FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: VENICE MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Dr. Karin Schmidt

SAC Chair: Mr. Joe Hampton

Superintendent: Mrs. Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/10/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Ms. Paula Cimillo	BS Psychology & Special Education K-12; University of South Florida. MS Educational Leadership; University of South Florida. Professional Certification Emotionally Handicapped K-12; Middle School Integrated 5-9; ESOL Endorsement; Educational Leadership K-12	1	4	Assistant Principal at Sarasota Middle School (SMS) 2009-2012 Grade: A; HIgh standards for students Proficiency Level in Reading, Math, Science , and Writing during all years as Assistant Principal at SMS. 2012 Data for student proficiency at or above: Reading 81%; Math 84%; Science 77%; Writing 97%
					Principal of Venice Middle School 2007 - Present Principal of Oak Park South in 2007 - Present

| Principal | Dr. Karin Schmidt | BA Early Childhood/Elementary Education; Master of Science in Reading;Professional Certificate Educational Leadership; Doctorate in Educational Leadership & Supervision.

Principal Certification - State of Florida | 8 | 6 | Principal of Venice Middle School in 2011 - 2012
Reading Level 3 and Above:
66% Met High Standards in Rg.
68% Made Annual Learning Goal
67% of Lowest 25% Made L.Goal

Math Level 3 and Above:
67% Met High Standards in Math
72% Made Annual Lerarning Goal
61% of Lowest 25% Made L. Goal

Science Level 3 and Above:
63% Met High Standards in Science

Writing Level 3 and Above:
91% Met High Standards in Writing

Oak Park South was a non-graded school 2011 - 2012 |

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	N/A	N/A			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. Partnering teachers with veteran staff members. 2. Monthly meetings with teachers, assistant principal, and principal.	Principal and Lead Teachers	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
43	14.0%(6)	16.3%(7)	39.5%(17)	30.2%(13)	86.0%(37)	0.0%(0)	7.0%(3)	18.6%(8)	30.2%(13)

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
Kim Bailey, Guidance Counselor	Rex Ingerick	Teacher new to Sarasota County School ; partnered with a veteran teacher	Weekly meetings after school; coaching; planning; feedback on meeting preparation; progress monitoring; parent home/school communication.
Karrie Byler, 6th Grade Reading/Language Arts	Susan Maas-Lyon	First year teacher partnered with a verteran teacher	Weekly meetings after school; coaching; planning; feedback on lesson preparation; progress monitoring; parent home/school communication.
Tom Connor, JROTC Teacher 6-8	Susan Maas-Lyon	First year teacher partnered with a verteran teacher	Weekly meetings after school; coaching; planning; feedback on lesson preparation; progress monitoring; parent home/school communication.
Marcy Cuervo-Hoeper, ESE and Social Studies Teacher	April Hess	First year teacher partnered with a veteran teacher	Weekly meetings after school; coaching; planning; feedback on lesson preparation; progress monitoring; parent home/school communication.
Sheree Richards, 7th Grade Language Arts Teacher	Laura Jordan	First year teacher partnered with a verteran teacher	Weekly meetings after school; coaching; planning; feedback on lesson preparation; progress monitoring; parent home/school communication.
Melissa Ball, Reading Teacher	Laura Jordan	First year teacher partnered with a verteran teacher	Weekly meetings after school; coaching; planning; feedback on lesson preparation; progress monitoring; parent home/school communication.

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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

1.Karin Schmidt, Principal - Develops, leads, evaluates, and facilitates data-based decision-making, ensures that the RTI Team implements, documents, and communicates with staff and parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities.
2. Paula Cimillo, Assistant Principal - Assists with the screening and early intervention programs for at-risk students; assists with progress monitoring, data collection, data analysis, and assists with professional development and intervention approaches.
3. Kim Waterhouse, Behavior Intervention Teacher Grades 6-8 - Works with student support services personnel and provides services and expertise on issues ranging from intervention with groups of students to individual students.
4. Kimberly Bailey, Guidance Counselor Grades 6-8 - Educates the team regarding interventions, works with the school social worker and school psychologist to link children and families to community resources and outside agencies, supports family and home/school communication, addresses academic, social, emotional needs of all students and provides overall student support.
5. Paula Evans, ESE Liaison Grades 6-8 - Participates in data a collection ; is key in providing assistance with Tier 2 and 3 Interventions, assists and collaborates with all teachers, and works to align activities and materials based upon student and teacher needs.
6. Susan Nell, Math Teacher, Math Department Chair, Curriculum Leader - Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points, delivers Tier 1 interventions, collaborates with other colleagues regarding Tier 2

interventions and strategies, and integrates Tier 1 interventions with Tier 2 & 3 activities and strategies.

