FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: LINCOLN MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Manatee

Principal: Ronnie King

SAC Chair: Elston Brown

Superintendent:

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

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

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)
Assis Principal	Bryan Kincannon	BS-Social Sciences, University of South Florida: Master of Education- Educational Leadership, Nova University; Principal Certification- State of Florida	5	7	Assistant Principal of Lincoln Middle in 2010-2011: Grade C, Reading Mastery 54%, Math Mastery 46%, Science Mastery 26% AYP Criteria Met: 69%, Total writing proficiency was met. Assistant Principal of Lincoln Middle in 2009-2010: Grade C, Reading Mastery 57%, Math Mastery 48%, Science Mastery: 31% AYP Criteria Met: 67%, Total writing proficiency was not met Assistant Principal of Lincoln Middle in 2008-2009: Grade C, Reading Mastery 58%, Math Mastery: 52%, Science Mastery: 34%. AYP Criteria Met: 72%, Total writing proficiency was met. Assistant Principal of Buffalo Creek Middle in 2007-2008: Grade C: Reading Mastery: 57%, Math mastery 55%, Science Mastery, 31%. AYP: 72%, Total writing proficiency was met. Assistant Principal of Harllee Middle School in 2006-2007: Grade B, Reading Mastery 52%, Math

					Mastery 53%, Science Mastery 29%. AYP: 77%, Total writing proficiency was met. Assistant Principal of Harllee Middle School in 2005-2006: Grade: C, Reading Mastery 54%, Math Mastery 52%. AYP: 79% Total writing proficiency was met.
Assis Principal	Shannicka Triplett	B.A.-English, Mississippi University for Women: M.Ed.-English Education, Mississippi College: Ed.S.-Educational Leadership, Argosy University: Ed.D.-Educational Leadership, Argosy University	4	7	Assistant Principal of Lincoln Middle in 2010-2011: Grade C, Reading Mastery 54%, Math Mastery 46%, Science Mastery 26% AYP Criteria Met: 69%, Total writing proficiency was met. Assistant Principal of Lincoln Middle in 2009-2010: Grade C, Reading Mastery 57%, Math Mastery 48%, Science Mastery: 31% AYP Criteria Met: 67%, Total writing proficiency was not met Assistant Principal of Palmetto High School 2008-2009: Grade: D, Reading Mastery 32%, Math Mastery 63%, Science Mastery 26%. AYP 69%. Total writing proficiency was met. Assistant Principal of Palmetto High School 2007-2008: Grade D, Reading Mastery 34%, Math Mastery 68%, Science Mastery 32%. Total writing proficiency was met.
Principal	Ronnie King	BA-Sociology, Tuskegee University; Master of Education-Educational Leadership Nova Southeastern University; Principal Certification-State of Florida	1	11	Assistant Principal of Buchanan Middle (2010-2011): Grade C, Reading Mastery 53%, Math Mastery 54%, Science Mastery 35% AYP Criteria Met: 69%. Total writing proficiency was met Assistant Principal of Buchanan Middle (2009-2010): Grade B, Reading Mastery 60%, Math Mastery 57%, Science Mastery: 41% AYP Criteria Met: 75%. Total writing proficiency was met Assistant Principal of Buchanan Middle (2008-2009): Grade: B, Reading Mastery 58%, Math Mastery 52%, Science Mastery 31%. AYP 72%. Total writing proficiency was met. Assistant Principal of Buchanan Middle (2007-2008): Grade B, Reading Mastery 54%, Math Mastery 56%, Science Mastery 31%. Total writing proficiency was met. Assistant Principal of Van Buren Middle (2007-2008): Grade D, Reading Mastery 34%, Math Mastery 33%, Science Mastery 26%. Total writing proficiency was met.

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)
N/A					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Hire to the school district's plan of recruiting highly-qualified applicants	Administrative Team	As necessary	
2	2. Interview/consider only highly-qualified candidates	Administrative Team	As necessary	
3	3. Pair new teachers with experienced teachers	Assistant Principals	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
N/A	

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
36	22.2%(8)	47.2%(17)	130.6%(47)	86.1%(31)	61.1%(22)	277.8% (100)	30.6%(11)	16.7%(6)	86.1%(31)

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
Chandoue Lawrence	Christy Durocher/Erica Bruton	*Same Grade Level/Academic Team *Classroom proximity *Assist with networking on campus *Mentor provides best practices and shares the consistent and pervasive practices modeled on 6th Grade Team and in every classroom.	*Welcome Luncheon - Administration, Mentor and Mentee *Classroom preparation - common board configurations *Weekly Q & A (mentor and mentee) *Monthly Q & A (mentee and administrator) *Monthly Faculty Meetings - whole group Q & A
Carolyn McCarter	Steve Cerchio	*Same Academic Team *Assist with networking on campus *Mentor provides best practices and shares the consistent and pervasive practices modeled in every classroom.	*Welcome Luncheon - Administration, Mentor and Mentee *Classroom preparation - common board configurations *Weekly Q & A (mentor and mentee) *Monthly Q & A (mentee and administrator) *Monthly Faculty Meetings - whole group Q & A
		*Same Academic Team *Assist with networking on campus *Mentor	*Welcome Luncheon - Administration, Mentor and Mentee *Classroom preparation - common board

Lora Blue	Kelly Woodland	provides best practices and shares the consistent and pervasive practices modeled in every classroom	configurations *Weekly Q & A (mentor and mentee) *Monthly New Teacher meetings (mentee and administrator) *Monthly Faculty Meetings - whole group Q & A
Kristine Kunkel	Jackie Sathe/Keith Coffey	*Same Grade Level/Academic *Classroom proximity *Assist with networking on campus *Mentor provides best practices and shares the consistent and pervasive practices modeled on Math Team and in every classroom.	*Welcome Luncheon - Administration, Mentor and Mentee *Classroom preparation - common board configurations *Weekly Q & A (mentor and mentee) *Monthly Q & A (mentee and administrator) *Monthly Faculty Meetings - whole group Q & A
Erin Lucas	Sarah Smitman	*Same Academic Team (ESE) *Classroom proximity *Assist with networking on campus *Mentor provides best practices and shares the consistent and pervasive practices modeled in every classroom	*Welcome Luncheon - Administration, Mentor and Mentee *Classroom preparation - common board configurations *Weekly Q & A (mentor and mentee) *Monthly Q & A (mentee and administrator) *Monthly Faculty Meetings - whole group Q & A
Terri McAllister	Steve Cerchio	*Same Academic Team *Assist with networking on campus *Mentor provides best practices and shares the consistent and pervasive practices modeled in every classroom.	*Welcome Luncheon - Administration, Mentor and Mentee *Classroom preparation - common board configurations *Weekly Q & A (mentor and mentee) *Monthly Q & A (mentee and administrator) *Monthly Faculty Meetings - whole group Q & A

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 funds will be used to provide remediation for Lincoln Middle's students to increase academic achievement. Funds will also be used for additional professional learning for teachers with regard school-wide instructional focus, assessments, progress monitoring, curriculum and other best practices.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Lincoln Middle offers a migrant homework help sessions before school each morning. Lincoln also offers summer school enrichment for migrant students. Lincoln is provided with a Migrant Home-School Liaison who offers specific programs and resources for migrant students.

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

This is used to provide additional professional learning for teachers.

Title III

Lincoln is provided with a Home-School Liaison and District ESOL Specialist.

Title X- Homeless

The School District of Manatee County has a Project H.E.A.R.T. program and a District Social Worker. Project H.E.A.R.T. and the social worker's collective efforts provide services for homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide tutoring and materials for the instruction of struggling students.

Violence Prevention Programs

Lincoln participates in an anti-Bullying program.

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Lincoln participates in the Adult, Career, and Technical (ACT) Education program which funds the Technology Student Association (TSA) and supports electives offered to all students.

Job Training

N/A

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Administrators (Ronnie King, Bryan Kincannon, Shannicka Triplett): Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team implements MTSS/RtI, conducts assessment of MTSS/RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional learning to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities.

RtI Chair (Vanessa Matta): Serves as coordinator of MTSS/RtI leadership team while MTSS/RtI team members serve as liaisons between team, teachers, administration, district personnel, and other schools. Assists in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of academic and behavioral data.

Select General Education Teachers (Erica Bruton, Christy Durocher, Angela Garrott, Vanessa Hedden, Jennifer Jackson, B.J. Jones, Lia Kaiser, Jackie Sathe): Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers (Sarah Smitman-Team Leader, Scott Blum-ESE Specialist): Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Reading Instructional Specialist (Lia Kaiser): Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist (Vanessa Matta): Participates in 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; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist (Lauren Balle): Educates the 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 need with respect to language skills

Student Services Personnel (Michelle Mathews, Cindi Liles, Diane Lopez-Diaz, Phyllis Milton): Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

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

The MTSS/RtI Team meets monthly or bi-weekly as needed to discuss data associated with students' needs for academic and behavior support. The team discusses individual students, support systems in place and needed to ensure student academic and behavior success. As an integral part of the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, the administrative team discusses, reviews, revises, and further develops the School Improvement Plan. Upon revision of the plan, MTSS/RtI team members will help facilitate professional development when presenting processes and procedures aligned with the overall goal of MTSS/RtI as related to the School Improvement Plan.

In addition, the RtI Leadership Team partners with other school teams (i.e. Literacy Leadership Team, Academic Teams, Administrative Team, etc.) to combine efforts of implementing goals and strategies to promote student academic and behavioral success. It is worth noting that individuals on other teams (specifically team leaders) are consulting members to the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team.

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?

During three summer planning sessions, members of the MTSS/RtI Team analyzed and discussed disaggregated school-wide discipline and academic data to determine SIP goals that would help students be more successful. Some goals required that specific members take action with respect to the level of intervention for groups (collectively) and students (individually). Members (Team Leaders) created an action plan based on data and designed a plan and instructional focus calendar for the upcoming school year.

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.

Student placement in Tiers for reading, mathematics, science, writing, will be determined by student performance on assessments agreed upon by the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team. Student placement in Tiers for behavior will be determined by documented FOCUS and Quick Query discipline records.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

MTSS/RtI staff training will be ongoing. An initial school-wide training occurred during the previous school year. Basis and overall goals of MTSS/RtI were explained. Upon agreement for the plan of implementation, the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will

review school data and determine specific MTSS/RtI needs and plan of implementation. MTSS/RtI trainings (plan for implementation and progress monitoring) will be provided during district's Modified (School) Wednesday's throughout the year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Ongoing discussions and professional learning will take place to ensure that common language is established, understood, and exercised in school's daily decision making.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Lincoln's Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) site team serves as the school-based Literacy Leadership Team. The AVID/Literacy Leadership Team is as follows:
Angela Garrott - Site Coordinator, AVID Elect Teacher
Angel Calcorzi - Site Team Member, Social Studies
Vanessa Hedden - Site Team Member, Science
Lia Kaiser - Site Team Member, Language Arts
Carol Mays-Davis - Site Team Member, Math
Don Winney - Site Team Member, Social Studies

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

Each site team member received training in his/her respective content area (listed). The training included specific Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, and Reading (WICR) strategies in each of the specific subjects. The site team meets monthly to discuss school literacy/strategy needs, and upcoming professional development. The site team's main role is to train staff in content areas (as related to literacy).

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

The Literacy Leadership Team's major initiative this year will be addressing literacy needs through monthly professional learning. Administrative observation and teacher discussion indicate the area of literacy that is of greatest challenge for students. Administrative observations indicate teachers' insufficient use of literacy strategies as the greatest challenge for teachers. The current year's goal is to address the literacy need of literacy through presentations of specific research-based strategies that teachers can utilize within their classrooms. Another initiative will be connecting components of the Literacy Leadership Team's initiative to components of the school's MTSS/RtI initiative.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/5/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Reading is an integral part of the district's adopted curriculum (Manatee Core Curriculum) and Common Core Literacy

Standards. Thus, reading will be monitored through lesson plans, walkthrough/classroom visits, etc. There is also a school-wide encouragement for reading through the use of AVID literacy strategies (for higher and lower-level learners), writing as a learning and/or assessment tool and Costas/higher-order thinking strategies (for higher-level learners) as related to Common Core literacy standards such as text complexity, quality, and range. Teachers in all subject areas will use AVID's research-based strategies through the facilitation of reading.

*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?

Students are prepared to select elective courses of their interest or directly related to their career of choice. During their sixth grade year, students are exposed to each elective through a nine-week rotation per elective. Students choose elective courses for their 7th and 8th grade years based on their 6th-grade elective experiences and interests.

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:	According FLDOE's School Reading Demographic Report, Lincoln's percentage of students performing at FCAT Level 3 in reading decreased. From 2011 to 2012, the overall school percentage decreased from 16% to 11%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
As of June 2012, 11% (67) of students achieved FCAT Level 3. Level 3 Reading Performance was as follows: 6th grade 10% (21), 7th grade 12% (24), 8th grade 12% (22).	By June 2013, 16% (91) of students will achieve FCAT Level 3. Level 3 Reading Performance Goals are follows: 6th grade 15% (22), 7th grade 17% (34), 8th grade 17% (35).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers' insufficient use of complexity and Common Core literacy strategies during instruction	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies: - Cues, Questioning, Advanced Organizers -Setting Objectives & Providing Feedback -Cooperative Learning -Complexity of task, text, questioning -Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Reading (WICR) instructional strategies	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Subject-Area Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to determine necessary modifications for implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Student difficulty maintaining Level 3 or above	-Differentiated Instruction -Cooperative Learning -Complexity of task, text, questioning -Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Reading (WICR) instructional strategies	Administration Classroom Teachers	Administrators will monitor teacher classroom instruction to ensure that strategies are incorporated.	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
3	Computer-based testing	FAIR Testing for all students Teacher-Student Data Chats Computerized reading assignment/Increase teacher facilitation of digital learning Marking Text on the computer	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Team data chats	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
4	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

				core standards in teachers' classroom instruction	
5					

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:	Over the past two years, an average of 25% (6/25) of Lincoln's students performed at a reading level of proficiency on the Florida Alternate Assessment. The goal is to decrease the number of students performing at the participatory level (1, 2, or 3) and increase the number of students performing at supported (4, 5, or 6) and independent (7, 8, or 9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 47% (7/15) of Lincoln's current students achieved a level 4, 5 ,or 6 on the Florida Alternative assessment .	By June 2013, 53% (8/15) will achieve a level 4, 5, or 6 on the Florida Alternative assessment for 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	Student difficulty retaining taught/reviewed concepts	Re-teaching with manipulatives and activities that encourage retention	Administrators ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations	Grade book Daily Logs Parent Notes Formal/Informal Assessments Problem Solving Process Teacher-student data chats
2	Students' low cognitive levels	Repetition of information and concepts	Classroom Teacher	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations Daily log checks	Grade Book Parent Notes Daily Logs
3	Too many resources to manage	Teacher will identify the essential resources Utilize district-provided Unique Learning Curriculum Differentiated Resources Collaborate with other Teachers	ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher	Teacher facilitates effective classroom activities and tasks that elicit evidence of learning Collection of formal/informal assessment data Teacher utilizes data to modify and adjust teaching practices to reflect on the needs and progress of students aligned to FAA access points	Pre/Post Tests Unique Learning Curriculum's Quarterly Benchmark Assessments
4	Lack of consistency/differentiation in previous year's instruction	More support for teacher Differentiated Resources Collaborate with other Teachers	Administration ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher	Teacher facilitates effective classroom activities and tasks that elicit evidence of learning Collection of formal/informal assessment data	Pre/Post Tests Unique Learning Curriculum's Quarterly Benchmark Assessments

				Teacher utilizes data to modify and adjust teaching practices to reflect on the needs and progress of students aligned to FAA access points	
5	Students' Low Attendance Parent Communication	Make-up Work in Class Make-up Work Sent Home Attendance Clerk	Classroom Teacher	Comparison of student attendance/grades from week-to-week, quarter-to-quarter, and semester-to-semester Focus Attendance	Grade Book Daily Logs Parent Notes
6	Student Medical Health Issues Parent Communication	Make-up Work in Class Make-up Work Sent Home	Classroom Teacher	Comparison of student attendance/grades from week-to-week, quarter-to-quarter, and semester-to-semeste	Grade Book Daily Logs Parent Notes

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:	According FLDOE's School Reading Demographic Report, Lincoln's percentage of students performing above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5) in reading decreased. From 2011 to 2012, the overall school percentage decreased from 6% to 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 6% (35) of students achieved above reading proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5). Grade-Level Reading Proficiency Performance (Levels 4 & 5) was as follows: 6th grade 5% (11), 7th grade 6% (12), 8th grade 6% (12).	By June 2013, 11% (59) of students will achieve above reading proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5). Grade-Level Reading Proficiency Goals are as follows: 6th grade 10% (15), 7th grade 11% (22/196), 8th grade 11% (22).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers' insufficient use of higher-order thinking and Common Core literacy strategies during instruction strategies during instruction	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies: -Generating and Testing Hypothesis -Text Complexity -Reference & Researching	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration Common Core Teacher Leaders	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of core standards in teacher lesson plans and classroom instruction	Lesson Plans Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

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:	Over the past two years, an average of 25% (6/25) of Lincoln's students performed at a reading level of proficiency on the Florida Alternate Assessment. The goal is to decrease the number of students performing at the participatory level (1, 2, or 3) and supported (4, 5, or 6) to increase students performing at independent level (7, 8, or 9).

	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	As of June 2012, 33% (5/15) of Lincoln's current students achieved a level 7, 8, or 9 on the Florida Alternative assessment for reading.		By June 2013, 40% (6/15) will achieve a level 7, 8, or 9 on the Florida Alternative assessment for 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	Student difficulty retaining taught/reviewed concepts	Re-teaching with manipulatives and activities that encourage retention	Administrators ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher ESE Aide	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations	Grade book Daily Logs Parent Notes Formal/Informal Assessments Problem Solving Process Teacher-student data chats
2	Avoidance/disruptive classroom behavior	Re-teach expectation Discuss choices Follow through with appropriate Time Out	Classroom Teacher ESE Aide	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations Review daily logs	Grade book Daily Logs Parent Notes

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:	There has been a slight increase in the percentage of students making (yearly) Learning Gains in Reading. From 2011 to 2012, the percentage of students making learning gains in reading increased from 55% to 56%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 56% (337) of students made Learning Gains in reading.	By June 2013, 65% (355) of students will make Learning Gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students' lack of fundamental skills	Differentiated Instruction Literacy/Scaffolding Strategies -Gradual Release of Responsibility Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
	Computer-based testing	FAIR Testing for all students Teacher-Student Data	Administration Team Leaders	Team data chats	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2		Chats Computerized reading assignment/Increase teacher facilitation of digital learning Marking Text on the computer	Classroom Teachers		Problem Solving Process
3	Level 2/Lower Level 3 difficulty maintaining or improving achievement level	Extended Day Learning Opportunities (After school tutoring/FCAT Fun Camp)	Administration After school tutoring	Tutoring team data chats Teacher-student data chats	Online Reading Assignments (Edmodo) ALEKS VMath
4	Student lack of motivation	Incentive Days Renaissance Reading Book Chain	Administration Team Leaders	Leadership Team goals/data chats	Team goals Problem Solving
5					

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:	Over the past two years, an average of 67% (2/3) of Lincoln's current students maintained or increased their reading level of proficiency on the Florida Alternate Assessment. Only 33% (1/3) of the students' reading level decreased. The goal is for students performing at the participatory level (1, 2, or 3) to increase their levels of proficiency and for students performing at supported (4, 5, or 6) and independent (7, 8, or 9) to maintain or increase their levels of proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, Lincoln's current students' achievement levels on the Florida Alternate Assessment are as follows: Level #Students Percent 1 0 0 2 1 13 3 3 20 4 1 7 5 4 27 6 2 13 7 3 20 8 2 13 9 0 0	As of June 2013, Lincoln's students achievement levels on the Florida Alternate Assessment will be as follows: Level #Students Percent 1 0 0 2 0 0 3 1 7 4 3 20 5 3 20 6 2 13 7 4 27 8 1 7 9 1 7

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student Medical Health Issues	Parent Communication Make-up Work in Class Make-up Work Sent Home	Classroom Teacher	Comparison of student attendance/grades from week-to-week, quarter-to-quarter, and semester-to-semester	Grade Book Daily Logs Parent Notes
2	Students' Low Attendance	Parent Communication Make-up Work in Class Make-up Work Sent Home	Attendance Clerk Classroom Teacher	Comparison of student attendance/grades from week-to-week, quarter-to-quarter, and semester-to-semester	Focus Attendance Grade Book Daily Logs Parent Notes

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:	There will be a 5% increase of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 62% (93/151) of students in Lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading.	By June 2013, 67% (94/140) of students in Lowest 25% will make learning gains in Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students' lack of fundamental skills	Differentiated Instruction Literacy/Scaffolding Strategies -Gradual Release of Responsibility Extended Learning Opportunities	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers After school Tutors	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices. Tutoring team data chats	Common Assessments Teacher-student data chats Online Reading Assignments (Edmodo) ALEKS VMath Problem Solving Process
2	Student lack of motivation	Incentive Days Renaissance Reading Book Chain Administration	Team Leaders	Leadership Team goals/data chats	Team goals Problem Solving

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 # 5A :	Over the next six years, the percent of students scoring satisfactory in reading will increase as outlined in the following:				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	37	48	54	59	64	

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:	According 2011-2012 Annual Measurable Objectives data, the following subgroups did not make satisfactory progress or meet AMO target for reading: White, Black, Hispanic.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 2012 level of performance for satisfactory in reading was as follows: White 53% (82) Black 34% (55)	The 2013 expected level of performance (as determined by AMO state data) for satisfactory in reading is as follows: White 63% (280) Black 44% (67)

Hispanic 25% (63) | Hispanic 30% (80)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with varying abilities/learning styles in one class	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies -Non-Linguistic Representations -Cooperative Learning	Administrators Classroom Leaders Classroom Teachers	Monitor Lesson Plans Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Existing achievement gaps among ethnic groups	Differentiated Instruction Graphic Organizers Lesson Study	Classroom Leaders Classroom Teachers	Professional conversations/reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

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

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	According 2011-2012 Annual Measurable Objectives data, the Students with Disabilities group met the AMO reading target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students with Disabilities 2012 level of performance for satisfactory in reading was 21% (28).	Students with Disabilities 2013 expected level of performance (as determined by AMO state data) for satisfactory in reading is 33% (45).

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
1	Students lacking fundamental skills	Literacy Strategies (WICR) Scaffolding during instruction (Gradual Release of Responsibility) Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Students with varying abilities/learning styles in one class	Differentiated Instruction Gradual Release of Responsibility Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies -Non-Linguistic Representations -Cooperative Learning	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
3	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of core standards in teacher lesson plans and classroom instruction	Lesson Plans Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

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:	According 2011-2012 Annual Measurable Objectives data, students in the Economically Disadvantaged group did not met the AMO reading target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students in the Economically Disadvantaged group's 2012 level of performance for satisfactory in reading was 29% (129).	Students in the Economically Disadvantaged group's 2013 expected level of performance (as determined by AMO state data) for satisfactory in reading is 37% (165).

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
1	Students with varying abilities/learning styles in one class	After School Tutoring Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Tutoring Gradual Release of Responsibility Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications	Lesson Plans Common Assessments Problem Solving Process FCAT 2.0

		-Non-Linguistic Representations -Cooperative Learning Text Complexity		to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	FAIR
2	Lack of Parental Involvement	Monthly Parent Involvement Workshops	Administration Parent Liaison	Invite parents of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) group to monthly parent workshops Check Workshop sign-in to determine whether or not ED parent attendance increase	Workshop rosters

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
Using technology for data analysis	7th Reading 8th Language Arts	District Instructional Technology Specialist	7th Reading 8th Language Arts	Every 7 Weeks 10/2012 1/ 2013 3/2013	Progress Monitoring	ITS Personnel Classroom Teachers

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing-based, engaging learning activities	Project-based supplies	Title I, School funds	$400.00
			Subtotal: $400.00
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: $400.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	By June 2013, the percent of students proficient in listening/speaking will be as follows: 6th 64% (14/22), 7th 72% (13/18), 8th 29% (2/7). The goal will be for 62% (29/47) to perform at proficient levels and should be obtained as students who mastered "High Intermediate" levels master "Proficient" levels while "Proficient" students maintain proficiency levels.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

As of June 2012, the percent of Lincoln's current ELL group that mastered proficiency in listening/speaking (by grade-level) was as follows: 6th 45% (10/22), 7th 33% (6/18), 8th 0% (0/7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	New enrolling English Language Learners	Before-school tutoring Bilingual dictionaries Computer translation programs One-on-one ELL aide accommodations Extra time to complete assignments	ELL Classroom Teacher ELL Aide	Problem-solving process Oral/Written student communication Review class performance ELL teacher communication with content-area teachers	Teacher-Created Assessments Report Cards Progress Reports
2	Lack of student motivation	Incentive Days Additional One-on-one accommodations School supplies provided	ELL Classroom Teacher ELL AIde	Review class performance ELL teacher communication with content-area teachers	Report Cards Progress Reports
3	Parents lack formal education	Monthly Parent Nights	Title I Parent Liaison and Support Personnel Parent Surveys	Parent Surveys	Sign-in sheets for parents

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	By June 2013, the percent of students proficient in reading will be as follows: 6th 59% (13/22), 7th 44% (8/18), 8th 29% (2/7). The goal will be for 49% (23/47) to perform at proficient levels and should be obtained as students who mastered "High Intermediate" levels master "Proficient" levels while "Proficient" students maintain proficiency levels.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

As of June 2012, the percent of Lincoln's current ELL group that mastered proficiency in reading (by grade-level) was as follows: 6th 23% (5/22), 7th 0% (0/18), 8th 14% (1/7).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	
	Person or	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	New enrolling English Language Learners	Before-school tutoring Bilingual dictionaries Computer translation programs One-on-one ELL aide accommodations Extra time to complete assignments	ELL Classroom Teacher ELL Aide	Problem-solving process Oral/Written student communication Review class performance ELL teacher communication with content-area teachers	Teacher-Created Assessments Report Cards Progress Reports
2	Parents lack formal education and parental involvement	Monthly Parent Nights	Title I Parent Liaison and Support Personnel	Teacher-Parent Communication Parent Surveys	Parent Surveys
3	Lack of student motivation	Incentive Days Additional One-on-one accommodations School supplies provided	ELL Classroom Teacher ELL Aide	Review class performance ELL teacher communication with content-area teachers	Report Cards Progress Reports
4	Advanced level of content-area curriculum	Word Walls Graphic Organizers Gradual Release Think-Pair-Share ELL Accommodations	Content-area Classroom Teacher ELL Classroom Teacher ELL Aide	Problem-solving process Review class performance ELL teacher communication with content-area teachers	Report Cards Progress Reports

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	By June 2013, the percent of students proficient in writing will be as follows: 6th 50% (11/22), 7th 44% (8/18), 8th 43% (3/7). The goal will be for 47% (22/47) to perform at proficient levels and should be obtained as students who mastered "High Intermediate" levels master "Proficient" levels while "Proficient" students maintain proficiency levels.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

As of June 2012, the percent of Lincoln's current ELL group that mastered proficiency in writing (by grade-level) was as follows: 6th 23% (5/22), 7th 6% (1/18), 8th 14% (1/7) Total 32% (7/22).

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	Advanced level of content-area curriculum	Graphic Organizers Gradual Release Think-Pair-Share ELL Accommodations	Content-area Classroom Teacher ELL Classroom Teacher ELL Aide	Problem-solving process Review class performance ELL teacher communication with content-area teachers	Report Cards Progress Reports
	Students (all) lack of practice daily use of standard grammar	Grammar activities incorporated with writing	Content-area Classroom Teacher	Review student work Teacher-student	Report Cards Progress Reports

2			performance chats	
		ELL Classroom Teacher		
		ELL Aide		

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:	According FLDOE's School Math Demographic Report, Lincoln's percentage of students performing FCAT Level 3 in math remained steady. From 2011 to 2012, the overall school percentage was 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 10% (60/601) of students achieved FCAT Level 3. Grade-Level Math Proficiency Performance (Level 3) was as follows: 6th grade 8% (17), 7th grade 11% (23), 8th grade 10% (20).	By June 2013, 15% (85) of students will achieve FCAT Level 3. FCAT Level 3 for grade-level math goals are follows: 6th grade 13% (20), 7th grade 16% (13), 8th grade 15% (30).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers' insufficient use of complexity and Common Core literacy strategies during instruction	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies: - Cues, Questioning, Advanced Organizers -Setting Objectives & Providing Feedback -Cooperative Learning -Complexity of task, text, questioning -Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Reading (WICR) instructional strategies	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Subject-Area Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to determine necessary modifications for implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Student difficulty maintaining Level 3 or above	-Differentiated Instruction -Cooperative Learning -Complexity of task, text, questioning -Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Reading (WICR) instructional strategies	Administration Classroom Teachers	Administrators will monitor teacher classroom instruction to ensure that strategies are incorporated.	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
3	Computer-based testing	FAIR Testing for all students Teacher-Student Data Chats Computerized reading assignment/Increase teacher facilitation of digital learning Marking Text on the computer	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Team data chats	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
4	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of core standards in teachers' classroom instruction	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

5	Non-relevant instruction (as perceived by students)	-Student active engagement in learning -Interdisciplinary Math, Science, Physical Education activities	Administrators Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Teacher collaborative planning/reflective discussion	FCAT 2.0 Performance-Based Math 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	Over the past two years, an average of 28% (7/25) of Lincoln's students performed at a math level of proficiency on the Florida Alternate Assessment. The goal is to decrease the number of students performing at the participatory level (1, 2, or 3) and increase the number of students performing at supported (4, 5, or 6) and independent (7, 8, or 9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 60% (9/15) of Lincoln's current students achieved a level 4, 5 ,or 6 on the Florida Alternative math assessment.	By June 2013, 67% (10/15) will achieve a level 4, 5, or 6 on the Florida Alternative assessment for 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	Student difficulty retaining taught/reviewed concepts	Re-teaching with manipulatives and activities that encourage retention	Administrators ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations	Grade book Daily Logs Parent Notes Formal/Informal Assessments Problem Solving Process Teacher-student data chats
2	Students' low cognitive levels	Repetition of information and concepts	Classroom Teacher	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations Daily log checks	Grade Book Parent Notes Daily Logs
3	Too many resources to manage	Teacher will identify the essential resources Utilize district-provided Unique Learning Curriculum Differentiated Resources Collaborate with other Teachers	ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher	Teacher facilitates effective classroom activities and tasks that elicit evidence of learning Collection of formal/informal assessment data Teacher utilizes data to modify and adjust teaching practices to reflect on the needs and progress of students aligned to FAA access points	Pre/Post Tests Unique Learning Curriculum's Quarterly Benchmark Assessments
4	Lack of consistency/differentiation in previous year's instruction	More support for teacher Differentiated Resources Collaborate with other Teachers	Administration ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher	Teacher facilitates effective classroom activities and tasks that elicit evidence of learning Collection of formal/informal assessment data	Pre/Post Tests Unique Learning Curriculum's Quarterly Benchmark Assessments

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
				Teacher utilizes data to modify and adjust teaching practices to reflect on the needs and progress of students aligned to FAA access points	
5	Students' Low Attendance Parent Communication	Make-up Work in Class Make-up Work Sent Home Attendance Clerk	Classroom Teacher	Comparison of student attendance/grades from week-to-week, quarter-to-quarter, and semester-to-semester Focus Attendance	Grade Book Daily Logs Parent Notes
6	Student Medical Health Issues Parent Communication	Make-up Work in Class Make-up Work Sent Home	Classroom Teacher	Comparison of student attendance/grades from week-to-week, quarter-to-quarter, and semester-to-semeste	Grade Book Daily Logs Parent Notes
7	Lack of curriculum focus	Teacher will utilize the math access points Provide consistent implementation of math instruction	ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher	Teacher facilitates effective classroom activities and tasks that elicit evidence of learning Collection of formal/informal assessment data Teacher utilizes data to modify and adjust teaching practices to reflect on the needs and progress of students aligned to FAA access points	Unique Learning Curriculum's Quarterly Benchmark Assessments Grade Book Daily Logs

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:	According FLDOE's School Math Demographic Report, Lincoln's percentage of students performing above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 or above) in math remained decreased. From 2011 to 2012, the overall school percentage was 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 5% (32) of students achieved above math proficiency (FCAT Level 4 or above). Grade-Level Math Proficiency Performance (Level 4 or above) was as follows: 6th grade 6% (13), 7th grade 5% (10), 8th grade 5% (9).	By June 2013, 10% (55) of students will achieve above math proficiency (FCAT Level or above). Grade-Level Math Proficiency Goals are follows: 6th grade 11% (16), 7th grade 10% (20), 8th grade 10% (20).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers' insufficient use of higher-order thinking and Common Core literacy strategies during instruction strategies during instruction	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies: -Generating and Testing Hypothesis -Text Complexity -Reference & Researching	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration Common Core Teacher Leaders	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of	Lesson Plans Common Assessments Problem Solving

				core standards in teacher lesson plans and classroom instruction	Process
3	Students' lack of engagement	Cooperative Learning Strategies Gradual Release of Responsibility Hands-on Math Activities	Administrators Classroom Teachers	Lesson Plan Check Teacher data chats/reflective discussions	FCAT 2.0 Common Performance-Based Assessments
4	Teachers' insufficient use of varied/relevant instruction	Teacher activities move student thinking from concrete to abstract	Administrators Classroom Teachers	Teacher data chats/reflective discussions Teacher-Student data chats	FCAT 2.0 Common Performance-Based Assessments Problem Solving Process

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:	Over the past two years, an average of 25% (1/25) of Lincoln's students performed at a math level of proficiency on the Florida Alternate Assessment. The goal is to decrease the number of students performing at the participatory level (1, 2, or 3) and supported (4, 5, or 6) to increase students performing at independent level (7, 8, or 9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 0% (0/14) of Lincoln's current students achieved a level 7, 8, or 9 on the Florida Alternative math assessment.	By June 2013, 7% (1/15) will achieve a level 7, 8, or 9 on the Florida Alternative assessment for 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	Student difficulty retaining taught/reviewed concepts	Re-teaching with manipulatives and activities that encourage retention	Administrators ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher ESE Aide	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations	Grade book Daily Logs Parent Notes Formal/Informal Assessments Problem Solving Process Teacher-student data chats
2	Avoidance/disruptive classroom behavior	Re-teach expectation Discuss choices Follow through with appropriate Time Out	Classroom Teacher ESE Aide	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations Review daily logs	Grade book Daily Logs Parent Notes

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:	There has been a decrease in the percentage of students making (yearly) Learning Gains in Math. From 2011 to 2012, the percentage of students making learning gains in reading decreased from 65% to 56%.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	As of June 2012, 56% (339) of students made Learning Gains in math.	By June 2012, 65% (357) of students will make Learning Gains in 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	Students' lack of fundamental skills	Differentiated Instruction Literacy/Scaffolding Strategies -Gradual Release of Responsibility Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Level 2/Lower Level 3 difficulty maintaining or improving achievement level	Extended Day Learning Opportunities (After school tutoring/FCAT Fun Camp)	Administration After school tutoring	Tutoring team data chats Teacher-student data chats	Online Reading Assignments (Edmodo) ALEKS VMath
3	Student lack of motivation	Incentive Days Renaissance Reading Book Chain	Administration Team Leaders	Leadership Team goals/data chats	Team goals Problem Solving
4	Students' misunderstanding of connection between skill/performance	Integrated Assessment and instruction Teacher-Student data chats	Administrators Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Teacher data chats/reflective discussions	FCAT 2.0 Unit Performance-Based Assessments
5	Non-relevant instruction (as perceived by students)	-Student active engagement in learning -Interdisciplinary Math, Science, Physical Education activities	Administrators Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Teacher collaborative planning/reflective discussion	FCAT 2.0 Performance-Based Math 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:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Over the past two years, an average of 33% (1/3) of Lincoln's current students maintained or increased their math level of proficiency on the Florida Alternate Assessment. Only 67% (2/3) of the students' reading level decreased. The goal is for students performing at the participatory level (1, 2, or 3) to increase their levels of proficiency and for students performing at supported (4, 5, or 6) and independent (7, 8, or 9) to maintain or increase their levels of proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, Lincoln's current students' achievement levels on the Florida Alternate Math Assessment are as follows: Level #Students Percent 1 0 0 2 2 14 3 3 21 4 2 14 5 3 21 6 4 29	As of June 2012, Lincoln's current students' achievement levels on the Florida Alternate Math Assessment will be as follows: Level #Students Percent 1 0 0 2 0 0 3 3 20 4 3 20 5 2 13 6 5 33

| | | | 7 0 0
8 0 0
9 0 0 | | 7 1 7
8 0 0
9 1 7 |

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student Medical Health Issues	Parent Communication Make-up Work in Class Make-up Work Sent Home	Classroom Teacher	Comparison of student attendance/grades from week-to-week, quarter-to-quarter, and semester-to-semester	Grade Book Daily Logs Parent Notes
2	Students' Low Attendance	Parent Communication Make-up Work in Class Make-up Work Sent Home	Attendance Clerk Classroom Teacher	Comparison of student attendance/grades from week-to-week, quarter-to-quarter, and semester-to-semester	Focus Attendance Grade Book Daily Logs Parent Notes

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	There will be a 5% increase of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 56% (84) of students in Lowest 25% made learning gains in Math.	By June 2013, 61% (92) of students in Lowest 25% will make learning gains in 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	Students' lack of fundamental skills	Differentiated Instruction Literacy/Scaffolding Strategies -Gradual Release of Responsibility Extended Learning Opportunities	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers After school Tutors	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices. Tutoring team data chats	Common Assessments Teacher-student data chats Online Reading Assignments (Edmodo) ALEKS VMath Problem Solving Process
2	Student lack of motivation	Incentive Days Renaissance Reading Book Chain Administration	Team Leaders	Leadership Team goals/data chats	Team goals Problem Solving
3	Students' misunderstanding of connection between skill/performance	Integrated Assessment and instruction Teacher-Student data chats	Administrators Team Leaders Classroom	Teacher data chats/reflective discussions	FCAT 2.0 Unit Performance-Based Assessments

			Teachers		
4	Curricular pacing	Blended teacher-led instruction with student-centered lessons online (VMath)	Math Team Leader Classroom Teachers	Teacher/Student Data chats Reflective discussions	FCAT 2.0 VMath Assessments Unit Performance-Based Assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # Over the next six years, the percent of students scoring satisfactory in math will increase as outlined in the following: 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	32	32	49	55	60	

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:	According 2011-2012 Annual Measurable Objectives data, no subgroups made satisfactory progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 2012 level of performance for satisfactory in math was as follows: White 46% (77) Black 28% (46) Hispanic 23% (58)	The 2013 expected level of performance (as determined by AMO state data) for satisfactory in math is as follows: White 59% (265) Black 43% (65) Hispanic 42% (113)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with varying abilities/learning styles in one class	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies -Non-Linguistic Representations -Cooperative Learning	Administrators Classroom Leaders Classroom Teachers	Monitor Lesson Plans Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Existing achievement gaps among ethnic groups	Differentiated Instruction Graphic Organizers Lesson Study	Classroom Leaders Classroom Teachers	Professional conversations/reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

3	Non-relevant instruction (as perceived by students)	-Student active engagement in learning -Interdisciplinary Math, Science, Physical Education activities	Administrators Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Teacher collaborative planning/reflective discussion	FCAT 2.0 Performance-Based Math 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	According 2011-2012 Annual Measurable Objectives data, the Students with Disabilities group did not meet the AMO math target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students with Disabilities 2012 level of performance for satisfactory in math was 17% (23).	Students with Disabilities 2013 expected level of performance (as determined by AMO state data) for satisfactory in math is 22% (30).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking fundamental skills	Literacy Strategies (WICR) Scaffolding during instruction (Gradual Release of Responsibility) Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
	Students with varying abilities/learning styles in one class	Differentiated Instruction Gradual Release of Responsibility	Administration Team Leaders Classroom	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments.	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2		Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies -Non-Linguistic Representations -Cooperative Learning	Teachers	Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Process
3	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of core standards in teacher lesson plans and classroom instruction	Lesson Plans Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	According 2011-2012 Annual Measurable Objectives data, students in the Economically Disadvantaged group did not met the AMO math target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students in the Economically Disadvantaged group's 2012 level of performance for satisfactory in math was 29% (129).	Students in the Economically Disadvantaged group's 2013 expected level of performance (as determined by AMO state data) for satisfactory in math is 38% (170).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with varying abilities/learning styles in one class	After School Tutoring Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Tutoring Gradual Release of Responsibility Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies -Non-Linguistic Representations -Cooperative Learning Text Complexity	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Lesson Plans Common Assessments Problem Solving Process FCAT 2.0 FAIR
2	Lack of Parental Involvement	Monthly Parent Involvement Workshops	Administration Parent Liaison	Invite parents of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) group to monthly parent workshops Check Workshop sign-in to determine whether or not ED parent attendance increase	Workshop rosters
3	Students' lack of fundamental skills	Differentiated Instruction Literacy/Scaffolding Strategies -Gradual Release of Responsibility	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Teacher data chats/reflective discussions	FCAT 2.0 Unit Performance-Based Assessments
4	Students' misunderstanding of connection between skill/performance	Integrated Assessment and instruction Teacher-Student data	Administrators Team Leaders	Teacher data chats/reflective discussions	FCAT 2.0 Unit Performance-Based

			chats	Classroom Teachers		Assessments

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
1	Teachers' insufficient use of complexity and Common Core literacy strategies during instruction	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies: - Cues, Questioning, Advanced Organizers -Setting Objectives & Providing Feedback -Cooperative Learning -Complexity of task, text, questioning -Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Reading (WICR) instructional strategies	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Subject-Area Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to determine necessary modifications for implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Computer-based testing	FAIR Testing for all students Teacher-Student Data Chats Computerized reading assignment/Increase teacher facilitation of digital learning Marking Text on the computer	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Team data chats	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
3	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of core standards in teachers' classroom instruction	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

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
1	Teachers' insufficient use of higher-order thinking and Common Core literacy strategies during instruction strategies during instruction	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies: -Generating and Testing Hypothesis -Text Complexity -Reference & Researching	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration Common Core Teacher Leaders	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of core standards in teacher lesson plans and classroom instruction	Lesson Plans Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Algebra Goal # 3A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra 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
1	Students with varying abilities/learning styles in one class	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies -Non-Linguistic Representations -Cooperative Learning	Administrators Classroom Leaders Classroom Teachers	Monitor Lesson Plans Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Existing achievement gaps among ethnic groups	Differentiated Instruction Graphic Organizers Lesson Study	Classroom Leaders Classroom Teachers	Professional conversations/reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of core standards in teacher lesson plans and classroom instruction	Lesson Plans Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
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
1	Students with varying abilities/learning styles in one class	After School Tutoring Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Tutoring Gradual Release of Responsibility Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies -Non-Linguistic Representations -Cooperative Learning Text Complexity	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Lesson Plans Common Assessments Problem Solving Process FCAT 2.0 FAIR

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				

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A :				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry 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 subgroup:

| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

Geometry Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing-based, engaging learning activities	Project-based supplies	Title I, School funds	$400.00
			Subtotal: $400.00
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: $400.00

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	There is no trend data for FCAT 2.0 science as 2012 was the first year that FCAT 2.0 science was administered.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 9% (17) of students achieved FCAT Level 3 on science.	By June 2013, 14% (21) of students will achieve FCAT Level 3 on 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	Teachers' insufficient use of complexity and Common Core literacy strategies during instruction	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies: - Cues, Questioning, Advanced Organizers -Setting Objectives & Providing Feedback -Cooperative Learning -Complexity of task, text, questioning -Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Reading (WICR) instructional strategies	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Subject-Area Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to determine necessary modifications for implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Student difficulty maintaining Level 3 or above	-Differentiated Instruction -Cooperative Learning -Complexity of task, text, questioning -Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Reading (WICR) instructional strategies	Administration Classroom Teachers	Administrators will monitor teacher classroom instruction to ensure that strategies are incorporated.	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
3	Computer-based testing	FAIR Testing for all students Teacher-Student Data Chats Computerized reading assignment/Increase teacher facilitation of digital learning Marking Text on the computer	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Team data chats	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor	Common Assessments Problem Solving

| 4 | Standards. | | | implementation of CCS and incorporation of core standards in teachers' classroom instruction | Process |
| 5 | Students' lack of vocabulary skills | Literacy Strategies
-Pre-reading
-NonLinguistic Representations (Marzano's)
-Strategies for Context Clues | Administrators

Team Leaders

Classroom Teachers | Teacher collaboration

Data chats

Reflective discussions | FCAT 2.0

Common Unit Assessments

Problem Solving Process |

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:	Over the past two years, 60% (3/5) of Lincoln's students performed at a science level of proficiency on the Florida Alternate Assessment. The goal is to decrease the number of students performing at the participatory level (1, 2, or 3) and increase the number of students performing at supported (4, 5, or 6) and independent (7, 8, or 9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 50% (1) of Lincoln's current students achieved a level 4, 5 ,or 6 on the Florida Alternative assessment for science.	By June 2013, 50% (2) will achieve a level 4, 5, or 6 on the Florida Alternative assessment for 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	Student difficulty retaining taught/reviewed concepts	Re-teaching with manipulatives and activities that encourage retention	Administrators ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations	Grade book Daily Logs Parent Notes Formal/Informal Assessments Problem Solving Process Teacher-student data chats
2	Students' low cognitive levels	Repetition of information and concepts	Classroom Teacher	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations Daily log checks	Grade Book Parent Notes Daily Logs
3	Too many resources to manage	Teacher will identify the essential resources Utilize district-provided Unique Learning Curriculum Differentiated Resources Collaborate with other Teachers	ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher	Teacher facilitates effective classroom activities and tasks that elicit evidence of learning Collection of formal/informal assessment data Teacher utilizes data to modify and adjust teaching practices to reflect on the needs and progress of students aligned to FAA access points	Pre/Post Tests Unique Learning Curriculum's Quarterly Benchmark Assessments
	Lack of	More support for	Administration	Teacher facilitates	Pre/Post Tests

#	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4	consistency/differentiation in previous year's instruction	teacher Differentiated Resources Collaborate with other Teachers	ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher	effective classroom activities and tasks that elicit evidence of learning Collection of formal/informal assessment data Teacher utilizes data to modify and adjust teaching practices to reflect on the needs and progress of students aligned to FAA access points	Unique Learning Curriculum's Quarterly Benchmark Assessments
5	Access points not clearly define in curriculum	Instruction to focus on access points (based on core reading)	Classroom Teacher	Lesson plans aligned with access points Instructional targets Classroom walkthroughs Progress monitoring data	Pre/Post Tests Unique Learning Curriculum's Quarterly Benchmark Assessments
6	Students' Low Attendance Parent Communication	Make-up Work in Class Make-up Work Sent Home Attendance Clerk	Classroom Teacher	Comparison of student attendance/grades from week-to-week, quarter-to-quarter, and semester-to-semester Focus Attendance	Grade Book Daily Logs Parent Notes
7	Student Medical Health Issues Parent Communication	Make-up Work in Class Make-up Work Sent Home	Classroom Teacher	Comparison of student attendance/grades from week-to-week, quarter-to-quarter, and semester-to-semeste	Grade Book Daily Logs Parent Notes

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	There is no trend data for FCAT 2.0 science as 2012 was the first year that FCAT 2.0 science was administered.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 5% (9) of students achieved at or above science proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5).	By June 2012, 10% (20) of students will achieve above science proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers' insufficient use of higher-order thinking and Common Core literacy strategies during instruction strategies during instruction	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies: -Generating and Testing Hypothesis -Text Complexity -Reference & Researching	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Academic/Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to	Assessments Problem Solving Process

				implemented strategies and instructional practices.	
2	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration Common Core Teacher Leaders	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of core standards in teacher lesson plans and classroom instruction	Lesson Plans Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
3	Teachers' insufficient use of varied/relevant instruction	Problem solving/research through scientific method STEM-related activities	Administrators Classroom Teachers	Lesson Plan Check Teacher data chats/reflective discussions	FCAT 2.0 Common Performance-Based 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 science. Science Goal #2b:	Over the past two years, 60% (3/5) of Lincoln's students performed at a science level of proficiency on the Florida Alternate Assessment. The goal is to decrease the number of students performing at the participatory level (1, 2, or 3) and increase the number of students performing at supported (4, 5, or 6) and independent (7, 8, or 9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 0% (0) of Lincoln's current students achieved a level 7, 8, or 9 on the Florida Alternative assessment for science.	By June 2013, 50% (2) will achieve a level 7, 8, or 9 on the Florida Alternative assessment for 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	Student difficulty retaining taught/reviewed concepts	Re-teaching with manipulatives and activities that encourage retention	Administrators ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher ESE Aide	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations	Grade book Daily Logs Parent Notes Formal/Informal Assessments Problem Solving Process Teacher-student data chats
2	Avoidance/disruptive classroom behavior	Re-teach expectation Discuss choices Follow through with appropriate Time Out	Classroom Teacher ESE Aide	ESE teacher/aide daily, reflective conversations Review daily logs	Grade book Daily Logs Parent Notes

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Between 2011 and 2012, the number of students scoring at an achievement level of 3.0 or higher on FCAT writing decreased.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 26% (49) of students score at an achievement level of 3.0 or higher on FCAT 2.0 writing.	By June 2013, 31% (63) of students will score at an achievement level of 3.0 or higher on FCAT 2.0 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
	Students' insufficient	Marzano's High-Yielding	Administration	Reflective discussions	FCAT Writing

		Strategy	Team Leaders	will help teachers and administrators to see necessary modifications to implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Assessments
1	use of description and supporting details in writing.	- Summarizing/Notetaking Writing as a learning & assessment tool Daily Reading Logs Journals Exit Notes	Classroom Teachers		Common Assessments (District, Teacher-Created) Problem Solving Process
2	Students' impaired ability to use standard language and spelling while writing	Marzano's High-Yielding Strategy - Summarizing/Notetaking Writing as a learning & assessment tool Daily Reading Logs Journals Exit Notes Focus on grammar	Teacher Leaders Classroom Teachers	Progress monitor student performance on grammar assessments Teacher-student data chats	FCAT Writing Assessments Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
3	Ambiguity/lack of direction/knowledge of FCAT Writing standards for teachers	Teacher Collaborative comparison of 2012 FCAT Writing assessments and planning	Teacher Leaders Classroom Teachers	Reflective discussions about trends/patterns found in 2012 Writing assessments Collaborative grading based on comparisons and discussions	2012 FCAT Writing 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 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
1	Students do not produce written work in traditional ways and are not able to clearly express themselves in writing.	Teacher will incorporate a variety of ways and practice often. Differentiated instruction Require students to both verbalize and write their understanding of topic	ESE Team Leader Classroom Teacher ESE Aides	Lesson plans Bi-weekly evaluation of student work	FAA Assessment reports Report Cards Pre/Post Tests Quarterly 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
Collaborative Writing Training	8th/Language Arts	Title I Personnel	Title I Personnel 8th Grade Language Arts Teachers	Biweekly PLT Meetings SIP Inservice Day	Collaborative Planning Data Chats	Administrators 8th Grade Language Arts Teachers
FCAT 2.0 Writing	Secondary	District Personnel	Language Arts Team Leader 8th Grade Language Arts Teachers	November 2012	Student Writing Workshops Collaborative Planning	Language Arts Team Leader 8th Grade Language Arts Teacher

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing-based/engaging learning activities	Project-based supplies	Title I, School funds	$400.00
			Subtotal: $400.00
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
Collaborative Training	Payroll for substitutes	Title I	$180.00
			Subtotal: $180.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $580.00

End of Writing Goals

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:

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers' insufficient use of complexity and Common Core literacy strategies during instruction	Differentiated Instruction Marzano's High-Yielding Strategies: - Cues, Questioning, Advanced Organizers -Setting Objectives & Providing Feedback -Cooperative Learning -Complexity of task, text, questioning -Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Reading (WICR) instructional strategies	Administration Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Subject-Area Teams will meet bi-weekly to discuss results from Unit Tests and/or FCIM assessments. Reflective discussions will help teachers and administrators to determine necessary modifications for implemented strategies and instructional practices.	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
2	Student difficulty maintaining Level 3 or above	-Differentiated Instruction -Cooperative Learning -Complexity of task, text, questioning -Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Reading (WICR) instructional strategies	Administration Classroom Teachers	Administrators will monitor teacher classroom instruction to ensure that strategies are incorporated.	FCAT 2.0 FAIR Common Assessments Problem Solving Process
3	Teacher lack of experience/exposure to Florida's Common Core Standards.	Ongoing professional learning and conversations	Administration	Administrators will continue to discuss and monitor implementation of CCS and incorporation of core standards in teachers' classroom instruction	Common Assessments Problem Solving Process

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:

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:	Lincoln Middle's attendance rate has decreased. The attendance rate has decreased an average of two percentage points each year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
As of June 2012, Lincoln Middle's attendance rate was 90.8%.	By June 2012, Lincoln Middle's attendance rate will be 92%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive

Absences (10 or more)	Absences (10 or more)
As of June 2012, the percentage of students with Excessive Absences was 41% (252).	By June 2013, the percentage of student with Excessive Absences will decrease from 41% (252) to 36% (222).
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
As of June 2012, the percentage of students with Excessive Tardies was 15% (92).	By June 2013, the percentage of student with Excessive Tardies will decrease from 15% (92) to 10% (64).

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	Parent Contact information not updated when the family moves	Update Bio and emergency contact forms, following up on FOCUS report of non-returned parent phone calls	Attendance clerk	RtI Leadership Team analyzes and graphs attendance data twice per quarter.	FOCUS attendance data
2	Students move but are not enrolled in another school	Check-in, check out system for students who are red-flagged according to our Early Warning System	RtI Liaison	RtI Leadership Team analyzes and graphs attendance data twice per quarter.	FOCUS attendance data
3	Students' lack of motivation to attend school	Student rewards for reaching attendance goals

Attendance contracts for students who had excessive absences in 2010-2011. | Guidance Counselors

RtI Leadership team | Guidance Services analyzes/monitors attendance

RtI Leadership Team analyzes and graphs attendance data twice per quarter. | FOCUS attendance data |

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Over the past three years, the number of disciplinary incidents decreased from 2372 (2008-2009) to 1559 (2010-2011). However, the number of classroom disciplinary incidents…
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
As of June 2012, the total number days of In School Suspension were 1255.	By June 2012, the total number days of In School Suspensions will be 1000 or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
Data not available	Data not available
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
As of June 2012, the total number days of Out-of-School Suspensions was 724.	By June 2012, the total number days of Out-of-School Suspensions will be 500 or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
Data not available	Data not available

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students fighting in common areas on campus.	During class change, teachers being present in the halls, high-traffic areas, and most	PBS Team	Quarterly review of student "Get REAL" cards, including type of infractions	PBS Cards

			common locations for fights.		
2	Same students frequently being suspended.	Create behavior contracts for individual students.	Guidance Counselors PBS Team	Quarterly review of discipline (ISS OSS) data	FOCUS Behavior Reports
3	Substitute teachers not trained on our PBS system for discipline	Instruct substitute teachers to follow our PBS system when disciplining students. Have the procedures written in all substitute folders.	Administrators PBS Team	Quarterly review of student "Get REAL" cards, including type of infractions Quarterly review of discipline (ISS OSS) data	PBS Cards FOCUS Behavior Reports

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Parental involvement is low. Generally, parents of high-performing students tend to attend and participate in parental involvement activities.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
As of June 2011, 25% of Lincoln Middle's parents attended and/or participated in school activities.	By June 2012, 30% of Lincoln Middle's parents will attend and/or participate in school activities.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The need for childcare	Provide childcare for smaller siblings	Title I Coordinator and Support Personnel	Parent Surveys Sign-in sheets for parents	Sign-in sheets for parents
2	Parents working and unable to attend functions	Schedule functions at various times of the day and week	Title I Coordinator and Support Personnel	Parent Surveys Sign-in sheets for parents	Sign-in sheets for parents
3	Parents speak languages other than English	Provide interpreters at school activities	Title I Coordinator and Support Personnel	Parent Surveys Sign-in sheets for parents	Sign-in sheets for parents
4	Lack of parent notification	Post parent events in school newsletter Callouts about parent events	Title I Parent Liaison and Support Personnel	Parent Surveys Sign-in sheets for parents	Sign-in sheets for parents

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

Increase home-school communication	Planners, agendas for each student	Title I	$1,500.00
Parents employ effective/active reading strategies with students	Books for Parents	Title I	$700.00
		Subtotal: $2,200.00	

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
On-site Parent Resource Center	Computer for Parent Resource Center	Title I	$1,500.00
		Subtotal: $1,500.00	

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
Monthly Parent/Family Nights	Teacher/Staff Payroll, Supplies, Refreshments	Title I, School funds	$3,200.00
		Subtotal: $3,200.00	
		Grand Total: $6,900.00	

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student lack of science vocabulary	Word Walls Increased complexity in task, text, questioning	Administrators Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Quarterly & Daily assessments Teacher-student data chats	Florida Achieves FOCUS FCAT Science 2.0
2	Student low reading abilities	Cornell Notes Interactive Notebooks Graphic Organizers Gradual Release of Responsibility Think-Pair-Share Marking the Text	Classroom Teachers	Common Assessments Daily Assessments	FOCUS

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increased digital learning for students	Next-speed lab	Title I	$4,500.00
			Subtotal: $4,500.00
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: $4,500.00

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				

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Review 2010-2011 student achievement data with Administrative/Leadership Team members to determine goals/plans to improve student achievement for 2011-2012 school year. Goal:

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
Leadership Planning (Establish Vision, Mission, Motto, focus, etc.)	All Grade Levels/Subject Area Team Members	Administrators	6-8 Grade Level Leaders 6-8 Content/Subject Area Leaders	School Pre-planning	Walkthroughs, observation of daily classroom instruction PLT meetings	Administrators

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
Succeeding with 90/90/90 Schools Strategies (Conference)	Payroll for Substitutes, Travel/Conference Costs	Title I, School funds	$8,000.00
			Subtotal: $8,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Leadership pre-planning to establish mission, vision, motto, and focus.	Teacher Payroll	Title I	$800.00
			Subtotal: $800.00
			Grand Total: $8,800.00

End of Review 2010-2011 student achievement data with Administrative/Leadership Team members to determine goals/plans to improve student achievement for 2011-2012 school year. Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Writing-based, engaging learning activities	Project-based supplies	Title I, School funds	$400.00
Mathematics	Writing-based, engaging learning activities	Project-based supplies	Title I, School funds	$400.00
Writing	Writing-based/engaging learning activities	Project-based supplies	Title I, School funds	$400.00
Parent Involvement	Increase home-school communication	Planners, agendas for each student	Title I	$1,500.00
Parent Involvement	Parents employ effective/active reading strategies with students	Books for Parents	Title I	$700.00
				Subtotal: $3,400.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Involvement	On-site Parent Resource Center	Computer for Parent Resource Center	Title I	$1,500.00
STEM	Increased digital learning for students	Next-speed lab	Title I	$4,500.00
				Subtotal: $6,000.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing	Collaborative Training	Payroll for substitutes	Title I	$180.00
Review 2010-2011 student achievement data with Administrative/Leadership Team members to determine goals/plans to improve student achievement for 2011-2012 school year.	Succeeding with 90/90/90 Schools Strategies (Conference)	Payroll for Substitutes, Travel/Conference Costs	Title I, School funds	$8,000.00
				Subtotal: $8,180.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Involvement	Monthly Parent/Family Nights	Teacher/Staff Payroll, Supplies, Refreshments	Title I, School funds	$3,200.00
Review 2010-2011 student achievement data with Administrative/Leadership Team members to determine goals/plans to improve student achievement for 2011-2012 school year.	Leadership pre-planning to establish mission, vision, motto, and focus.	Teacher Payroll	Title I	$800.00
				Subtotal: $4,000.00
				Grand Total: $21,580.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC Funds will be used for various school improvement and student academic achievement projects.	$3,500.00

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

Monthly SAC meetings will be held to discuss school improvement activities and efforts to increase student achievement.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Manatee School District LINCOLN MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	54%	46%	82%	26%	208	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	55%	65%			120	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	65% (YES)	72% (YES)			137	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					465	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Manatee School District LINCOLN MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	57%	48%	85%	31%	221	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	61%	67%			128	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	67% (YES)			134	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					483	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested