi- <br> monthly progress <br> monitoring of data | Focus Calendar <br> Assessments <br> (FCA), <br> SuccessMaker <br> Reports, District <br> Benchmark <br> Assessments, FAIR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | none | Every teacher will <br> Identify those students <br> who fall in this categorey <br> and provide additional <br> support to help students <br> be successful. | Administrators and <br> teachers | Weekly vertical and <br> hortizontal collaboration <br> meetings. | SMS and Custom <br> Reports, FCAs, <br> DBMA, and FCAT. |


| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by $50 \%$. |  |  | ```Reading Goal # Meet the 2013 AMO goal but progress will be measured as 10% # of AMO from previous year. In 2017, 83% of students will be proficient in reading. 5A:``` |  |  |  |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|  |  |  | - | - | - |  |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5B: |  |  | $80 \%$ of White subgroup will make satisfactory gains in Reading $70 \%$ of Hispanic subgroup will make satisfactory gains in Reading $55 \%$ of Black Subgroup will make satisfactory gains in Reading |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| White - 70\% (357) of students made gains Hispanic - 65\% (144) of student made gains Black - 49\% (106) made gains |  |  | $80 \%$ of White subgroup will make satisfactory gains in Reading <br> $70 \%$ of Hispanic subgroup will make satisfactory gains in Reading <br> $55 \%$ of Black Subgroup will make satisfactory gains in Reading |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Funding for a tutoring program | We would like to provide an after school tutoring/enrichment program for students to provide additional time and support to students. Priority enrollment would be provided to our minority students. | Administrative team | Data analysis of student performance in core academic classes | Focus Calendar Assessments, District Benchmark Assessments |
| 2 | Limited exposure of students to reading complex nonfiction text in core classes | Implememt critical reading skills in all courses. Teachers will participate in on- going Common Core trainings throughout the school year | Principal Asst Principals CC Lead Teachers | Monitor lesson plans and assessments, classroom walkthroughs | Grades <br> FCAs <br> FCAT <br> QWAs |
| 3 | Excessive absences, mobility | Provide intensive reading courses (Read 180, SRA, Corrective Reading, 50 minute Reading | Administrators, Teachers | Bi- monthly data analysis meetings and frequent progress monitoring of students Focus Calendar | FCA, DBMA, FAIR |


| $\square$ | Instruction) |
| :--- | :--- |

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

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

| Reading Goal \#5C: |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfor | nance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| N/A |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited personnel to assist students during instrucitonal time in his/her native language. | Develop schedule in which ESOL <br> paraprofessionals can serve all ESOL students throughout their core classes. | Principal Asst Principal | Data analysis of student performance on Focus Calendar Assessments, QWA, District Benchmark Assessments and FCAT | FAIR, FCAs, QWAs, DBMA, FCAT |
| 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5D: |  |  | 86\% (201) of Students With Disabilities (SWD) will make gains in Reading based on the 2013 FCAT reading. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| $66 \%$ (152) of Students with Disabilities scored below grade level in reading based on the 2012 FCAT. |  |  | 86\% (201) of Students with Disabilities will make gains based on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited internet access at home necessary to access the District parent portal and teacher web pages. | Students in need of materials or school supplies will be assisted through our guidance department to ensure they have adequate supplies to participate in the everyday learning environment. The District Parent Portal, Websites, and phone conferences will be available to parents at the school so they may stay up to date with their child's | Administrative team, counselors, teachers | Student success will be measured by report card grades and performance on both formative and summative assessments. | Quarterly report cards, FAIR, FCAT |


|  |  | progress. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Excessive Absences, Mobility | Provide intenisve Reading courses (Read 180), SRA, Corrective Reading, SuccessMaker) | Administrators, Teachers | Bi- monthly analysis of SWD data and frequent progress monitoring throughout the 20122013 school year. | Focus Calendar Assessments (FCA), District Benchmark data, SucceessMaker Reports, FCAT Explorer, FCAT |
| 3 | Getting teachers trained in the use of inclusion strategies. | Enrolling students with disabilities in inclusion classes. | APC, staffing specialist, support facilitators. | Support facilitators monitor student's progress in inclusion classes several times a week. | focus calendar assessments, district benchmark data, successmakers reports, FAIR FCAT data. |