7. Sheree Barlow, Science Teacher, Science Department Chair - Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points, delivers Tier 1 interventions, collaborates with other colleagues regarding Tier 2 interventions and strategies, and integrates Tier 1 interventions with Tier 2 & 3 activities and strategies.

8. Laura Jordan, Language Arts Teacher, Language Arts Department Chair - Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points, delivers Tier 1 interventions, collaborates with other colleagues regarding Tier 2 interventions and strategies, and integrates Tier 1 interventions with Tier 2 & 3 activities and strategies.

9. Lynne Remo, Social Studies Teacher, Social Studies Department Chair - Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points, delivers Tier 1 interventions, collaborates with other colleagues regarding Tier 2 interventions and strategies, and integrates Tier 1 interventions with Tier 2 & 3 activities and strategies.

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 team meets monthly. Key topics of discussion are: progress monitoring, tier interventions and strategies, identification of new students, updates on students receiving tier interventions and their progress, rich problem-solving conversations, and the sharing of best practices.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team collaborated on the components of the school improvement plan. The team discussed and reviewed the RTI tier interventions and expectations as well as various instructional practices that may impact learning within the core curriculum. Professional development opportunities were also explored.

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.

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), FCAT, FAIR, FOCUS, and monthly writing prompts.

Mid-year: PMRN, FAIR, FOCUS, monthly writing prompts

End of year: FCAT

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school administrative team has participated in district trainings on MTSS, PBS, RTI. Teacher professional development took place during pre-student week in August. 100% of the VMS staff participated in this offering. On-going training takes place at staff meetings and monthly curriculum leader meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Ongoing training throughout the school year. Case Managers work directly with teachers.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Karin Schmidt, Principal
Paula Cimillo, Assistant Principal
Kristin Mikarts, Media Specialist
Mary Alampi, LA/SS Curriculum Leader Grade 8
Laura Jordan, LA/SS Curriculum Leader Grade 7
Lynne Remo, LA/SS Curriculum Leader Grade 6

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

LLT meets monthly. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Curriculum Leaders facilitate the meeting. Teachers are participants and oftentimes present their projects and best practices. The LLT provides teachers with classroom resources and materials.

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

STARBOOKS Reading program for grades 6-8; Reading across the curriculum; Gradual Release of Responsibility; and book study.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 32% (204) Level 3,4,5 - 70%(447)	Level 3 - 36% Level 3,4,5 - 72%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Include higher order questions in lesson plans. 2. Implement Instructional Focus Calendars (IFCs). 3. Starbooks Reading Program	1. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walk throughs (CWT). 2. Create lesson plans aligned to benchmarks; analyze data; share progress monitoring data from assessments. Collaborate on enrichment activitieds as well as intervention activities and strategies; Collaborate on mini-assessments and end of chapter tests. 3. Students in Grades 6-8 read common novels written by well-known authors.	1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Leaders, and Department Chairs. 2. Curriculum Leaders; Reading teachers, Administration 3. Teachers, and Administration.	1. CWT checklists to determine frequency of higher order questions. 2. Shared lesson plans; analyze data with grade level subject area teachers; collaborate on mini-assessments. Administration will be able to follow IFC flow via CWT. 3. CWT; Read-alouds; literacy letters, oral and silent reading.	1. CWT checklists 2. Assessment data; mini-assessment data; Curriculum Leader meeting notes. 3. CWT; lesson plans; and end of chapter quizzes.

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:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5, - 38%(245) Level 3,4,5 - 70%(447)	Level 4,5 - 40% Level 3,4,5 - 72%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Include high order questions in lesson plans. 2. Implement IFCs. 3. STARBOOKS Reading program.	1. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 2. Create lesson plans aligned to the benchmarks; analyze data; share progress monitoring data from assessments; collaborate on enrichment activities as well as intervention activities and strategies collaborate on mini-assessments and end of chapter tests.	1. Administration, Curriculum leaders, and Department Chairs. 2. Curriculum Leaders, Reading teachers, and Administration. 3. Teachers and Administration.	1. CWT checklists 2. Shared lesson plans; analyze data with grade level subject areas teachers; collaborate on mini-assessments. Administration will be able to follow flow of IFC via CWT. 3. CWT; Read-alouds; literacy letters, oral and silent reading.	1. CWT checklists. 2. PMRN data; mini-assessments data; Curriculum Leader meeting notes. 3. CWT lesson plans; end of chapter quizzes.

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:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%(373)of the students made learning gains in reading.	71% of the students will make learning gains in reading.

