

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: C C WASHINGTON ACADEMY

District Name: Bay

Principal: Darnita A. Rivers

SAC Chair: Susan A. Mayo

Superintendent: William A. Husfelt

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 11/5/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Darnita A. Rivers	BA English Education, Dillard University; Master of Science – Educational Leadership, Florida State University; Principal Certification – State of Florida	2	10	Principal of C. C. Washington Academy 2010-2011 School Improvement Rating: Maintaining, Reading 48% learning gains, Math 63% learning gains; Writing 94%; AYP 64%; AP of Jinks 2009-2010 Grade: C, Reading Mastery 68%; , Math mastery: 61%,Writing 82%, Science Mastery: 37%. AP of Rosenwald MS from 2007-2009; 2008-2009 Grade: B, Reading Mastery 69%; , Math mastery: 64%,Writing 86%, Science Mastery: 39%. AYP: 77%, Total, Black, Econ. Disadvantaged, and SWDs did not make AYP in reading. Total, White, Black, Econ. Disadvantaged, and SWDs did not make AYP in math. 2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 64%, Math Mastery 66%,Writing 89%, Science Mastery 36%. AYP 100%. 2006-2007: Grade C, Reading Mastery 61%, Math Mastery 55%, Writing 95%,Science 40%. AYP: 85%,Black, Econ. Disadvantaged, and SWDs did not make AYP in reading and math. AP of Hutchinson Beach Elementary 2004-2006. 2005-2006: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 84%, Math

					Mastery 78%, Writing 67%. AYP: 100%. 2004-2005, Grade B, Reading Mastery 84%, Math Mastery 70%, Writing 63%. AYP: 100%. AA of Bay HS 2003-2004, Grade D, Reading Mastery 43%, Math Mastery 63%, Writing 79%, AYP: 67%. Black, Econ. Disadvantaged, SWDs did not make AYP in reading and math.
Assis Principal	Rhonda R. Woodward	B.S. Elementary Education, Florida State University; Master of Science - Mathematics Education, Florida State University; Specialist Educational Leadership and Administration, Florida State University; Principal Certification - State of Florida	2	2	Administrative Assistant of C. C. Washington Academy 2010-2011 School Improvement Rating: Maintaining, Reading 48% learning gains, Math 63% learning gains; Writing 94%; AYP 64%; 2009-2010: School Grade C, 71% Reading Mastery, 70% Mathematics Mastery, 75% Writing Mastery, 44% Science Mastery, AYP: No, White, Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Reading and Mathematics. 2008-2009: School Grade A. 80% Reading Mastery, 78% Mathematics Mastery, 74% Writing Mastery, 50% Science Mastery. AYP No, Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Reading while Black students and Economically Disadvantaged Students failed to make AYP in Mathematics, 2007-2008: School Grade B. 78% Reading Mastery, 76% Mathematics Mastery, 42% Writing Mastery, 34% Science Mastery. AYP No, Black students and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Reading and Mathematics. 2006-2007: School Grade C. 73% Reading Mastery, 61% Mathematics Mastery, 50% Writing Mastery, 22% Science Mastery. AYP No, Black students, Economically Disadvantaged Students and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Mathematics. 2005-2006: School Grade C. 76% Reading Mastery, 65% Mathematics Mastery, 46% Writing Mastery, Science Mastery N/A. AYP No, Black students and Students with Disabilities failed to make AYP in Mathematics.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy	Lisa Womack	Elementary Education K-6, ESOL Endorsement, Gifted Endorsement, Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum)5-9)			
RtI/MTSS Coach	Susan Mayo	Elementary Education K-6, Math 5-9, ESE, Reading Endorsement (K-12), ESOL(K-12)	1	1	

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Principal will meet regularly with new teachers.	Principal	On-going	
2	2. New teachers will be partnered with veteran staff.	Principal	September, 2012	

3	3. New teachers will participate in Bay District's New Teacher Induction Program.	District Coordinator or Staff Development	May, 2013	
---	---	---	-----------	--

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
9	0.0%(0)	55.6%(5)	33.3%(3)	11.1%(1)	44.4%(4)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	33.3%(3)

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
Lisa Womack	Nancy Montague	Ms. Womack is the school Literacy Coach and will be mentoring Mrs. Montague, a Reading/Language Arts teacher who is new to C. C. Washington Academy.	Feedback, modeling, coaching, planning, professional development, additional support and resources.
Cylle Rowell	Wendy Perrin	Mrs. Rowell is the district Math Staff Training Specialist and also the School Ambassador. She will be mentoring Mrs. Perrin, a Math teacher who is new to C. C. Washington Academy.	Feedback, modeling, coaching, planning, professional development, additional support and resources.
		Mrs. Rowell is the district Math Staff Training Specialist and	

Cylle Rowell	Angela Brown	also the School Ambassador. She will be mentoring Mrs. Brown, a Math teacher who is new to C. C. Washington Academy.	Feedback, modeling, coaching, planning, professional development, additional support and resources.
--------------	--------------	--	---

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part A Supplemental Funding in the amount of \$55,934 to address the academic needs of students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part C Migrant provides services to eligible students and families. Bay District Schools contract with PAEC to offer these services.

Title I, Part D

Title I, Part D provides services to eligible neglected and delinquent students returning to C. C. Washington Academy.

Title II

Title II has partnered with Title I to provide mentoring staff, professional development and resources for many teachers.