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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5E: |  |  | 86\% of Economically Disadvantaged students will make gains based on the 2013 FCAT. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 42\% (279)Economically Disadvantaged students made gains based on the 2012 FCAT. |  |  | 86\% of Economically Disadvantaged students will make gains based on the 2013 FCAT. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students coming to school without necessary supplies. | Students in need of materials or school supplies will be assisted through our guidance department to ensure they have adequate supplies to participate in the everyday learning environment. The District Parent Portal, Websites, and phone conferences will be available to parents at the school so they may stay up to date with their child's progress. | Administrative team, counselors, teachers, Social Services (if necessary) | Student success will be measured by report card grades and performance on both formative and summative assessments. | Report cards, FAIR, FCAT |
| 2 | Families not having access to internet at home to utilize the District Parent Portal and the school/teacher web pages. | The district parent portal, district and teacher web pages, and phone conferences will be available to parents so they may stay up to date with their child's progress. | Administrative team, counselors, teachers | Student success will be measured by report card grades and performance on both formative and summative assessments. | Report cards, FAIR, FCAT |
| 3 | Excessive absences, mobility | Provide Intensive intervention reading courses (Read 180, SRA, Corrective Reading, SuccessMaker) | Administrators, teachers | Bi- monthly reading department meetings, bimonthly progress monitoring of data. | Focus Calendar Assessments (FCA), <br> SuccessMaker Reports, District Benchmark <br> Assessments, FAIR |
| 4 | Funding | After school programs including tutoring and unit recovery. | Administrators, teachers | Monitor the number of students attending the after school program. Monitor the numbers of | Continued monitoring of students through the guidance |

## 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 <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator and/ or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | ```Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)``` | Strategy for Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Common Core Lead Teacher Training | Grades 6-8 All Subjects | Tara Hart, Pam Roberts | Louann Boemio ELA, Terri Adams Soc St, Michael Orloff Science, J ames Heruth Math, Velvea Brown Vocational | district training dates | CCLT will meet with admin team before and after each training to discuss school goals | Principal, Asst Principals |
| Deep Reading Training | All Teachers | CCLT and Michelle Lewis | All Teachers | Early Release dates and every other Wednesday | Admin walkthroughs | Principal, Asst Principals |
| NGCAR-PD Training | Grade 7 Civics | Sue Eatmon and Michelle Surman | Quentin Anderson, Andrew Bordelon | district training dates | Admin team will use district provided "look fors" rubric to conduct classroom walkthroughs | Principal, Asst Principals |
| Common Core Overview Training | All staff | CCLT (Common Core Lead Teachers) | All teachers | Early Release dates and every other Wednesday | Admin walkthroughs | CCLT, Principal, Asst Principals |
| Text Complexity | All staff | CCLT and Michelle Lewis | All Teachers | Early Release dates and every other Wednesday | Admin walkthroughs | Principal, Asst Principals |

## Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |

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

| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non- ELL students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/ speaking. CELLA Goal \#1: |  |  | $50 \%$ of 6 Grade students will be proficient in listening/speaking $86 \%$ of 7 Grade students will be proficient in listening/speaking $77 \%$ of 8 Grade students will be proficient in listenting/speaking |  |  |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/ speaking: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 Grade: $10 / 22$ ( $45 \%$ )7 Grade: $13 / 16(81 \%)$8 Grade: $18 / 25(72 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students who speak languages other than Spanish have no assistance in heritage language | Allow access to Rosetta Stone | APC <br> ESOL <br> Paraprofessional <br> Classroom <br> Teacher | Data analysis of student performance on FCAs, QWAs, DBMAs, and 2013 CELLA | FAIR, FCA, QWA, DBMA, FCAT, CELLA |
| 2 | Limited personnel to assist students in native language in all core classes | Develop schedule that allows ESOL paraprofessional to serve all students for at least $20 \mathrm{~min} /$ day, 3 times/week in core classes | Principal APC <br> APD | Data analysis of student performance on FCAs, QWAs, DBMAs, and 2013 CELLA | FAIR, FCA, QWA, DBMA, FCAT, CELLA |

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non- ELL students.