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Targeted conversations and interventions for students not making learning gains. 2.Differentiated Instructional strategies. 3. STARBOOKS reading program.	1. Student achievement chats will be conducted with all students following assessments. 2. Determine core class needs by reviewing assessment data; plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction and intervention strategies. 3. Grades 6-8 will read a common fiction novel by a well-known author.	1. Administration; Curriculum Leaders; Reading teachers. 2. Curriculum Leaders, Reading teachers, and Administration.	1. Teacher and student & administration and student will have data chats regarding assessment data and quarterly grades. 2. Student progress monitoring determined by comparing student's trend lines to aim lines. 3. CWT; Read-alouds; literacy letters, oral and silent reading.	1. Student assessment data, logs,and class grades. 2. Core subject assessmnt data. 3. CWT; lesson plans; end of chapter quizzes.

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64%(96)of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	68% of the students in the 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	1. Targeted conversations and interventions for student not making learning gains. 2. Differentiated Instruction. 3. STARBOOKS reading program.	will be conducted with all students following assessments. 2. Determine core class needs by reviewing assessment data; Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction and interventions within the core classes. 3. Grades 6-8 will read a common fiction novel by a well-known author.	1. Administration, Curriculum Leaders; Reading teachers. 2. Reading teachers and administration. 3. Teachers and administration.	1. Teacher and student & administration and student will have data chats regarding assessment data, and overall quarterly academic grades. 2. Student progress monitoring determined by comparing student's trend lines to aim lines. 3. CWT; Read-alouds; literacy letters;oral and silent reading.	1. Student assessment data; logs;class grades. 2. Assessment data. 3. CWT; lesson plans; end of chapter quizzes.

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 # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	75	78	80	82	84	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 71%(400) Hispanic 72%(22)	White 75% Hispanic 76%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.Targeted conversations and interventions for students not making AYP. 2. Differentiated Instruction 3. STARBOOKS Reading program	1. Students achievement chats will be conducted with all students following the collection of assessment data. 2. Determine core class needs by reviewing assessment data points; plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instructional strategies. 3. Grades 6-8 will read a common fiction novel by a well-known author.	1. Administration; Curriculum Leaders; Reading teachers 2. Reading teachers and administration 3. Teachers and administration	1. Teacher and student & administration and student will have data chats regarding assessment data and overall quarterly academic grades. 2. Student progress monitoring determined by comparing student's trend lines to aim lines. 3. CWT; Read-alouds; lioteracy letters; oral and silent reading.	1. Student assessment data; meeting logs; class grades. 2. Assessment data 3. CWT; lesson plans; end of chapter quizzes.

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A *is shown when the number of students in the group is less than 10.	In grades 6-8, 100% of the students will make Level 3 or Higher on FCAT.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Immersion and Differentiated Instruction. 2. Language rich literacy lessons. 3. STARBOOKS reading program.	1. Student achievement chats will be conducted with all students following the collection of assessment data. 2. Determine core class needs by reviewing assessment data points; plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instructional strategies. 3. Grades 6-8 will read a common fiction novel by a well-known author.	1. LA, Reading teachers, and administration. 2. LA, Reading teachers, and administration. stration. 3. LA, Reading teachers, and administration.	1. Student progress monitoring determined by comparing student's trend lines to aim lines. 2. Assessments, textbook resources and materials. 3. CWT; Read-alouds; literacy letters; oral and silent reading.	1. Assessment data; mini-assessments; unit and chapter quizzes and tests; oral assessments. 2. Assessment scores and sub-group data points. 3. CWT; lesson plans; end of chapter quizzes.