Title III

Title III funds have provided a Paraprofessional and a Parent Liaison who helps with Spanish speaking parents and students in areas such as SES tutoring, parent involvement, parent workshops, translating written communication, and other areas where an interpreter is needed. Title III funds have also provided staff development opportunities for instructional staff at conferences, district trainings and ESOL endorsement activities.

Title X- Homeless

Staff is provided through Title X that offers homeless families contacts to services/agencies and resources that can be assessed. These staff members are a vital source of communication between schools and families that otherwise may not exist in many situations.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are provided to students who have been unsuccessful. The SAI funds provide tutorial services.

Violence Prevention Programs

The Bay District School Board has a policy on "Bullying, Harassment or Cyberstalking" (Policy 7.2.7). This policy is reviewed annually during pre-school inservice by the administrative and instructional staff at each school. In addition, a bullying curriculum has been adopted by Bay District and implementation at C.C.W.A. has begun.

Each school has a Character Education Plan in place. Character Education Plans support the prevention of violence and foster a drug free learning environment.

In addition, C. C. Washington Academy shares a School Resource Deputy with the high school on which its campus is located and C.C.W.A. is a PBS school.

Nutrition Programs

All students who qualify for free or reduced lunch, in accordance with federal guidelines, are provided breakfast and lunch at the school site.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

C. C. Washington Academy provides parents with information on adult education from Gulf Coast State College and Haney Learning Center.

Career and Technical Education

C. C. Washington Academy has partnered with Gulf Coast State College and Haney. Students will be given the opportunity to tour the campuses and attend fairs for career track or trade advancement at Gulf Coast State College and Haney Learning Center.

Job Training

N/A

Other

C. C. Washington Academy partners with community organizations which provide services to families and students. We collect data with the purpose of linking needy families with the appropriate agencies for food, clothing and school-related items. The sources include: Junior Service League, Rosenwald Alumni Association, Panama City Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., Salvation Army and local churches.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based RtI/MTSS Team includes: RtI/MTSS Coach, RtI/MTSS staff training specialist, administrator, guidance counselor, regular education teacher, ESE teacher, speech language pathologist and school psychologist.

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

The RtI/MTSS team meets monthly. The current data for each RtI/MTSS student will be reviewed such as progress monitoring, the learning trend as shown by the required graphs, test scores (Discovery Education, FCAT, Scholastic Reading Inventory, etc.), report cards, attendance record, behavioral reports or any other data pertinent to each individual student. All data will be reviewed in order to determine tier placement and dismissal. The team will assess whether each student is meeting expectations and offer strategies and interventions for teachers to implement in the classroom. The team will also review global data and make suggestions to the School Improvement Team regarding core (tier 1) interventions using the problem solving process.

The roles of the RtI/MTSS team are as follows:

Administrator: Darnita Rivers - provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, ensures that the school based team is implementing RtI/MTSS, participates in the collection, interpretation and analysis of data, facilitates development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation, provides professional development and technical assistance for problem solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning and program evaluation. Facilitate data based decision making activities.

Guidance Counselor: Taveka Ross - Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students, assists the school and families to support the student's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.

RtI/MTSS Staff Training Specialist: Kelly Chisholm - provides support to school level RtI/MTSS teams, helps with Tier 2/3 strategies at school, provides resources, ensures that district approved interventions are in place and used with fidelity, provides guidance and support for documentation of interventions.

RtI/MTSS Coach: Susan Mayo - assists classroom teachers with Tier 2/3 intervention strategies, provides intervention services to students, collects and publishes data to administrators and classroom teachers, progress monitors, presents progress, graph lines and other pertinent data to RtI/MTSS team and ensures that approved interventions are being used with fidelity for all RtI/MTSS students.

School Psychologist: Fred Schnepel - Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documents; provides professional development and technical

assistance of problem solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Janae Syfrett - educates the RtI/MTSS team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment and instruction as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student needs with respect to language skills.

Regular Education Teacher: Makeda James - provides information regarding core instruction, participates in data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction, collaborates with other staff members to implement Tier 2 interventions and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 materials, instruction and activities.

ESE Teacher: Susan Mayo - Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2/3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Reading/Literacy Coach: Lisa Womack - Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to classroom teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 intervention plans.

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

The basis for RtI/MTSS is a data based problem solving process. The process involves: 1. Identify/defining the problem. 2. Analyze why it is occurring 3. Design and implement an intervention plan and measure the results. 4. Evaluate the results and modify the plan as necessary. The RtI/MTSS team will bring this philosophy of the problem solving process to assist in the development of the School Improvement Plan. In addition, the team will provide data on: Tier 1, 2 and 3 targets; academic and behavioral areas that need to be addressed; help set clear expectations for instruction (rigor, relevance and relationship) and behavior. The RtI Team will also contribute to the Professional Development Plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

Reading: Tier 1 - READ 180 is the core curriculum. Tier 2 - READ 180 with supplemental time on the computer. Tier 3 - SRA Corrective Reading will be used for the Tier 3 intervention. The data systems used for reading are www.easycbm.com. Easycbm.com is the data system approved by the district for 6th, 7th and 8th grade students and provides probes for monthly progress monitoring and the required graph. In addition, Read 180 provides reports on student usage and progress.

Mathematics: Tier 1 - Glencoe Math Connects is the core curriculum. Tier 2 - Classworks. Classworks self adjusts based on the student's FCAT scores. Tier 3 - Number Worlds. The data system used for math is www.easycbm.com. Easycbm.com is the data system approved by the district for 6th, 7th and 8th grade students and provides probes for monthly progress monitoring and the required graph. In addition, Classworks provides reports on student usage and progress.