## 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal \#2:

46\% of 6 Grade students will be proficient in Reading $5 \%$ of 7 Grade students will be proficient in Reading $21 \%$ of 8 Grade students will be proficient in Reading

## 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

6 Grade: 9/22 (41\%)
7 Grade: 1/16 (.06\%)
8 Grade: 4/25 (16\%)

| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited personnel to assist students in native language in all core classes | Develop schedule where ESOL paraprofessional can serve all students $20 \mathrm{~min} /$ daily, 3 times/weekly in core classes | Principal APC <br> APD | Data analysis of student performance on Focus Calendar Assessments, Quarterly Writing Assessments, District Benchmarks and 2013 FCAT | FAIR, FCA, QWA, DBMA, FCAT, CELLA |

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non- ELL students.

| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal \#3: |  |  | $41 \%$ of 6 Grade students will be proficient in Writing $5 \%$ of 7 Grade students will be proficient in Writing $20 \%$ of 8 Grade students will be proficient in Writing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 6: $8 / 22$ (36\%)Grade 7: $2 / 16(.12 \%)$Grade 8: $5 / 25(20 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students who speak languages other than Spanish receive no assistance in heritage language | Allow student access to Rosetta Stone, with monitoring by ESOL Paraprofessional | Principal <br> APC <br> APD <br> Classroom <br> Teacher | Data analysis of student performance on Focus Calendar Assessments, Quarterly Writing Assessments, District Benchmarks, and 2013 FCAT | FAIR, FCA, QWA, DBMA, FCAT , CELLA |

CELLA Budget:


## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#1a: |  |  | $86 \%$ (911) of students will achieve proficiency in math based on the 2013 FCAT. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 71\% (738) of students achieved proficency based on the 2012 FCAT Math. |  |  | $86 \%$ (911) of students will achieve proficiency in math based on the 2013 FCAT. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Excessive Absences, mobility | Provide individual instruction and intensive remediation using VMath and manipulatives | Content area math teachers, administrators | Bi- monthly analysis of student achievement data, classroom walkthroughs | Focus Calendar Assessments (FCA), District Benchmark data, SuccessMaker, VMath, FCAT Explorer |
| 2 | Implementation with fidelity of Common Core practices in Math classes | Teachers will participate in ongoing CC math practice trainings this school year | Principal <br> APC <br> APD <br> Common Core Lead Teachers | Monitor trainings, lesson plans, assessments and classroom walkthroughs | Grades, FCAs, FCAT, MCIES |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#1b: |  |  | $60 \%(3 / 5)$ students will score a level 4,5 , or 6 on the FAA Mathematics. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| $100 \%(3 / 3)$ students scored a level 4, 5, or 6 in FAA Mathematics |  |  | $60 \%(3 / 5)$ students will score a level 4,5 , or 6 on the FAA Mathematics. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Large number of subjects taught within same school day | Provide strategies for learning centers and work stations, continued paraprofessional assistance, behavior specialist if needed | Principal <br> APC <br> APD | Classroom walkthroughs, behavior specialist | MCIES, FAA |

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#2a: |  |  | 25\% (280) of students in grades 6 - 8 will achieve avbove proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) in mathematics based on the FCAT. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 23\% (265) of students in grades 6-8 achieved above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) in mathematics based on the FCAT. |  |  | $25 \%$ (280) of students in grades 6-8 will achieve above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) in mathematics based on the FCAT. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited activities for upper level students to be challenged. | Provide enrichment activities to students in all advanced, honors, and gifted classes. | Administrators, Teachers | Monitoring of teacher lesson plans | 2013 FCAT <br> Mathematics <br> Assessment |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#2b: |  |  | 50\% (2 students) will score level 7 in mathematics FAA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 25\% (1 student) scored a level 7 in math FAA |  |  | AMO data unavailable but 2 students will score proficient achievement level |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Large number of subjects taught within school day | Provide strategies for learning centers or work stations, continued support of paraprofessional, behavior specialist if needed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Principal } \\ & \text { APC } \\ & \text { APD } \end{aligned}$ | Classroom walkthroughs, behavior specialist | MCIES, FAA |

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

Mathematics Goal \#3a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:
$72 \%$ (749) of students in grades 6-8 made learning gains in mathematics based on the FCAT.

86\% (911) of students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains in mathematics based on the FCAT.