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	In grades 6-8, 39% of the SWD made satisfactory progress in reading.	In grades 6-8, 43% of the SWD will make satisfactory progress 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	1. Tier 1 Interventions 2. Tier 2 Interventions 3. Tier 3 Interventions	1. Determine Core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. 2. Plan supplemental and/or intervention for students not responding to core instruction and Tier 1 interventions and strategies. 3. Plan targeted interventions for students not responding to core or Tier 1 & 2 Interventions. Supplemental instruction using problem-solving processes will be implemented.	1. Core teachers; Reading/Math teachers; administration. 2. Core teachers; Reading/Math teachers; administration. 3. RTI Team Leader; Case Managers; Core teachers; and administration.	1. Student progress is assessed via data points and on-going progress monitoring. Percent of students making progress is charted. 2. Student progress is assessed via data points and on-going progress monitoring. Percent of students making progress is charted. 3. Student progress is assessed via data points and on-going progress monitoring. Percent of students making progress is charted.	1. Assessment data and on-going progress monitoring will be collected and analyzed. 2. Assessment data and on-going progress monitoring will be collected and analyzed. 3. Assessment data and on-going progress monitoring will be collected and analyzed.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 64% of the students made satisfactory progess in reading.	In grades 6-8, 73% of the students will make satisfactory progress 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	1. Language rich literacy lessons. 2. Differentiated Instruction 3. Kagan Structures	1. Include additional non-fiction texts into lessons. 2. Determine core class needs by reviewing assessment data; Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction and interventions. 3. Think-Pair-Share and other strategies and interventions.	1. Teachers and administration 2. Teachers and administration 3. Teachers and administration	1. Student progress is monitored via assessment data and on-going progress monitoring. Percent of students making progress is charted. 2. Student progress monitoring determined by comparing student's trend lines to aim lines. 3. CWT checklists.	1. Assessment data: cluster and sub group scores. 2. Assessment data: cluster and sub group scores. 3. CWT 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
1. Kagan Structures	Grades 6-8 Social Studies, Science Language Arts and Math	Michelle Miller, Kate Albert-Hefner,	Grades 6-8 Social Studies, Science Language Arts and Math	Weekly PLCs; Monthly Curriculum Leaders Meetings; District Trainings	Classroom Walk Throughs; Observational Data will be used for follow up and monitoring	School Administrators.
2. Common Core Standards	Grades 6-8 Social Studies, Science Language Arts, Math, and Technology	Kate Albert-Hefner, Louisa McCutcheon, Karin Schmidt	Grades 6-8 Social Studies, Science Language Arts and Math	Weekly PLCs; Monthly Curriculum Leaders Meetings; District Trainings	Classroom Walk Throughs; Observational Data will be used for follow up and monitoring	School Administrators.
3. WOW-Schoolwide Vocabulary	Grades 6-8 Social Studies, Science Language Arts and Math	Karin Schmidt, VMS Curriculum Leaders	Grades 6-8 Social Studies, Science Language Arts and Math	Staff Meetings and Weekly PLCs	Classroom Walk Throughs; Observational Data will be used for follow up and monitoring	School Administrators
4. LA Reading and Writing Workshop	GRdaes 6-8 LA	Sue Mecklar, Catherine Cocozza, and Patty Brustad	Grades 6-8 LA teachers	Weekly PLCs and Quarterly trainings	Classroom Walk Throughs; Observational Data will be used for follow up and monitoring	School Administrators
5. Gradual Release of Responsibility Model	Grades 6-8 Social Studies, Science Language Arts and Math	District Personnel	Grades 6-8 Social Studies, Science Language Arts and Math	Weekly PLCs; Monthly Curriculum Leaders Meetings; District Trainings	Classroom Walk Throughs; Observational Data will be used for follow up and monitoring	School Administrators.
5. Fusion Reading COMPASS	Grades 6-8 Reading	Sue Mecklar	Grades 6-8 Reading Teachers	Weekly PLCs and Quarterly trainings	Classroom Walk Throughs; Observational Data will be used for follow up and monitoring	School Administrators

Reading Budget:

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

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 the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:
In grades 6-8, 3o% (10) of the students demonstrated proficiency in Listening/Speaking on Florida CELLA.

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	Immersion and Differentiated Instruction	Determine class core class needs by reviewing assessment data, differentiating instruction, providing ELL accommodations, and implementing research based on best practices and instructional strategies.	LA, Reading teachers, ESOL Contact, Administration	Classroom Walkthroughs and observations	Data will be used for follow up and monitoring

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:
In grades 6-8, 20% (10) of the students demonstrated proficiency in reading on Florida CELLA.

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	Immersion and Differentiated Instruction	Determine core class needs by reviewing assessment data, differentiating instruction, providing ELL accommodations, and implementing best practices and instructional strategies.	LA, Reading Teachers, ESOL Contact, Administration	CWT and Observations	Data will be used to determine follow up and monitoring

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

In grades 6-8, 10% or (1) of the students demonstrated proficiency in writing on Florida CELLA.

	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	Immersion and Differentiated Instruction	Determine class core needs by reviewing assessment data, differentiating instruction, providing ELL accommodations, and implementing research based best practices and instructional strategies.	LA, Reading teachers, ESOL Contacts, and Administration	CWT and Observations	Data will be used for follow up and monitoring.