Behavior: The core curriculum for behavior is PBS. Tier 2 - CICO and counseling by Crisis Intervention personnel. The data management system for behavior is www.flrtib.org. RtI: B allows data collection for Tiers 1, 2 and 3.

General data such as attendance, grades and test scores will be obtained and monitored through FOCUS, FCAT and Discovery Education.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff received training from the RtI/MTSS coach during pre school inservice and will continue to receive professional development throughout the year by participating in webinars, PLCs and grade/group subject area meetings. After each Discovery Education testing the faculty will review students' data and will participate in placing data on school wide data boards. When the data is reviewed, the RtI/MTSS team and the faculty will jointly review strategies and interventions that can be used to improve individual student's scores as well as to increase school wide scores.

In addition, the RtI/MTSS coach will attend monthly district level meetings to stay abreast of current changes and developments.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The plan to support RtI/MTSS is outlined above and includes monthly meetings of the RtI/MTSS team, faculty meetings to review and categorize data after each Discovery Education testing and the collaboration of administrators, the RtI/MTSS coach and faculty to provide individualized interventions and strategies for students.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Darnita Rivers - principal, Rhonda Woodward, administrative assistant, Lisa Womack - literacy coach, Crystal Sullivan - reading/language arts and 8th grade chair, Nancy Montague - 7th grade reading and language arts, Janice McAllister - 6th grade reading and language arts, Makeda James - 8th grade science and 7th grade chair, Edward Lee - history/civics and 6th grade chair. The LLT will support the K12 CRP with fidelity.

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

The LLT will meet monthly. The role of the team is to monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan by analyzing assessment results, sharing literacy strategies across curriculums as well as discipline data. The LLT will look at school wide data to discover weaknesses and areas for improvement. Just as the RtI/MTSS team looks at the individual student and plans for individualized improvement, the LLT team looks at the school data as a whole and provides strategies to make school wide improvements in the areas of curriculum, behavior plans, areas of low testing scores, etc.

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

The major initiative of the LLT this year is to review school wide data on data boards in order to plan for weaknesses and to integrate CRISS, Kagan and other strategies to provide effective instruction across content areas and to enhance academic vocabulary across the curriculum.

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.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

The School Improvement Plan includes reading strategies which will be utilized throughout content areas such as CRISS and Kagan strategies. The literacy coach will provide monthly, ongoing professional development which will support teachers in the implementation of the strategies. All teachers will teach academic vocabulary words across content areas. Data will be reviewed for each student following Discovery Education testing and strategies will be discussed to raise the achievement of each student.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	To increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency on the FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16%(18) of 111 students achieved proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Reading.	19%(22) of 117 students will achieve proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of student engagement which leads to discipline and attendance issues	1.1. PBS, Kagan, CRISS strategies, lesson study and SmartBoard technology	1.1. Read/ Lang. Arts Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	1.1. Formative/ Summative Assessments, classroom diagnostics	1.1. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom diagnostics
2	1.2. Limited access to collaboration	1.2. Book study: Differentiated Instruction; LLT meetings; Professional development on Common Core, School wide Focus calendar	1.2. Reading/ LA teachers, Literacy Leadership Team (LLT), Literacy Coach, Administration	1.2. Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	1.2. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom assessments
3	1.3. Teacher capacity to differentiate instruction	1.3. Book study: Differentiated Instruction, Reading Frameworks	1.3. Literacy Leadership Team, Reading/LA teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	1.3. Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	1.3. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom 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 Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	To increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency on the FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9%(10) of 106 students scored a level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT Reading.	10% (12) of 117 students will score a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of student engagement which leads to discipline and attendance issues	2.1. PBS, Kagan, CRIS strategies, lesson study and SmartBoard technology	2.1. Reading/LA teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2.1. Formative/ Summative Assessments, classroom diagnostics	2.1. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom diagnostics
2	2.2. Limited access to collaboration	2.2. Book study: Differentiated Instruction, LLT meetings, Professional development on Common Core, School wide Focus calendar	2.2. Reading/LA teachers, Literacy Leadership Team (LLT), Literacy Coach, Administration	2.2. Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	2.2. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom assessments
3	2.3 Teacher capacity to differentiate instruction	2.3 Book study: Differentiated Instruction, Reading Frameworks	2.3 Literacy Leadership Team, Reading/LA teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	2.3 Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	2.3 Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom 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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	To increase the percentage of students making learning gains on the FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (45) of 106 students achieved learning gains on the 2011 FCAT reading .	47% (55) of 117 students will achieve learning gains on the 2012 FCAT reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Lack of student engagement which leads to discipline and attendance issues	3.1. PBS, Kagan, CRIS strategies, lesson study, READ180, Bay District Reading Frameworks and SmartBoard technology	3.1. Reading/LA teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	3.1. Formative/ Summative Assessments, classroom diagnostics	3.1. Discovery Education Assessments, READ 180 reports, FOCUS, classroom assessments, FCAT 2.0
2	3.2. Limited access to collaboration	3.2. Book study: Differentiated Instruction In a Whole Group Setting, LLT meetings, Professional development on Common Core, school wide common Focus calendar, READ 180 online community	3.2. Reading/LA teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	3.2 Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	3.2. Discovery Education Assessments, READ 180 reports, FOCUS, classroom assessment, FCAT 2.0
3	3.3. Teacher capacity to differentiate instruction	3.3. Book study: Differentiated Instruction in a Whole Group Setting, Bay District Reading Frameworks, Professional development on Common Core and READ 180	3.3. Reading/LA teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	3.3. Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	3.3. Discovery Education Assessments, READ 180 reports, FOCUS, classroom assessments, FCAT 2.0