## 2013 Expected Level of Performance:

86\% (911) of students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains in mathematics based on the FCAT.

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |  |  |


| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#3b: |  |  | $100 \%$ (4) students will make math learning gains as measured by FAA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| $100 \%$ of students made math learning gains as measured by FAA |  |  | AMO data unavailable but all 4 students (100\%) will make math learning gains |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Large number of subjects taught within school day | Provide strategies for learning centers and works centers, continued support of paraprofessionals, offer assistance from behavior specialist if needed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Principal } \\ & \text { APC } \\ & \text { APD } \end{aligned}$ | Classroom walkthroughs, behavior specialist data | MCIES, FAA |


| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25\% making learning gains in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#4: |  | $86 \%$ of the lowest $25 \%$ will make learning gains in mathematics based on the FCAT. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Perfo | nance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| $70 \%$ of the lowest 25\% made based on the FCAT. | arning gains in mathematics | $86 \%$ of the lowest $25 \%$ will make learning gains in mathematics based on the FCAT. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| Excessive absences, mobility | Provide individual instruction and intensive | Administrators, teachers | Bi- monthly analysis of student achievement | Focus Calendar Assessments |


| 1 |  | remediation using VMath <br> and manipulatives |  | data, classroom walk- <br> through observations | (FCA), District <br> Benchmark <br> Assessments, <br> SuccessMaker, |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FCAT Explorer, |  |  |  |  |  |
| VMath |  |  |  |  |  |$|$


| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by $50 \%$. |  |  | Middle School Mathematics Goal \#$\square$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Baseline data } \\ 2010-2011 \end{array}$ | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#5B: |  |  | At least 86\% (911) of all tested subgroups will make gains in mathematics based on the 2013 FCAT. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| White, Black and Hispanic students did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics based on the FCAT. <br> $73 \%$ (373) white students proficient <br> 48\% (107) black students proficient <br> 67\% (145) Hispanic students proficient. |  |  | At least $86 \%$ (911) of all tested subgroups will make gains in mathematics based on the FCAT. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Excessive absences, mobility | Provide individual instruction and intensive remediation using VMath and manipulatives | Administrators, Teachers | Bi- monthly anaylsis of student achievement data, classroom walkthrough observations | Focus Calendar Assessments (FCA), District Benchmark data, SuccessMaker reports, VMath, FCAT Explorer |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making <br> satisfactory progress in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#5C: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| N/A not enough students in this subgroup |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|  |  |


| N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Problem- Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#5D: |  |  | $86 \%$ (215) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make gain in mathematics based on the 2013 FCAT. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 71\% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and are belwo grade level in mathematics based on the 2012 FCAT. |  |  | 86\% (215) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make gain in mathematics based on the 2013 FCAT. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Excessive absences, mobility | Provide individual instruction and intensive remediation using VMath, Acaletics and manipulatives | Administrators, teachers, support faciltators | Bi- monthly analysis of student achievement data, classroom walkthroughs | Focus Calendar Assessments (FCA), District benchmark assessments, SuccessMaker Reports, VMath, FCAT Explorer |
| 2 | Student engagement | Utilize technology (Engaged classrooms), VMath, SuccessMaker, and FCAT Explorer to enhance instructional program and raise mastery. | Administrators, Teachers | Bi- monthly analysis of student achievement data, classroom walkthroughs | Focus Calendar Assessments (FCA), District benchmark assessments, SuccessMaker Reports, VMath, FCAT Explorer |

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics

86\% of Economically disadvantaged students will make gains in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT.

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

86\% of Economically disadvantaged students will make gains in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT.
$41 \%$ of Economically disadvantaged students did not make Adegquate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics based on the 2011 FCAT.

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Excessive absences, <br> mobility | Provide individual <br> instruction and intensive <br> remediation using VMath <br> and manipulatives | Administrators, <br> Teachers | Bi- monthly analysis of <br> student achievement <br> data, classroom <br> walkthrough observations | Focus Calendar <br> Assessments <br> (FCA), District <br> Benchmark <br> Assessments, |
| SuccessMaker <br> Reports, FCAT <br> Explorer, VMath |  |  |  |  |  |

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.

Algebra Goal \#1:
20\% (22) students will score a level 3 on 2013 Algebra EOC

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23\% (19) students scored level 3 on Algebra EOC in 2012 |  |  | 20\% (22) students will score a level 3 on 2013 Algebra EOC |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Implementation to Common Core math practices | Teachers will participate in ongoing training in common core practices for math | Administration Common Core Lead Teachers | State Algebra EOC Exam, along with Focus Calendar Assessments and District Benchmarks | Algebra 1 EOC Exam, FCAs, DBMA |

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#2: |  |  | $80 \%$ (90) of our students will score at level 4 or 5 on Algebra EOC |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 67\% of students scored at level 4 or 5 on Algebra EOC 2012 |  |  | $80 \%$ (90) of our students will score at level 4 or 5 on Algebra EOC 2013 |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Implementation to Common Core math practices | Teachers will participate in ongoing training in common core practices for math | Administration Common Core Lead Teachers | Algebra EOC Exam, along with Focus Calendar Assessments and District Benchmarks | Algebra 1 EOC <br> Exam, FCAs, DBMA |



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

| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#3B: |  |  | 100\% of students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 0\% of students failed to make satisfactory performance on Algebra 1 EOC |  |  | AMO data no available |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Implementation to Common Core math practices | Teachers will participate in ongoing training in common core practices for math | Administration Common Core Lead Teachers | Algebra EOC Exam, along with Focus Calendar Assessments and District Benchmarks | Algebra 1 EOC Exam, FCAs, DBMA |


| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#3C: |  | N/A Subgroup too small to collect significant data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| N/A Subgroup too small to collect significant data |  | N/A Subgroup too small to collect significant data |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#3D: |  | N/A Subgroup too small to collect significant data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| N/A Subgroup too small to collect significant data |  | N/A Subgroup too small to collect significant data |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |

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

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

N/A Subgroup too small to collect significant data
Algebra Goal \#3E:

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

N/A Subgroup too small to collect significant data
N/A Subgroup too small to collect significant data

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas <br> in need of improvement for the following group: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level $\mathbf{3}$ in <br> Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#1: | Liberty Middle does not offer Geometry |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Level of Performance: |
|  |  |


| Liberty Middle does not offer Geometry |  | Liberty Middle does not offer Geometry |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible <br> for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |



| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by $50 \%$. |  | Geometry Goal \# $\square$ <br> Liberty Middle does not offer Geometry <br> 3A: |  |  |  |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. $\quad$ Liberty Middle does not offer Geometry Geometry Goal \#3B:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Liberty Middle does not offer Geometry | Liberty Middle does not offer Geometry |


| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |



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

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

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

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

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

| ```PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus``` | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or schoolwide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level Math Trainings | Grades 6-8 | Chris Hanes | entire mathematics department | $\begin{gathered} 9 / 10 \& 11 ; \\ 9 / 12 \& 13 ; 9 / 17 \& 18 ; \\ 12 / 3-5 \end{gathered}$ | CCLT will meet with department and admin team before and after trainings to discuss dissemination of information to teachers | Principal, Assistant Principals |
| Common Core Math Practices Training | Grades 6-8 | Common Core Lead Teacher | entire mathematics department | Early Release and Wednesdays | Admin walkthroughs, lesson plans | Principals, Assistant Principals |

Mathematics Budget:

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

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement

Level 3 in science.
Science Goal \#la:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |
| :--- |
| 43\% (160) of 8th grade students achieved proficiency <br> on the FCAT science assessment. |

$50 \%$ (195) of students will achieve proficiency on the FCAT Science 2013

2013 Expected Level of Performance:
$50 \%$ (195) of students will achieve proficiency on the FCAT Science 2013

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Limited student <br> experience with <br> context reading skills in <br> all core classes | Implement critical <br> reading skills in all <br> courses. Teachers will <br> participate in ongoing <br> Common Core Trainings <br> throughout the school <br> year. | Administrators, <br> Common Core <br> Lead Teachers, <br> Science <br> Teachers | Monitor lesson plans, <br> classroom <br> assessments, <br> classroom <br> walkthroughs | Grades <br> FCA <br> FCAT |
| 2 | Teacher training | Use of new science <br> standards and new <br> textbooks with <br> integration of Common <br> Core strategies | Administration, <br> district science <br> coordinator. | Observations of <br> instruction using new <br> science standards and <br> textbooks | FCA, 8th grade <br> FCAT science <br> assessments. |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Asse Students scoring at Levels <br> Science Goal \#1b: | sment: <br> 4, 5, and 6 in science | All students (5/5) will receive a level 4, 5, or 6 in FAA Writing. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Perfor | ormance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 3/3 students received a level | 4, 5, or 6 in Science FA | All students (5/5) will receive a level 4, 5, or 6 in FAA Writing. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| Large number of subjects taught within | Provide strategies for learning centers and | Principal APC | Classroom walkthroughs, data, | MCIES <br> Behavior Data |


| 1 | school day | work stations, <br> continued support from <br> paraprofessionals, <br> behavior specialist <br> assistance if needed | APD | behavior data, <br> behavior specialist |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.

20\% (78) Students will score above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) in 2013 FCAT Science
Science Goal \#2a:

| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Level of Performance: |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11\% (41) of students in grade 8 achieved above <br> proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) in science based on <br> the 2012 FCAT. | $20 \% ~(78)$ Students will score above proficiency (FCAT <br> levels 4 and 5) in 2013 FCAT Science | the 2012 FCAT.

levels 4 and 5) in 2013 FCAT Science

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |
| Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. <br> Science Goal \#2b: |  |  | N/A Currently no 8 grade students scheduled for FAA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 0/2 students scored level 7 or higher in FAA Science |  |  | N/A Currently no 8 grade students scheduled for FAA |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Large number of subjects taught within school day | Provide strategies for learning centers and work stations, continued support from paraprofessionals, behavior specialist assistance if needed | Principal <br> APC <br> APD | Classroom walkthroughs, data, behavior data, behavior specialist | MCIES <br> Classroom Data |

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

| PD <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Remponsible for <br> Monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Core <br> Overview <br> Training | All staff | CCLT | All teachers | Department | Admin <br> walkthroughs | CCLT, Principal, <br> Asst. Principals |
| Deep <br> Reading <br> Training | Grades 6-8 <br> Science <br> Teachers | CCLT and <br> Michelle <br> Lewis | Grades 6-8 <br> Science | Early Release <br> Dates and every <br> other Wednesday | Admin <br> walkthroughs and <br> school wide Close <br> Reading activities | Principal, Asst. <br> Principals |
| Text <br> Complexity <br> Training | Grades 6-8 <br> Science | CCLT and <br> Michelle <br> Lewis | Grades 6-8 <br> Science, ELA, SS, <br> elective | Early Release <br> Dates and every <br> other Wednesday | Admin <br> walkthroughs and <br> school wide Close <br> Reading activities | Principal, Asst. <br> Principals |

## Science Budget:



End of Science Goals

## Writing Goals

[^0]| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Excessive Absences, Mobility | 8th grade students will utilize Pearson's on-line essay scorer through their Language Arts class in order to enhance their writing skills. | Administrators, Teachers | Review student essays to determine target skill instruction. | Formal and informal observation, collaborative departmental/grade level and cross curricular team planning. |
| 2 | Support from core content teachers with Common Core writing initiative | Consistent lessons with writing assignments in all classes | Administrators | Gradebook checks, performance matters, classroom walkthroughs | QWA (Quarterly Writing Assessments), Demand Writings, FCAT Writes |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. <br> Writing Goal \#1b: |  |  | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ no students scheduled to take FAA writing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 2/2 of FAA Writing students recieved a level 4 or higher on the Writing piece of the test. |  |  | n/a no students scheduled to take FAA writing |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy |  | on or ion onsible <br> toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |  |

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

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

| ```PD Content / Topic and/ or PLC Focus``` | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/ or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or schoolwide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Common Core Team/Data | 6-8 | Common Core Lead Teachers and Administration | All subject areas, broken down into CC areas | Early Release dates, Wednesdays | Lesson plans, observations, classroom walkthroughs | Administration |



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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas <br> in need of improvement for the following group: <br> 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. <br> Civics Goal \#1: |
| :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |
| Test has not been given yet, data not available |
| (180/360) of Civics students will be proficient on the |
| Civics Assessment |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels

4 and 5 in Civics.
$50 \%$ (180/360) or more of students taking Civics will be
Civics Goal \#2:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N/A Test not given yet |  |  | 50\% (180/360) or more of students taking Civics will be proficient on the exam |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | New curriculum, new test, teacher training | Teachers will receive ongoing training from the district regarding the curriculum | Administration | Classroom walkthroughs, monitoring of grades, assessments | Grades DBMA QWAs |

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 schoolwide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Common Core Training | 6-8 | Common Core lead teachers, administration | All 7 grade Civics teachers | District inservice days throughout school year, early release days, Wednesdays | Lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, assessments | Administration |

Civics Budget:


## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| 1. Attendance <br> Attendance Goal \#1: |  |  | Students daily attendance in grades 6 - 8 will increase by $10 \%$ (110) students . |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: |  |  | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |  |  |
| 68\% (655) of students missed less than 10 days of school throught the 2011-2012 school year. |  |  | Students daily attendance in grades $6-8$ will increase by $10 \%$ (110) students . |  |  |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |  |  |
| 39\% (413) of students in grades 6-8 had excessive absences throughout the 2011-2012 school year. |  |  | Less than $20 \%$ (220) of students in grades 6 - 8 will have excessive absences throughout the 2012-2013 school year. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies ( 10 or more) |  |  |
| 40\% (420) of students in grades 6-8 had excessive tardies throughout the 2011-2012 school year. |  |  | Less than $30 \%$ (330) students in grades 6 - 8 will have excessive absences throughout the 2012-2013 school year. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Suspensions | LMS is implementing the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) system which will reward students. | Administrators, Guidance Counselors, Attendance Clerk, Social Worker | Weekly attendance reports provided to social worker, bimonthly PBS data collection | SMS data, Social worker records |

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

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

| PD <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Attendance Budget:

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

$\left.$| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | | Available |
| ---: |
| Amount | \right\rvert\, | $\$ 0.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |



End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Suspension <br> Suspension Goal \#1: |  | The goal for Liberty Middle School for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease suspensions by at least $15 \%$ by implementing the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) program. |  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions |  | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |  |  |
| There were 496 incidents of in-school suspensions throughout the 2011-2012 school year. |  | The goal for 2012-2013 is to have less than 425 incidents of in- school suspension. |  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In- <br> School |  |  |
| There were 217 students assigned to in- school suspension throughout the 2011-2012 school year. |  | The goal for 2012-2013 is have less than 150 students assigned to in-school suspension. |  |  |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |  | 2013 Expected Number of Out- of-School Suspensions |  |  |
| There were 417 incidents of out- of- school suspensions throughout the 2011-2012school year. |  | The goal for 2012-2013 is to have less than 300 incidents of out- of -school suspension. |  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- ofSchool |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |  |  |
| There were 297 students suspended out- of-school throughout the 2011-2012 school year. |  | The goal for 2012-2013 is to have less than 200 students suspended out- of- school. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| Mobility of students, | Liberty Middle School As | Assistant Principal | -monthly data | SMS discipline |

1 | 1 |
| :--- |

will implement the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) program school- wide. Students who are unsuccessful with this new program will receive intense interventions. Examples of this include: daily check in/check out (ROAR), monthly anger management meetings
|of Discipline, RtI paraprofessional
analysis and bi-monthly summary reports, progress monitoring of daily or weekly identified students.
student behavior tracking forms.

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

 (PLC) or PD ActivityPlease note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| Positive <br> Behavior <br> Support | $6-8$ | Assistant <br> Principal of <br> Discipline, <br> Deans | All teachers | Small group <br> meetings, PBS <br> Team meetings | Continued <br> monitoring of <br> behavior data | APD |

## Suspension Budget:



End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

[^1]| 1. Parent I nvolvement <br> Parent I nvolvement Goal \#1: <br> *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. |  |  | Increase the number of parents attending open house on September 20, 2012 and increase the percentage of parents serving on the School Advisory Council (SAC). |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent I nvolvement: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Parent I nvolvement: |  |  |
| 20\% (200 parents) participated in school activities in the 2011-2012 school year. |  |  | At least $30 \%$ ( 330 parents) will participate in school activities in the 2012-2013 school year. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Difficult for some parents to attend SAC meetings due to long work hours. | Conduct monthly SAC meetings and schedule them at later times when parents are able to attend. | Principal | Review of monthly minutes from SAC meetings | Meeting minutes, parent evaluation form |
| 2 | Incorrect parent contact information. | Frequent distribution of student grade and progress reports. | Administrative Team, Teachers | Parent conferences, Alert Now call to notify parents of distribution dates, frequently updated school website and calendar so parents have all important dates. | Teacher generated grade reports, parent generated emails through website, progress reports, report cards |
| 3 | Difficult for some parents to attend open house due to long work hours. | Schedule annual open house later in the evening so parents are able to attend. | Principal | Parents will sign in with homeroom teacher. <br> Administration will collect the data and determine its effectiveness. | Parent sign- in $\log$. |

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

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

| PD <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

$\left.$| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | | Available |
| ---: |
| Amount | \right\rvert\, | No Data | No Data | No Data |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |


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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. STEM

STEM Goal \#1:

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

## STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

## Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. CTE

CTE Goal \#1:
Career and Technical Education teachers will implement Deep and Close Reading strategies in their classrooms to encompass content texts related to their subject matter.

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Limited student <br> experience with context <br> reading in all classes. | Implement critical <br> reading skills in all <br> courses. Teachers will <br> participate in ongoing <br> Common Core trainings | Principal, Asst <br> Principals, CCLT | Monitor lesson plans <br> and assessments, <br> classroom walkthroughs | Grades <br> FCAT <br> QWA |

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

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

| PD <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CTE Common <br> Core <br> Trainings | $6-8$ | CCLT | CTE teachers | Early Release days, <br> Wednesdays |  |  |
| Continued <br> Classroom <br> walkthroughs, <br> monitoring of <br> lesson plans | Administration |  |  |  |  |  |

CTE Budget:

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

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |  |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |  |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | n/a | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |  |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

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

Are you a reward school: j Yes j No
A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/17/2012)

## School Advisory Council

## School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

## Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
| :--- | :---: |
| If funds are allotted, SAC would like to provide an after-school tutoring/boot camp program for students in certain <br> subjects. SAC would also like to incorporate a grant opportunity for teachers to write grants, requesting specific <br> resources for their classrooms. | $\$ 10,000.00$ |

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) will meet monthly (Second Monday of each month) to discuss upcoming school related activities and events, as well as fundraising opportunities. We hope to incorporate a Grant opportunity for teachers as well into this year's activities.

## AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-201
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010
SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Marion School District
LI BERTY MIDDLE SCHOOL

## 2010-2011

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 70\% | 72\% | 73\% | 46\% | 261 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the \% scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the \% scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| \% of Students Making Learning Gains | 61\% | 72\% |  |  | 133 | 3 ways to make gains: <br> - Improve FCAT Levels <br> - Maintain Level 3,4 , or 5 <br> - Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25\% in the School? | 64\% (YES) | 70\% (YES) |  |  | 134 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest $25 \%$ of students in reading and math. Yes, if $50 \%$ or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned |  |  |  |  | 528 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent Tested = } \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and \% of students tested |

## Marion School District <br> LI BERTY MIDDLE SCHOOL <br> 2009-2010

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 71\% | 70\% | 84\% | 45\% | 270 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the \% scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the \% scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| \% of Students Making Learning Gains | 68\% | 74\% |  |  | 142 | 3 ways to make gains: <br> - Improve FCAT Levels <br> - Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br> - Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25\% in the School? | 72\% (YES) | 69\% (YES) |  |  | 141 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest $25 \%$ of students in reading and math. Yes, if $50 \%$ or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned |  |  |  |  | 553 |  |
| Percent Tested $=99 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and \% of students tested |


[^0]:    * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)).

    Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
    1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level
    3.0 and higher in writing.

    At least $80 \%$ ( $312 / 391$ ) of students will be proficient on the FCAT Writing assessment.
    Writing Goal \#1a:

    ## 2012 Current Level of Performance:

    2013 Expected Level of Performance:
    $73 \%$ (228) of students achieved proficiency (FCAT level At least $80 \%(312 / 391)$ of students will be proficient on 3.0 and higher) in writing in 2012

[^1]:    * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)).

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