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 34% (216) Level 3,4,5 - 67% (429)	Level 3 - 38% Level 3,4,5 - 71%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Monitor students in core curriculum. 2. Higher order thinking questions. 3. COMPASS Math Intervention Program.	1. Utilize assessments to monitor students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment via FOCUS and COMPASS. 2. Include higher order questions in lesson plans; create real-world math problems for students to solve within "real-world" e.g. relevance. 3. Utilize COMPASS ILS to remediate, enrich, and reinforce concepts previously taught.	1. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 2. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 3. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair.	1. Review student grouping charts to ensure groups are redesigned to target student need. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 3. Review student grouping charts and performance data to ensure groups are designed to target students needs.	1. FOCUS assessment data and mini assessments results. 2. CWT logs and focused CWT checklists to determine frequency of higher order questions. 3. FOCUS data assessment and mini assessments results.
2	1. CWT checklists 2. Assessment data; mini-assessment data; Curriculum Leader meeting notes. 3. CWT; lesson plans; and end of chapter quizzes.	1. Utilize assessments to monitor students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment via FOCUS and COMPASS. 2. Include higher order questions in lesson plans; create real-world math problems for students to solve within "real-world" e.g. relevance. 3. Utilize COMPASS ILS to remediate, enrich, and reinforce concepts previously taught.	1. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 2. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 3. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair.	1. Review student grouping charts to ensure groups are redesigned to target student need. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 3. Review student grouping charts and performance data to ensure groups are designed to target students needs.	1. FOCUS assessment data and mini assessments results. 2. CWT logs and focused CWT checklists to determine frequency of higher order questions. 3. FOCUS data assessment and mini assessments results.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 32% (213) Level 3,4,5 - 67% (429)	Level 4,5 - 34% Level 3,4,5 - 69%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Monitor students in core curriculum. 2. Higher order thinking questions. 3. COMPASS Math Intervention Program.	1. Utilize assessments to monitor students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment via FOCUS and COMPASS. 2. Include higher order questions in lesson plans; create real-world math problems for students to solve within "real-world" e.g. relevance. 3. Utilize COMPASS ILS to remediate, enrich, and reinforce concepts previously taught.	1. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 2. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 3. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair.	1. Review student grouping charts to ensure groups are redesigned to target student need. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 3. Review student grouping charts and performance data to ensure groups are designed to target students needs.	1. FOCUS assessment data and mini assessments results. 2. CWT logs and focused CWT checklists to determine frequency of higher order questions. 3. FOCUS data assessment and mini assessments results

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (385)	73%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Monitor students in core curriculum. 2. Higher order thinking questions. 3. COMPASS Math Intervention Program	1. Utilize assessments to monitor students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment via FOCUS and COMPASS. 2. Include higher order questions in lesson plans; create real-world math problems for students to solve within "real-world" e.g. relevance. 3. Utilize COMPASS ILS to remediate, enrich, and reinforce concepts previously taught.	1. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 2. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 3. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair.	1. Review student grouping charts to ensure groups are redesigned to target student need. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 3. Review student grouping charts and performance data to ensure groups are designed to target students needs.	1. FOCUS assessment data and mini assessments results. 2. CWT logs and focused CWT checklists to determine frequency of higher order questions. 3. FOCUS data assessment and mini assessments results

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lower quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (84)	63%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Monitor students in core curriculum. 2. Higher order thinking questions. 3. COMPASS Math Intervention Program	1. Utilize assessments to monitor students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment via FOCUS and COMPASS. 2. Include higher order questions in lesson plans; create real-world math problems for students to solve within "real-world" e.g. relevance. 3. Utilize COMPASS ILS to remediate, enrich, and reinforce concepts previously taught.	1. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 2. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 3. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair.	1. Review student grouping charts to ensure groups are redesigned to target student need. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 3. Review student grouping charts and performance data to ensure groups are designed to target students needs.	1. FOCUS assessment data and mini assessments results. 2. CWT logs and focused CWT checklists to determine frequency of higher order questions. 3. FOCUS data assessment and mini assessments results

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 # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66	69	72	75	78	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Hispanic 60%(19) White 68%(379)	Hispanic 68% White 69%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	1. Monitor students in core curriculum. 2. Higher order thinking questions. 3. COMPASS Math Intervention Program	1. Utilize assessments to monitor students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment via FOCUS and COMPASS. 2. Include higher order questions in lesson plans; create real-world math problems for students to solve within "real-world" e.g. relevance. 3. Utilize COMPASS ILS to remediate, enrich, and reinforce concepts previously taught.	1. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 2. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 3. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair.	1. Review student grouping charts to ensure groups are redesigned to target student need. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 3. Review student grouping charts and performance data to ensure groups are designed to target students needs.	1. FOCUS assessment data and mini assessments results. 2. CWT logs and focused CWT checklists to determine frequency of higher order questions. 3. FOCUS data assessment and mini assessments results

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A *is shown when the number of students in the group is less than 10.	By 2012, 100% of all ELL students will make a Level 3 or Higher on the FCAT 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	1. Immersion and Differentiated Instruction. 2. Rich math lessons. 3. COMPASS Math Intervention Program.	1. Student achievement chats will be conducted with all students following the collection of assessment data. 2. Determine core class needs by reviewing assessment data points; plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instructional strategies.	1. Math teachers, Math Dept. Chair, and Administration. 2. Math teachers, Math Dept. Chair, and Administration. 3. Math teachers, Math Dept. Chair, and Administration.	1. Student progress monitoring determined by comparing student's trend lines to aim lines. 2. Assessments, textbook resources and materials. 3. Review student performance data to ensure target needs have been met.	1. Assessment data; mini-assessments; unit and chapter quizzes and tests; oral assessments. 2. Assessment scores and sub-group data points. 3. COMPASS assessment results.

		3. Utilize COMPASS to remediate.			

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 32% of the SWD made a Level 3 or Higher on the FCAT in math.	In grades 6-8, 38% of the SWD will make a Level 3 or Higher on the FCAT 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	1. Tier 1 Interventions 2. Tier 2 Interventions 3. Tier 3 Interventions	1. Determine Core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. 2. Plan supplemental and/or intervention for students not responding to core instruction and Tier 1 interventions and strategies. 3. Plan targeted interventions for students not responding to core or Tier 1 & 2 Interventions. Supplemental instruction using problem-solving processes will be implemented.	1. Core teachers; Reading/Math teachers; administration. 2. Core teachers; Reading/Math teachers; administration. 3. RTI Team Leader; Case Managers; Core teachers; and administration.	1. Student progress is assessed via data points and on-going progress monitoring. Percent of students making progress is charted. 2. Student progress is assessed via data points and on-going progress monitoring. Percent of students making progress is charted. 3. Student progress is assessed via data points and on-going progress monitoring. Percent of students making progress is charted.	1. Assessment data and on-going progress monitoring will be collected and analyzed. 2. Assessment data and on-going progress monitoring will be collected and analyzed. 3. Assessment data and on-going progress monitoring will be collected and analyzed.

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60%	62%

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. Monitor students in core curriculum.	1. Utilize assessments to monitor students in the	1. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math	1. Review student grouping charts to ensure	1. FOCUS assessment data

			groups are redesigned to target student need.	and mini assessments results.
1	2. Higher order thinking questions. 3. COMPASS Math Intervention Program	core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment via FOCUS and COMPASS. 2. Include higher order questions in lesson plans; create real-world math problems for students to solve within "real-world" e.g. relevance. 3. Utilize COMPASS ILS to remediate, enrich, and reinforce concepts previously taught.	Dept. Chair. 2. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 3. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair.	2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 3. Review student grouping charts and performance data to ensure groups are designed to target students needs.	assessments results. 2. CWT logs and focused CWT checklists to determine frequency of higher order questions. 3. FOCUS data assessment and mini assessments results.

En

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student sungroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23.1% (15) students scored Level 3 in Algebra.	27% will score Level 3 in Algebra.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. CWT checklists 2. Assessment data; mini-assessment data; Curriculum Leader meeting notes. 3. CWT; lesson plans; and end of chapter quizzes.	1. Utilize assessments to monitor students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment via FOCUS and COMPASS. 2. Include higher order questions in lesson plans; create real-world math problems for students to solve within "real-world" e.g. relevance. 3. Utilize COMPASS ILS to remediate, enrich, and reinforce concepts previously taught.	1. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 2. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 3. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair.	1. Review student grouping charts to ensure groups are redesigned to target student need. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 3. Review student grouping charts and performance data to ensure groups are designed to target students needs.	1. FOCUS assessment data and mini assessments results. 2. CWT logs and focused CWT checklists to determine frequency of higher order questions. 3. FOCUS data assessment and mini assessments results.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student sungroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency.There will be a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| | 35.4% (23) students scored at Level 4 | 39% will score above Level 4 |
| | 41.5% (27) students scored at Level 5 | 46% will score above Level 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	1. CWT checklists 2. Assessment data; mini-assessment data; Curriculum Leader meeting notes. 3. CWT; lesson plans; and end of chapter quizzes.	1. Utilize assessments to monitor students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment via FOCUS and COMPASS. 2. Include higher order questions in lesson plans; create real-world math problems for students to solve within "real-world" e.g. relevance. 3. Utilize COMPASS ILS to remediate, enrich, and reinforce concepts previously taught.	1. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 2. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair. 3. Principal, Asst. Principal, and Math Dept. Chair.	1. Review student grouping charts to ensure groups are redesigned to target student need. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 3. Review student grouping charts and performance data to ensure groups are designed to target students needs.	1. FOCUS assessment data and mini assessments results. 2. CWT logs and focused CWT checklists to determine frequency of higher order questions. 3. FOCUS data assessment and mini assessments results.

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 :	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student sungroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency.There will be a two percentage point increase for all student				
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
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 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
No Data Submitted				

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. 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
No Data Submitted				

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

<div align="center">

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

</div>

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:

<div align="center">

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

</div>

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kagan Structures	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	Michelle Miller, Kate Albert-Hefner	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration

Common Core Standards	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	Kate Albert-Hefner, Louisa McCutcheon, and Karin Schmidt	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes including Technology	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration
Gradual Release of Responsibility Model	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	District Personnel	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration
WOW Schoolwide Vocabulary	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	Karin Schmidt and Curriculum Leaders	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration
TechAtive Inspire Training	Grade 6-8 Math	District Personnel	Grades 6-8 COT Math teachers	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 40%(102)	Level 3 - 44%

Level 3,4,5 - 61%(155)	Level 3,4,5 - 65%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Include higher order questions in lesson plans. 2. Implement IFCs and utilize Purpose Guides.	1. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 2. Create lesson plans aligned to the benchmarks; analyze data; share progress monitoring data from assessments; collaborate on enrichment activitied as well as intervention activities and atrategies; collaborate on mini-assessments and end of chapter tests.	1. Teachers, Curriculum Leaders, Depart. Chairs, and Administration. 2. Teachers, Curriculum Leaders, Depart. Chairs, and Administration.	1. CWT Checklists. 2. Shared lesson plans; PLCs analysis; flow and timing of IFCs via CWT.	1. CWT checklists and meeting logs. 2. FOCUS assessment data; mini-assessment data; Curriculum Leaders, Depart. Chairs, and PLC minutes and agendas.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	N/A

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 21%(53) Level 3,4,5 - 61%(155)	Level 4,5 - 25% Level 3,4,5 - 65%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Include high order questions in lesson plans. 2. Implement IFCs. 3. STARBOOKS Reading program.	1. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT. 2. Create lesson plans aligned to the benchmarks; analyze data; share progress monitoring data from assessments; collaborate on enrichment activities as well as intervention activities and strategies collaborate on mini-assessments and end of chapter tests.	1. Administration, Curriculum leaders, and Department Chairs. 2. Curriculum Leaders, Reading teachers, and Administration. 3. Teachers and Administration.	1. CWT checklists 2. Shared lesson plans; analyze data with grade level subject areas teachers; collaborate on mini-assessments. Administration will be able to follow flow of IFC via CWT. 3. CWT; Read-alouds; literacy letters, oral and silent reading.	1. CWT checklists. 2. PMRN data; mini-assessments data; Curriculum Leader meeting notes. 3. CWT lesson plans; end of chapter quizzes.

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:	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
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

Common Core Standards	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	Kate Albert-Hefner, Louisa McCutcheon, and Karin Schmidt	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration
WOW schoolwide Vocabulary Program	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	Karin Schmidt and VMS Curriculum Leaders	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration
TechActive Training	Grade 6-8 Science	District Personnel	Grades 6-8 Science Teachers	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration
Kagan Structures	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	Michelle Miller, Kate Albert-Hefner	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration
Gradual Release of Responsibility Model	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	District Personnel	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

90%(231)	90%

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><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>1</td>
<td>1.Targeted conversations and interventions for students not making AYP.
2. Differentiated Instruction
3. STARBOOKS Reading program</td>
<td>1. Students achievement chats will be conducted with all students following the collection of assessment data.
2. Determine core class needs by reviewing assessment data points; plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instructional strategies.
3. Grades 6-8 will read a common fiction novel by a well-known author.