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	**Less than 30 students: per DOE substitute reading gains of all students. To increase the percentage of students making learning gains on the FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (45) of 106 students achieved learning gains on the 2011 FCAT reading.	47% (55) of 117 students will achieve learning gains on the 2012 FCAT reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. Lack of student engagement which leads to discipline and attendance issues	4.1. PBS, Kagan, CRIS strategies, lesson study, READ 180, Bay District Reading Frameworks and SmartBoard technology	4.1. Reading/LA teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, LLT	4.1. Formative/Summative Assessments, classroom diagnostics	4.1. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom assessments, FCAT 2.0
2	4.2. Limited access to collaboration	4.2. Book study: Differentiated Instruction in a Whole Group Setting, LLT meetings, Professional development on Common Core, school wide Focus calendar	4.2. Reading/LA teachers, LLT, Literacy Coach, Administration, READ 180 online community	4.2. Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	4.2. Discovery Education Assessments, READ 180 reports, FOCUS, classroom assessments, FCAT 2.0
3	4.3 Teacher capacity to differentiate instruction	4.3. Book study: Differentiated Instruction in a Whole Group Setting, Bay District Reading Framework, Professional Development on Common Cored and READ 180	4.3. Reading/LA teachers, LLT, Literacy coach, Administration	4.3. Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	4.3. Discovery Education Assessments, READ 180 reports, FOCUS, classroom assessments, FCAT 2.0
4	4.4 Scheduling constraints due to a limited number of classes	4.4. Identify the lowest 25% of students who are not making learning gains to be placed in RtI/MTSS for additional support, use READ 180 program	4.4. Reading/LA teachers, LLT, Literacy Coach, RtI/MTSS Coach, Administration	4.4. Ongoing formative/summative assessments, classroom diagnostics, progress monitoring, READ 180 classroom reports	Discovery Education Assessments, READ 180 reports, FOCUS, classroom assessments, FCAT 2.0

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 # In six years, the percentage of students scoring at Levels 3 and above in Reading will increase according to the AMO Target Goals as outlined below.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

	33%	39%	45%	51%	57%	
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The percentage of students in subgroups scoring at Levels 3 and above in Reading will increase to meet the AMO Target for 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black/AA subgroup 95% (100) +/- (AMO shows that less than 5% scored satisfactory) White subgroup 40% (42) Economically disadvantaged 76% (80)	Black/AA subgroup 90% White subgroup 30% Economically disadvantaged 66%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5b.1. Lack of student engagements which leads to discipline and attendance issues	PBS, Kagan, CRISS strategies and lesson study	Reading/LA Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	Formative/Summative Assessments, classroom diagnostics	Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom diagnostics
2	5b.2. Limited access to collaboration	5b.2. Book study: Differentiated Instruction, LLT meetings, Professional development on Common Core, School wide FOCUS calendar	5b.2. Reading/LA Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team (LLT), Literacy Coach, Administration	5b.2. Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	5b.2. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom assessments
3	5b.3. Teacher capacity to differentiate instruction	5b.3. Book study: Differentiated Instruction, Reading Frameworks	5b.3. Literacy Leadership Team, Reading/LA Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	5b.3. Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	5b.3. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom 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 subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scoring at Levels 3 and above in Reading will increase to meet the AMO Target for 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (number)	40% (number)

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	5e.1. Lack of student engagements which leads to discipline and attendance issues	5e.1. PBS, Kagan, CRISS strategies and lesson study	5e.1. Reading/LA Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	5e.1. Formative/ Summative Assessments, classroom diagnostics	5e.1. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom diagnostics
2	5e.2. Limited access to collaboration	5e.2. Book study: Differentiated Instruction, LLT meetings, Professional development on Common Core, School wide FOCUS calendar	5e.2. Reading/LA Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team (LLT), Literacy Coach, Administration	5e.2. Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	5e.2. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom assessments
3	5e.3. Teacher capacity to differentiate instruction	5e.3. Book study: Differentiated Instruction, Reading Frameworks	5e.3. Literacy Leadership Team, Reading/LA Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration	5e.3. Increase in school based and state based assessments and DEA scores, professional development minutes	5e.3. Discovery Education Assessments, FOCUS, classroom assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Classworks	All	RtI/MTSS Coach Classworks trainer	School-wide	Monthly	Classworks reports of student usage	Administration RtI/MTSS Coach
Book study: Differentiated Instruction in a Whole Group Setting	All	Staff Training Specialist	School-wide	Monthly	Edmodo Lesson plan observations	Adminstration Literacy Coach
Kagan	All	Kagan Trainer	School-wide	Monthly	Lesson plan observations	Administration Literacy Coach
CCSS/ELA	All	Literacy Coach Staff Training Specialist	Language Arts Department	Monthly	Lesson plan observations	Administration Literacy Coach
CRISS II	All	Staff Training Specialist Literacy Coach	School-wide	Monthly	Lesson plan observations	Administration Literacy Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
READ 180 and supplemental instructional material	Program materials	Title I	\$2,700.00
			Subtotal: \$2,700.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
SmartBoard Technology	Technology	District	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CRISS II	Manual	Title I	\$633.00
Focus Calendar	Planning time	Title I	\$494.00
Kagan Coaching	Program materials	District	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$1,127.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
RtI/MTSS Coach	MTSS serves to assist	Title I	\$8,543.00
Beyond School Tutoring	Before, After and Summer School	Title I	\$4,766.00
Reading Paraprofessional	Assist students with Reading	Title I	\$12,758.00
Transportation for summer interventions	Getting students to school	Title I	\$854.00
			Subtotal: \$26,921.00
			Grand Total: \$30,748.00

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

CELLA Goal #1:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	To improve the percentage of students achieving proficiency in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (17) of 106 students achieved proficiency on the 2011 FCAT Math	19% (22) of 117 students will achieve proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Math

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	1.1. Teacher capacity to differentiate instruction	1.1 Book study on Guided Math: A Framework for Teaching Forming a PLC with another middle school	1.1. Math department, Principal, Administrative Assistant, District math resource person	1.1. Increase in school based and state assessments and DEA scores. Book study survey results	1.1. FOCUS, DEA, classroom assessments, FCAT 2.0, Classworks, Connect Ed and FCAT Explorer
2	1.2. Limited access to collaboration	1.2. Participating in a PLC with another middle school	1.2. Math department, Principal, Administrative Assistant, District math resource person	1.2. Increase in school based and state assessments and DEA scores. Book study survey results	1.2. FOCUS, DEA, classroom assessments, FCAT 2.0, Classworks, FCAT Explorer and Connect Ed.
3	1.3. Lack of students' prior knowledge in prerequisite math skills	1.3. Use diagnostic tests to identify gaps in math knowledge and provide individualized remediation.	1.3. Math department Principal, Administrative Assistant, RtI/MTSS coach	1.3. Ongoing formative/summative assessments, classroom diagnostics (pre- and post-)	1.3. FOCUS, DEA, Classroom diagnostics, progress monitoring, FCAT 2.0, Classworks, FCAT Explorer and Connect Ed.
4	1.4 Lack of student engagement which leads to discipline and attendance issues	1.4 PBS, Lesson study, CRISS strategies, Kagan, SmartBoard technology	1.4 Math department, Principal, Administrative Assistant	1.4 Ongoing formative/summative assessments	1.4. FOCUS, DEA, FCAT 2.0, Classworks, FCAT Explorer and Connect Ed.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	To improve the percentage of students achieving proficiency in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2% (2) of 106 students scored a level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT Math	5% (2) of 117 students will score a level 4 or 5 of the 2012 FCAT Math

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	2.1 Teacher capacity to differentiate instruction	2.1. Book study on Guided Math: A Framework for Teaching by Laney Sammons	2.1 Math department, Principal, Administrative assistant, District math resource person	2.1 Increase in school based and state assessments and DEA scores. Book study survey results	2.1 FOCUS, Discovery Education Assessment, Classroom assessments, FCAT 2.0, Classworks, FCAT Explorer and Connect Ed.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	To improve the percentage of students achieving proficiency in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55 (52%) of 106 students achieved learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math.	64 (55%) of 117 students will achieve learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math.

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	3.1. Teacher capacity to differentiate instruction.	3.1. Book student on Guided Math: A Framework for Teaching Forming a PLC with another middle school	3.1. Math department, Principal, Administrative assistant, District math resource person	3.1. Increase in school based and state assessments and DEA scores. Book study survey results	3.1. FOCUS, DEA, classroom assessments, FCAT Explorer, Classworks, FCAT 2.0 and Connect Ed.
2	3.2. Limited access to collaboration	3.2. Participating in a PLC with another middle school	3.2. Math department, Principal, Administrative assistant, District math resource person	3.2. Increase in school based and state assessments and DEA scores. Book study survey results	3.2. FOCUS, DEA, classroom assessments, Classworks, FCAT Explorer and Connect Ed.
3	3.3. Lack of students' prior knowledge in prerequisite math skills	3.3. Use diagnostic tests to identify gaps in math knowledge and provide individualized remediation.	3.3. Math department, Principal, Administrative assistant, RtI/MTSS coach	3.3. Ongoing formative/summative assessments, classroom diagnostics (pre- and post-)	3.3. FOCUS, DEA, Classroom diagnostics, progress monitoring, FCAT Explorer, Classworks and Connect Ed.
4	3.4. Lack of student engagement which leads to discipline and attendance issues	3.4. PBS, Lesson study, CRISS strategies, Kagan and SmartBoard technology	3.4. Math department, Principal, Administrative assistant	3.4. Ongoing formative/summative assessments, classroom diagnostics	3.4. FOCUS, DEA, classroom diagnostics, Classworks, FCAT Explorer and Connect Ed.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	**Less than 30 students: per DOE substitute math gains for all students.
Mathematics Goal #4:	To improve the percentage of students achieving proficiency in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55 (52%) of 106 students achieved learning gains on the 2012 FCAT math.	64 (55%) of 117 students will achieve learning gains on the 2012 FCAT math.

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	4.1. Teacher capacity to differentiate instruction	4.1. Book study of Guided Math: A Framework for Teaching Forming a PLC with another middle school	4.1. Math department, Principal, Administrative assistant, District math resource person	4.1. Increase in school based and state assessments and DEA scores Book study survey results	4.1. FOCUS, DEA, classroom assessments
2	4.2. Limited access to collaboration	4.2. Participating in a PLC with another middle school	4.2. Math department, Principal, Administrative assistant, District math resource person	4.2. Increase in school based and state assessments and DEA scores Book study survey results	4.2. FOCUS, DEA, classroom assessments
3	4.3. Lack of students' prior knowledge in prerequisite math skills	4.3. Use diagnostic tests to identify gaps in math knowledge and provide individualized remediation Use Classworks and/or Number Worlds for Tier 2 students to remediate math skills	4.3. Math department, Principal, Administrative assistant, RtI/MTSS coach	4.3. Ongoing formative/summative assessments, classroom diagnostics, progress monitoring	4.4. FOCUS, DEA, classroom diagnostics, progress monitoring
4	4.4. Lack of student engagement with leads to discipline and attendance issues	4.4. PBS, Kagan Cooperative Learning, Lesson study, CRIS strategies	4.4. Math department, Principal, Administrative assistant	4.4. Ongoing formative/summative assessment, classroom diagnostics	4.4. FOCUS, DEA, classroom diagnostics
5	4.5. Scheduling constraints due to limited number of classes	4.5. Identify the lowest 25% of students who are not making learning gains to be placed in RtI/MTSS for additional support	4.5. Math department, Principal, Administrative assistant	4.5. Ongoing formative/summative assessments, classroom diagnostics, progress monitoring	4.5. FOCUS, DEA, classroom diagnostics, progress monitoring

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

Middle School Mathematics Goal #

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		<div>5A : In six years, the percentage of students scoring at Levels 3 and above in Math will increase to meet the AMO Target Goals.</div>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	27%	33%	40%	47%	53%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:			The percentage of students in subgroups scoring at Levels 3 and above in Math will increase to meet the AMO Target Goals.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Black/African American subgroup 6%			Black/African American subgroup 28%		
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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #5C:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

Mathematics Goal #5D:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:		The percentage of students in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup scoring at Levels 3 and above in Math will increase to meet the AMO Target Goal.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Economically disadvantaged subgroup 22%		Economically disadvantaged subgroup 33%		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.				
Geometry Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.				
Geometry Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Guided Math Book Study and PLC	ALL	District Math Resource Person	Math Department	Bi-weekly	Lesson plan observations	Principal, Administrative assistant, Team leader
Number Worlds	All	RTI/MTSS Coach	Math Department	Monthly	Lesson plan observations	Principal, Administrative assistant, Team leader, RTI/MTSS coach
KAGAN	All	KAGAN Trainer	Math Department	Monthly	Lesson plan observations	Principal, Administrative assistant, Team leader
Classworks	All	RTI/MTSS Coach Classworks trainer	Math Department	Monthly	Classwork reports on student usage	Principal, Administrative assistant, RTI/MTSS Coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Supplemental instructional material	Supplemental instructional material	Title I	\$1,350.00
			Subtotal: \$1,350.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

SmartBoard	Technology	District	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CRISS II	Manual	Title I	\$633.00
Focus Calendar	Planning time	Title I	\$494.00
Kagan Coaching	Materials	District	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$1,127.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
RtI/MTSS Coach	To serve and assist MTSS	Title I	\$8,543.00
Beyond School Tutorial	Before, After and Summer School	Title I	\$4,766.00
Transportation for Summer Camp		Title I	\$834.00
			Subtotal: \$14,143.00
			Grand Total: \$16,620.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:			To increase the number of students scoring a Level 3 in Science.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
11% (5) of 45 achieved proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Science			14% (9) of 63 students will achieve proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Science.		
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	1.1. Space and materials for hands on lab	1.1. Incorporate hands on lab activities into daily lessons	1.1. Classroom teacher, Administration	1.1. Lesson plans, use of District Pacing Guides	1.1. Observations, lesson plans
2	1.2. Student ability to understand complex content area vocabulary	1.2. Kagan and CRISS strategies to incorporate content area vocabulary, SmartBoard technology	1.2. Classroom teacher, Administration	1.2. Formative and summative assessments, Discovery Education diagnostics and monitoring	1.2. Discovery Education Assessment, classroom assessments, FOCUS, FCAT 2.0
3	1.3. Text complexity	1.3. Incorporate more informational/ expository tests and writing in response to text.	1.3. Classroom teacher, Administration	1.3. Lesson plans, student exemplars	1.3. Discovery Education Assessments, FCAT 2.0 Science and classroom 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 Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.				
Science Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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.			To increase the number of student scoring a Level 4 or above in science.		
Science Goal #2a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
0 of 45 students achieved a Level 4 or above on the FCAT Science			2 (3%) of 63 students will score a Level 4 or higher on the FCAT Science.		
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	1.1. Space and materials for hands on lab	1.1. Incorporate hands on lab activities into daily lessons	1.1. Classroom teacher, Administration	1.1. Lesson plans	1.1. Observations, lesson plans
2	1.2. Student ability to understand complex content area vocabulary	1.2. Kagan and CRISS strategies to incorporate content area vocabulary	1.2. Classroom teacher, Administration	1.2. Formative and summative assessments, Discovery Education diagnostics and monitoring	1.2. Discovery Education Assessment, classroom assessments, FOCUS, FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.	
Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kagan	All	Kagan Trainer	School-wide	Monthly	Lesson plan observations	Administration Literacy Coach
Classworks	All	Rtl/MTSS Coach Classworks trainer	School-wide	Monthly	Classworks reports of student usage	Administration MTSS Coach
CCSS/ELA	All	Paula Weaver	School-wide	Monthly	Lesson plan observations	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Hands-on lab activities	Lab supplies, consumable science material allocation	Title I	\$1,350.00
			Subtotal: \$1,350.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
SmartBoard	Technology	District	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Criss II	Manual	Title I	\$633.00
Focus Calendar	Planning time	Title I	\$494.00
Kagan Coaching	Materials	District	\$0.00
Beyond School Tutorial	Before, After and Summer School	Title I	\$4,766.00
Transportation to Summer Camp		Title I	\$834.00
			Subtotal: \$6,727.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	To increase the number of students scoring a Level 3 or higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (15) of 51 scored a Level 3 or higher in writing.	32% (20) of 63 students will score a Level 3 or higher in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students' lack of motivation toward writing	1.1. Incorporate cross-curriculum writings weekly via text response, assignments, essays and FCAT 2.0 writing rubric	1.1. Reading/LA teachers, Administration	1.1. Formative/summative assessments	1.1. Wildcats Writes, FCAT 2.0 Writing
2	1.2. Students' lack of organizational skills when writing	1.2. Students will use the writing process through journaling, note-taking, summarizing writing in response to text and use of FCAT 2.0 Writing rubrics Explicit instruction on the use of graphic organizers	1.2. Reading/LA teachers, Administration	1.2. Formative/summative assessments	1.2. Wildcat Writes, FCAT 2.0 Writing
3	1.3. Teachers' reluctance to teach writing	1.3. CRISS/Kagan strategies Use of Focus calendar to plan writing instruction and use of FCAT 2.0 Writing rubrics	1.3. Teachers, Administration	1.3. Formative/summative assessments	1.3. Wildcat Writes, FCAT 2.0 Writing

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Text Complexity	All	Staff Training Specialist Literacy Coach	School-wide	Monthly	Wildcat Writes, FCAT 2.0 and Lesson plans	Administration, Literacy Coach, Teachers
Common Core/ELA	All	Staff Training Specialist Literacy Coach	School-wide	Monthly	Wildcat Writes; FCAT 2.0; Lesson plans	Administration, Literacy Coach, Teachers

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CRISS II	Manual	Title I	\$633.00
Focus Calendar	Planning time	Title I	\$494.00
Kagan Coaching	Materials	District	\$0.00
Subtotal:			\$1,127.00
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:			\$1,127.00

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.				
Civics Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	To increase the number of students in attendance
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
77% of CCWA students attended school during the 2011-12 school year	85% of CCWA students will attend school during the 2012-13 school year
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
75% (80) of 106 students had 10 or more absences	65% (76) of 117 students will have 10 or more absences
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

44% (47) of 106 students had 10 or more tardies			34% (40) of 117 students will have 10 or more tardies		
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	1.1. Out of school suspensions	1.1. Continue implementation of PBS strategies to decrease the number of OSS. Provide an alternative to OSS	1.1. PBS Team, Administration	1.1. Discipline reports, reports generated through www.flrtib.org	1.1. www.flrtib.org, student discipline records, FOCUS
2	1.2. Students' lack of motivation to attend school	1.2. Continue implementation of CRISS/Kagan strategies Provide counseling through Crisis Interventionist Parent contact through Parent Liason	1.2. Teachers, Administration, Crisis intervention personnel, Parent Liason	1.2. Daily attendance records	1.2. 20 Day Report, Daily attendance records, FOCUS
3	1.3. Limited technology in some homes	1.3. Increase parent participation through use of Parent Portal. Encourage sign-up at Open House	1.3. Teachers, Administration, Parent Liason, Office personnel	1.3. Review statistics regarding Parent Portal usage	1.3. Parent Portal data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS	All	PBS Trainers PBS Team	School-wide	Monthly	Rtl: B data	Administration, PBS Team

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PBS	Planning time	Title I	\$246.95
			Subtotal: \$246.95
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
PBS incentives	Incentives	PBS Internal	\$350.00
			Subtotal: \$350.00
			Grand Total: \$596.95

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	To decrease the number of students being suspended at C. C. Washington Academy.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
295 in-school suspensions for the 2012 school year.	150 in-school suspensions for the 2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
160 students received in-school and out-of-school suspensions for 2012. At this time, the data is not able to be disaggregated to show in-school and out-of school suspensions.	150 students or less will receive in-school or out-of suspensions for 2013.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
608 out-of-school suspensions for the 2012 school year.	400 out-of-school suspensions for the 2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
160 students received in-school and out-of-school suspensions for 2012. At this time, the data is not able to be disaggregated to show in-school and out-of school suspensions.	150 students or less will receive in-school or out-of suspensions for 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	1.1. Student behaviors	1.1. Continue implementation of PBS strategies (2nd year) Use Tier 2 behavioral interventions for top 10% of students receiving discipline referrals.	1.1. Teachers, Crisis Interventionist, PBS team, Administration, MTSS Coach	1.1. PBS data, token count, attendance at PBS instituted awards days Progress monitoring	1.1. www.flrtib.org, student discipline records, FOCUS
2	1.2. Student past performance which cause 10 day suspensions	1.2. Re-entry conference with student/parents/guardians after suspensions of 10	1.2. Administration, Crisis Interventionist	1.2. Discipline reports, PBS data	1.2. www.flrtib.org, student discipline records, FOCUS

		days or longer			
3	1.3. Students' lack of motivation to achieve success	1.3. Engage in goal-setting activities for academic and behavioral success	1.3. Teachers, Crisis Interventionist, Administration	1.3. Very Important Wildcat forms, goal forms, PBS data	1.3. www.flrtib.org, student discipline records, suspension reports, FOCUS
4	1.4. Limited manpower and time constraints	1.4. Continue to refine the Check-In/Check Out system for "frequent flyers"	1.4. MTSS Coach, Teachers, Administration	1.4. RtI:B data, PBS Team meetings, progress monitoring, behavioral reports	1.4. Discipline referrals, RtI:B data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS Team MeetingPs	All	PBS Coach, PBS Team	PBS Coach and team members	Monthly	PBS data, student discipline reports, www.flrtib.org data	PBS Coach, Administrative Assistant
Positive Behavior Support (PBS) Tier 2 Training	All	PBS Trainers	PBS Coach and team members	Monthly	Faculty meetings/PBS meetings	PBS Team, Administrative Assistant

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PBS	Implementation of program	District	\$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
PBS	Planning time	Title I	\$246.95
National At-Risk Conference			\$2,333.00
			Subtotal: \$2,579.95
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PBS rewards	Games, drawings, incentives	PBS Internal	\$350.00
			Subtotal: \$350.00
			Grand Total: \$2,929.95

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	To increase parental involvement at C. C. Washington Academy
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
5% of parental involvement in 2012.	There will be 10% of parental involvement in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Parental time constraints due to employment schedules	1.1. Offer meetings at times when parents often come to school such as Orientation and Open House	1.1. Administrators, Guidance Counselor, Crisis Interventionist, Parent Liason	1.1. Sign-in sheet	1.1. Climate Survey
2	1.2. Parental lack of motivation to attend school functions due to anticipated negativity based on past experience	1.2. Make sure that the first contact that is made is positive.	Parent Liason, Crisis Interventionist, Teachers, Administration, Guidance	FOCUS	FOCUS
3	1.3. Parental lack of knowledge of how to help their student succeed in school	1.3. Offer workshops on a variety of subjects such as teaching your child study skills, nutrition, organizational skills, etc.	1.3. Administrators, Guidance Counselor, Crisis Interventionist, Parent Liason	1.3. Sign-in sheets	1.3. Climate Survey

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Portal	Focus and Gradebook	District	\$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
Ruby Payne	Training materials	Title I	\$349.00
			Subtotal: \$349.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Liason	Assist parents with school related matters; Assist with attendance	Title I	\$10,240.00
			Subtotal: \$10,240.00
			Grand Total: \$10,589.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM			To increase faculty awareness of courses and opportunities for STEM integration in the classroom		
STEM Goal #1:					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of time and resources	To bring in community experts or STEM professionals Bioscopes training Integration of math, science and technology in lesson plans SmartBoard technology	Science Teacher, Literacy Coach, Administration	Lesson plans	FOCUS, DEA, FCAT 2.0

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Bioscopes	All	Staff Training Specialis	STEM Teachers	Spring, 2013	Lesson study	Administration

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. CTE				
CTE Goal #1:				
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				

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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	READ 180 and supplemental instructional material	Program materials	Title I	\$2,700.00
Mathematics	Supplemental instructional material	Supplemental instructional material	Title I	\$1,350.00
Science	Hands-on lab activities	Lab supplies, consumable science material allocation	Title I	\$1,350.00
Writing	CRISS II	Manual	Title I	\$633.00
Writing	Focus Calendar	Planning time	Title I	\$494.00
Writing	Kagan Coaching	Materials	District	\$0.00
Attendance	PBS	Planning time	Title I	\$246.95
Suspension	PBS	Implementation of program	District	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Portal	Focus and Gradebook	District	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$6,773.95
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	SmartBoard Technology	Technology	District	\$0.00
Mathematics	SmartBoard	Technology	District	\$0.00
Science	SmartBoard	Technology	District	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	CRISS II	Manual	Title I	\$633.00
Reading	Focus Calendar	Planning time	Title I	\$494.00
Reading	Kagan Coaching	Program materials	District	\$0.00
Mathematics	CRISS II	Manual	Title I	\$633.00
Mathematics	Focus Calendar	Planning time	Title I	\$494.00
Mathematics	Kagan Coaching	Materials	District	\$0.00
Science	Criss II	Manual	Title I	\$633.00
Science	Focus Calendar	Planning time	Title I	\$494.00
Science	Kagan Coaching	Materials	District	\$0.00
Science	Beyond School Tutorial	Before, After and Summer School	Title I	\$4,766.00
Science	Transportation to Summer Camp		Title I	\$834.00
Suspension	PBS	Planning time	Title I	\$246.95
Suspension	National At-Risk Conference			\$2,333.00
Parent Involvement	Ruby Payne	Training materials	Title I	\$349.00
				Subtotal: \$11,909.95
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	RTI/MTSS Coach	MTSS serves to assist	Title I	\$8,543.00
Reading	Beyond School Tutoring	Before, After and Summer School	Title I	\$4,766.00
Reading	Reading Paraprofessional	Assist students with Reading	Title I	\$12,758.00
Reading	Transportation for summer interventions	Getting students to school	Title I	\$854.00
Mathematics	RTI/MTSS Coach	To serve and assist MTSS	Title I	\$8,543.00
Mathematics	Beyond School Tutorial	Before, After and Summer School	Title I	\$4,766.00

Mathematics	Transportation for Summer Camp		Title I	\$834.00
Attendance	PBS incentives	Incentives	PBS Internal	\$350.00
Suspension	PBS rewards	Games, drawings, incentives	PBS Internal	\$350.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Liason	Assist parents with school related matters; Assist with attendance	Title I	\$10,240.00
				Subtotal: \$52,004.00
				Grand Total: \$70,687.90

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

☐
Priority

☐
Focus

☐
Prevent

☐
NA

Are you a reward school: ☐ Yes ☐ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/2/2012)

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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

To support the 2012-13 School Improvement Plan initiatives of increased student achievement, increased attendance, and increased positive behavior as outlined in the Positive Behavior Support plan. Further, the SAC's goals are to encourage increased SAC membership representative of the total school population and to increase awareness in the community of C. C. Washington Academy as a second chance school for credit recovery and for future graduation from high school.

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found