.</td>
<td>1. Administration; Curriculum Leaders; Reading teachers
2. Reading teachers and administration
3. Teachers and administration

1</td>
<td>1. Teacher and student & administration and student will have data chats regarding assessment data and overall quarterly academic grades.
2. Student progress monitoring determined by comparing student's trend lines to aim lines.
3. CWT; Read-alouds; lioteracy letters; oral and silent reading.</td>
<td>1. Student assessment data; meeting logs; class grades.
2. Assessment data
3. CWT; lesson plans; end of chapter quizzes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4. Writing Process
5. Grade level writing prompts.
6. Writing within the core content.</td>
<td>4. Students will use the writing process daily; all writing will be dated and recorded in a journal, notebook, or work folder for monitoring growth over time.
5. Utilize grade level writing prompts to access and monitor students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment.
6. Infuse writing and reading into core classroom instruction creating an integrated approach.</td>
<td>4. Teachers and LA Dept. Chair; Administration.
5. Teachers and LA Dept. Chair; Adminsitration.
6. Teachers, LA Dept. Chair; Administration.</td>
<td>4. A school-wide consistent method of saving work will be established.
5. Review student grouping charts to ensure groups are redesigned to target student needs.
6. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT.</td>
<td>4. Progress between baseline and mid-year prompt/data.
5. Common writing assessment results.
6. CWT logs and data.</td>
</tr>
</table>

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
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
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kagan Structures	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	Michelle Miller, Kate Albert-Hefner	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration
Common Core Standards	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	Michelle Miller, Kate Albert-Hefner and Karin Schmidt	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Trainings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration
LA Reading and Writing Workshops	Grades 6-8 LA teachers	Sue Mecklar, Patty Brustad	Grades 6-8 LA teachers	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Training; Department Meetings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration
WOW School wide Vocabulary Program	Grades 6-8 Teachers in Core Classes	Karin Schmidt and Curriculum Leaders	Grades 6-8 Teachers from all four Core classes	Weekly PLCs and Weekly Training; Department Meetings	CWT and Observations with follow up progress monitoring	Administration

Writing Budget:

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage. ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease . ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more

	Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
99% (699/706)	100%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
302	274
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
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	1. Student Attendance 2. Parent notification notices 3. Counseling services	1. Daily Connect-Ed messages to families when students are absent from school. 2. Attendance notification letters going to all teachers on teams. 3. Attendance counseling for students and groups that are at-risk.	1. Asst. Principal 2. Asst. Principal 3. Guidance Counselor	1. Monitoring daily attendance data. 2. Monitoring daily attendance data. 3. Monitoring daily attendance data.	1. Attendance reports. 2. Attendance reports. 3. Attendance 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						

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
135	100
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
85	50
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
110	75
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
77	42
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Tracking and charting discipline. 2. PLC Teamwork 3. Community of Caring school-wide initiative	1. Progress monitoring, data collection, strategies, and interventions will follow the PS/RTI model. 2. PLC teams will identify priority social and behavioral strategies to address deficit areas. 3. Use Second Step curriculum on Community of Caring Mondays.	1. Asst. Principal 2. Asst. Principal 3. Asst. Principal	1. Progress monitoring and data collection of all demographics. 2. Progress monitoring and data collection of all demographics. 3. Progress monitoring and data collection of all demographics.	1. Discipline Data Reports 2. Discipline Data Reports 3. Discipline Data 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.*	BY 2012, there will be a 5% percentage point increase in parent involvement at school functions and activities as measured by the five + opportunities per school year.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
In 2012, PALS data of parent volunteer hours for VMS and OPS combined was 1,561.	For 2013, PALS data of parent volunteer hours for VMS and OPS combined will be 1,639 hours minimum.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Tele-Communications 2. Home / School Communication 3. Written Communication 4. Principal's Communication	1. Connect-Ed call to all families reminding them of the activities and programs. 2. Flyers sent home with students and as email attachments reminding them of school events and activities. 3. Newsletter information on school web site 4. Daily / weekly Principal's Blog.	1.Administration 2.Administration 3. Principal 4. Principal	1. Use Connect-Ed data to determine "successful calls" to homes. 2. Use team data to determine emails read and responded to via teachers. 3. Number of "hits" on web site. 4. Number of "hits" on web site.	1. Parents Climate Survey results. 2. Parents Climate Survey results. 3. Computer data 4. Computer 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						

Parent Involvement 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 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
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/10/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) has an important function for the success of Venice Middle School. Some of their responsibilities include but are not limited to:
~ Reach out to community to obtain more partners

~Organize FCAT/SHOWCASE Family Literacy Night
~Sponsor drives to increase parent involvement
~Work with SDMT Chair
~Analyze school climate surveys from teachers, parents, and students
~Support the initiatives helping to further the development of the Venice Middle Young Marines program
~Support TechActive Classrooms of Tomorrow

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Sarasota School District
VENICE MIDDLE SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	84%	77%	93%	70%	324	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	69%	70%			139	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?	72% (YES)	64% (YES)			136	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					599	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District
VENICE MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	77%	96%	68%	320	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	63%	67%			130	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?	62% (YES)	67% (YES)			129	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					579	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested