FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: WATSON B. DUNCAN MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Adrian Ocampo

SAC Chair: Robert Gilmore

Superintendent: Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval: 12/31/2011

Last Modified on: 9/24/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Mr. Adrian Ocampo	Bachelors Ed. Leadership Masters Guidance Masters ESE K-12 Guidance K-12 School Principal K-12		10	Egret Lake EL FY 12 A Egret Lake EL FY 11 A Palm Beach Gardens HS FY 10 A Allamanda EL FY09 A Dwyer HS FY 08 A Dwyer HS FY 06 C Odyssey MS FY 03 A Bear Lakes MS FY 01 C
					Assistant Principal of Watson B. Duncan MS: 2011-2012 Grade:A Performance Measure:621 Reading Mastery:66% Math Mastery:70% Science Mastery:67% Writing Mastery: 90% Assistant Principal of Watson B. Duncan MS:

	Assis Principal	Mr. Phillip D'Amico	– University of New York at Buffalo; BS Master's Degree Educational Leadership- Nova SE University; Certification- Educational Leadership, State of Florida; Principal Certification- State of Florida	8	8	2010-2011 Grade:A Performance Measure:597 Reading Mastery:83% Math Mastery:83% Science Mastery:74% Writing Mastery: 86% AYP:79% Black, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities need improvement in Reading. Black, Hispanics, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities need improvement in Math. Eighty Six percent of students are meeting state standards in Writing. This school did not meet Writing criteria in AYP for Students with Disabilities.(Improved percentage in Writing by 1%) Assistant Principal at Watson B. Duncan MS 2009-2010: Grade:A Performance Measure:603 Reading Mastery:82% Math Mastery:84% Science Mastery:69% AYP:79% Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities need improvement in Reading. Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities need improvement in Math. Ninety-one percent of students are meeting state standards in Writing. This school did not meet Writing criteria in AYP for Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities.(Improved percentage in Writing by 1%) 2008-2009: Grade: A, Performance Measure: 589 Reading Mastery: 79%, Math mastery 79%, Science mastery 54%. AYP: 92%, Blacks did not make AYP in Math, Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Reading or Math. 2007-2008: Grade: A, Performance Measure:565 Reading mastery 76%, Math mastery 77%, Science mastery 54%. AYP: 95%. 2006-2007: Grade: A, Performance Measure:553 2005-2006: Grade: A Performance Measure: 444
	Assis Principal	Mrs. Mary Raiford	Bachelor of Science Communications Bachelor of Arts Education Masters of Educational Leadership Certification: K-12 Educational Leadership K-12 ESE K-6 Elementary Ed		1	2011-2012 Reading Specialist Supporting North Area Accountability 2010-2011 Reading Specialist Supporting North Area Accountability 2009-2010 Jerry Thomas Elementary School- Reading Coach 2010 Grade A % Meeting High Standards Reading- 92 % Meeting High Standards Math-93 %Meeting High Standards Science-81 %Meeting High Standards -Writing- 88 AYP-yes 2008-2009 Jupiter Elementary Reading Coach Grade A, Reading Mastery:78%, Math Mastery: 82%, Science Mastery:44%, Writing Mastery:90%, AYP:97%, ELL did not make AYP in Reading. 2007-2008

					Jupiter Elementary Reading Coach Grade A, Reading mastery:78%, Math Mastery:80%, Science Mastery:57%, Writing Mastery:84%, AYP 90%, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math.

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)

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. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	Principal	On-going	
2	2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Assistant Principal Mentor teachers	On-going	
3	3. Recruit successful interns	Assistant Principal	On-going	
4	4. Soliciting referrals from current employees	Principal	On-going	
5	5. Mentoring new teachers	Assitant Principal	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

81	1.2%(1)	19.8%(16)	29.6%(24)	49.4%(40)	28.4%(23)	92.6%(75)	13.6%(11)	3.7%(3)	40.7%(33)

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
Carmen McKenzie	Kerry Mulligan	Mentor has completed the district required FPMS program to support a new teacher.	Completion of the new teacher Educational Support program
Casey Runner	Susan Green	Mentor has completedthe district required FPMS program to support a new teacher.	Completion of the new teacher Educational Support program
Courtney Hess	Valerie LaRocque	Mentor has completedthe district required FPMS program to support a new teacher.	Completion of the new teacher Educational Support program
Donna Perron	Sherrod Mosley	Mentor has completedthe district required FPMS program to support a new teacher.	Completion of the new teacher Educational Support program

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Single School Culture and Appreciation of Multicultural Diversity.

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

Required Instruction Listed in 1003.42(2) F.S., as applicable to appropriate grade levels

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal –
Oversees implementation of school-based RtI Leadership Team. Facilitates team process by evaluating and supporting team functions and providing feedback on team processes. Ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation.
Asst. Principals –
Participate in RtI Leadership Team process. Assist with data collection, assessment and decision making. Provide input regarding RtI Tier 2 and 3 interventions.
Guidance Counselors –
Oversee collection, interpretation and analysis of data. Direct school based RtI Leadership Team process. Coordinate implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Provide services and expertise on issues ranging from RtI Team design to assessment and intervention with individual students.
ELL Contact, ESE Coordinator and ESE Teachers –
Participate in team process by assisting with data collection and assessment. Also provide input regarding Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions and assist with implementation. Collaborate with general education teachers regarding development and implementation. Collaborate with general education teachers regarding development and implementation of Tier 2 and 3 interventions.
School Psychologist –
Participates in the collection, development and interpretation of data. Provides expertise in the development and implementation of Tier 2 and 3 interventions. Provides support for ensuring the fidelity of the intervention process. Collaborates with school personnel to facilitate data-based decision making and recommendations.
Select General Ed. Teachers –
Provide input and data regarding student performance and progress. Also provide data regarding Core instruction, implementation of Tier 1 interventions and collaborate with Team regarding the integration of Tier 1, 2 and 3 interventions.
Student Services Personnel –
Provide interventions and input regarding community based services for students and parents. Collaborate with team to support academic, behavioral and emotional success.
Department Instructional Leader – Identify student needs and provide input and assistance to school based RtI Team in developing evidence based Tier 2 and 3 interventions. Collaborates with classroom teachers to assist with the implementation of interventions. Assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring and staff development

activities. Provides data regarding scientifically-based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches.

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 Watson B. Duncan Community Middle School School-Based Response-to-Intervention Team will focus its efforts on students as individuals and on the facilitation of their academic, social and emotional well-being. Our team will meet as needed no less than once per month. The meetings will follow a pre-determined agenda which will be formulated from a broad-based collaboration between team members, teachers and support staff. The school-based RtI Leadership Team will review universal screening data, diagnostic data, and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team will identify the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. After determining that effective Tier-1 Core Instruction is in place, the team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic targets. The identified students will be referred to the school-based RtI Leadership Team.The SBT will use the Problem Solving Model to conduct all meetings. Based on data
and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic
and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive). An intervention plan will be developed (PBCSD Form 2284) which identifies a student's specific areas of deficiencies
and appropriate research-based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team
will ensure the necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented
with fidelity. Each case will be assigned a case liason to support the interventionist
(e.g., teacher, RtI/Inclusion Facilitator, guidance counselor) and report back on all data
collected for further discussion and follow up support for the students.

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 RtI Team will meet with SAC to assist in the development of school-wide strategies that will support the instructional process and promote student success promoting th vison and misson of the school. Members of the school-based RtI Leadership Team will meet with the School Advisory
Council (SAC) and will help develop and implement the SY12 SIP. The school based MTSS team meets on an on-going basis to ensure support and follow up is provided to meet individual student needs. Utilizing the previous year's data,
information on Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 targets and focus attention on deficient areas
will be discussed.
Topics for discussion include, but are not limited to, the following:
• FCAT scores and the lowest 25%
• Subgroups
• Strengths and weaknesses of intensive programs
• Mentoring, tutoring, and other services.

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:
• Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
• Curriculum Based Measurement
• Palm Beach County Fall Diagnostics
• Palm Beach Writes
• K-5 Literacy Assessment System (Incoming 6th graders)
• Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)
• FAIR Data
• Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
• Discipline Referrals
• Retentions
• Absences

Midyear data:
• Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
• Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)
• Palm Beach County Winter Diagnostics
• Palm Beach Writes

End of year data:

• Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
• FCAT Writes
• EOC

Frequency of required Data Analysis and Action Planning Days:
• Once within a cycle of instruction (refer to appropriate focus calendar)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

In-service to the faculty will be provided via TrainU, Learning team meetings, and Profesional development days cooridinated by the professional development team and administrative staff. Individual professional development will be provided to classroom teachers, as needed. These in-service opportunities will
include, but are not limited to, the following:

• Problem Solving Model
• Consensus building
• School wide Postive behavior support (swPBS)
• Data-based decision-making to drive instruction
• Progress monitoring through formative assessments
• Selection and availability of research-based interventions
• Tools utilized to identify specific discrepancies in reading. (AIMS web)

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Ongoing professional development and monitoring will be provided through the leadership team and school based team leader. The School based team leader and administrative team will monitor student data.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal - Adrian Ocampo
Assistant Principal - Phillip D'Amico
Assistant Principal - Mary Raiford
ESE Coordinator - Robert Gilmore
Language Arts/Reading Department Chair - Martha Griffith
Social Studies Department Chair - Carmen McKenzie
Guidance Coordinator - Carla Waldron
Media Specialist - Matthew Banazynski
Guidance Counselor - Sulimar DeJesus

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

1. The LLT and department instructional leaders will meet on a monthly basis to review and analyze data and support the reading instructional process.
2. Principal and Assistant Principals will observe and monitor the implementation of the school-wide reading/writing plans on a regular basis.
3. Principal and Assistant Principals will participate and monitor Learning Team Meetings,lesson plan implementation and lesson delivery to increase instructional capacity.
4. Principal and Assistant Principals will participate and monitor Department Meetings.
5. PDD team, Administration, Language Arts, and Social Studies Department Instructional Leaders will provide professional development on implementing Reading/Writing strategies school-wide.

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

To provide leadership with the common goal and vision of improving the school's learning gains in Reading and Writing. Increase Common Core Literacy strategies in content areas.

Increase student engagement with Creating Independence through Student-owned Strategies (CRISS) strategies

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.

All instructional staff are required to implement reading strategies. Science, Social Studies, and Technology teachers will implement Common Core literacy strategies. All other content area teachers will implement content area reading strategies (i.e. CRISS strategies, Learning Village lessons and appropriate materials). Training provided during professional development days, Learning Team meetings, TrainU, and other district trainings. Teachers will analyze data through EDW.

*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:	In grades 6-8, 34% of students (443) will score at achievement level 3 in reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT Reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Twenty-nine percent of students(379) scored at Level 3 in Reading of students have achieved proficiency in Reading.	Thirty-four percent of students(443)will achieve proficiency 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	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Provide differentiated instruction in daily instruction to meet the needs of the students.	Administration and faculty	Use of data from formative and summative assessments and student portfolios to determine strengths and weaknesses.	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports
2	Minimal use of reading strategies in content areas	Increase use of reading strategies in content areas through the use of CRISS, common core objectives	Administration and faculty	Use of data from formative and summative assessments	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports

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:	In grades 6-8, 18% of students (4)taking the 2012-2013 FAA will score at achievement level 4, 5,and 6 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Thirteen percent of students(3) scored at Level 4, 5, and 6 in reading on FAA	Eighteen percent of students(4) will score at Level 4, 5, and 6 in reading on FAA.

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	Meeting all individual needs	Continue to monitor IEP goals and strategies.	Administration, ESE Coordinator, ESE faculty	Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In grades 6-8 students achieving Level 4 or higher in reading will increase from 37%(479) to 42%(547).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Thirty-seven percent of students (479) scored at or above Level 4 in reading.	42% (547) of students will achieve Level 4 or higher 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	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Provide differentiated instruction in daily instuction to meet the needs of the students and increase student engagement	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports
2	Minimal use of reading strategies in content areas	Increase use of reading strategies in content areas through the use of CRISS and common core objectives	Administration and faculty	Use of data from formative and summative assessments	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports
3	The students' inabilty to answer the higher order thinking questions.	To incorporate higher order thinking questions into daily instruction and lesson plans.	Administration and faculty	Use of data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis, diagnostic tests and EDW reports
4	Inability of students to read and comprehend grade level texts.	Scaffold instruction to assist students with grade level text comprehension. ie; graphic organizers,outlines,	Administration and faculty	Use of data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis, diagnostic tests and EDW reports

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:	In grades 6-8, 57% of students (13)taking the 2012-2013 FAA will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Fifty-two percent of students (12) scored at or above Level 7 in Reading	Fifty-seven percent of students(13) will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading on FAA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of knowledge of fluency of facts	Provide differentiated instruction to remediate fluency of facts	Administration and ESE faculty	Meeting IEP goals	IEP, FAA exam
2	Meeting all individual needs	Continue to monitor IEP goals and strategies.	Administration, ESE Coordinator, ESE faculty	Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In grades 6-8 students making learning gains in reading will increase from 61%(756) to 66%(859).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Sixty-one percent of students (756) made learning gains in reading.	Sixty-six percent of students(859)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	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Provide differentiated instruction in daily instuction to meet the needs of the students and increase student engagement.	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis, diagnostics assessments, and EDW reports
2	Minimal use of reading strategies in content areas	Increase use of reading strategies in content areas through the use of CRISS and common core objectives	Administration and faculty	Use of data from formative and summative assessments	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports
3	Challenge of utilizing data for differentiated instruction	During LTM teachers will receive instruction on how to review data and develop strategies for best practices.	Administration, department heads	Teachers will incorporate strategies and best practices in their lesson plans and daily instruction.	administrative walkthroughs
4	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Provide differentiated instruction daily to meet the diverse needs of students.	Administration	Utilize data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports

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:	In grades 6-8, 31% of students (7)taking the 2012-2013 FAA will make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Twenty-six percent of students (6) made learning gains in Reading.	Thirty-one percent of students(7) will make learning gains in reading on 2012-2013 FAA.

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	Meeting individual needs of students	Continue to monitor IEP goals by providing differentiated instruction	Administration, ESE faculty, and coordinator	Meeting IEP goals	IEP, FAA
2					

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:	In grades 6-8 students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase from 57%(174) to 62%(189).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Fifty-seven percent of students (174) made learning gains in reading.	Sixty-two percent of students in lowest 25% (189) will make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Provide differentiated instruction in daily instuction to meet the needs of the students.	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis, diagnostics assessments, and EDW reports
2	Minimal use of reading strategies in content areas	Increase use of reading strategies in content areas through the use of CRISS and common core objectives	Administration and faculty	Use data from formative and summative assessments	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports
3	Inability of students to read and comprehend grade level text.	Provide students text/passages at appropriate reading level. Scaffold instruction to assist with comprehension acquistion strategies ie graphic organizers, outlines	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data Analysis, Diagnostic Assessments and EDW reports
4	Lack of student engagement and motivation.	Increase data chats and formative assessments to modify instruction to meet individual needs.	Administration and faculty	Utilize data from assessments and student work.	Data analysis, Diagnostic Tests, Data Chats and EDW reports.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 5A : School will reduce the achievement gap by 9% each year.			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Percentage of students making satisfactory progress will increase as follows: White:76% (610) Black:43%(71) Hispanic:72% (167) Asian:80% (41) American Indian:72% (4)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On 2012 FCAT,the percentage of students making	The percentage of students making satisfactory progress will

satisfactory progress in reading: White:71% (577) Black:38%(59) Hispanic:67% (155) Asian:75% (39) American Indian:67% (2)	increase by 5 % as follows: White:76% (610) Black:43%(71) Hispanic:72% (167) Asian:80% (41) American Indian:72% (4)

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	Inability of students to read and perform at grade level.	Scaffold instructional activities	Administration and faculty	Use of data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis, Diagnostic Assessments and EDW reports
2	Meeting individual academic needs of students and providing supplemental instruction.	Increase data chats and conferencing with students based on individual needs Provide specific instruction based on student data Provide targeted tutorials	Administration and faculty	Conference and data chat notes, data from formative and summative assessments	Data analysis, Diagnostics, EDW and classroom assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The number of ELL students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase from 8 %(1) to 13 % (2).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Eight percent of ELL students (1) made satisfactory progress in reading.	Thirteen percent (2) of the ELL 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	Students limited understanding of the English language vocabulary	Provide ELL students with reference materials that are language specific Provide additional vocabulary development Scaffold instruction to assist with vocabulary and language acquisition	Administration and faculty	Monitor vocabulary development through formative assessments and vocabulary notebooks	Teacher assessments, Diagnostics, FCAT, CELLA
2					

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:	The number of SWD students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase from 35%(66) to 40%(76).

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Thirty-five percent (66) of students with disabilities (SWD) made satisfactory progress in reading.	Forty percent (76)of SWD 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	Inability of students to read and perform academic tasks with proficiency.	Scaffold academic instruction Provide differentiated instruction	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis of Diagnostic Assessments and EDW reports
2	Insufficient number of support personnel available to facilitate learning goals of ESE students	Provide professional development opportunities to increase number of certified teachers	Administration, Department Instructional Leaders	Monitor teacher certification information	DOE teacher certifications
3	Lack of collegial planning and conferencing time between ESE teachers and regular classroom teachers	Provide opportunities for collegial planning through LTMs and PLCs	Administration, ESE contact, and faculty	Meeting updates, agendas and lesson plans	Data analysis of formative and summative assessments.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The number of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase from 53%(242) to 58%(265).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Fifty-three percent (242) of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in reading.	Fifty-eight percent (265)of economically disadvantaged 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	Limited access to technology and resources at home	Provide additional access to computers before, during, and after school Peer tutoring Provide homework assistance before and after school	Administration and faculty Before/Aftercare director and staff	Using data from formative and summative assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis of Diagnostic Assessments and EDW reports
2	Inability of students to read and comprehend grade level text	Scaffold academic instruction	Administration and faculty	Using data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis of Diagnostic Assessments and EDW 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
Provide training of Critical Thinking and higher order student engagement activities (ie: CRISS, Advanced Placement workshops)	All faculty 6-8	Professional Development committee, (PDC) Administration, Department Instructional Leaders Train U District offered trainings	All faculty 6-8	Monthly department meetings, LTMs,PDD, teacher workdays	Lesson plans classroom walk throughs	Administration, PDC
Increase use of Common Core Literacy strategies in all content areas	All content areas, 6-8	Professional Development committee, (PDC) Administration, Department Instructional Leaders	All content area teachers	Monthly department meetings, LTMs,PDD	Lesson plans classroom walk throughs	Administration, PDC

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	Fifty percent of students taking the 2013 CELLA will be proficient in listening/speaking.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Forty five percent of students (10) taking 2012 CELLA were proficient in listening/speaking.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited vocabulary knowledge	Provide opportunities for oral language development with ELL teacher and content teachers	Administration and ELL instructor	Learning gains on CELLA	CELLA

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	Thirty two percent of students taking the 2013 CELLA will be proficient in reading.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Twenty seven percent of students (6) taking 2012 CELLA were proficient in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited vocabulary knowledge	Increase reading fluency through small group work and vocabulary acquisition Use scaffolded strategies	Administration and ELL instructor	Learning gains on CELLA	CELLA

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Twenty eight percent of students taking the 2013 CELLA will be proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Twenty three percent of students (5) taking 2012 CELLA were proficient in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Limited vocabulary knowledge and	Increase writing ability by providing	Administration and ELL instructor	Learning gains on CELLA	CELLA

1	background knowledge	opportunities for writing, editing, and revising Increase vocabulary acquisition through use of word walls, notebooks, and graphic organizers			

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:	In grades 6-8, 34%(443) of the students will score at Achievement Level 3 on 2013 administration of the FCAT mathematics test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Twenty-nine percent(376)scored at Achievement Level 3 on 2012 administration of the FCAT mathematics test.	Thirty-four percent(443) will score at Achievement Level 3 on 2013 administration of the FCAT mathematics test.

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	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Provide differentiated instruction in daily instruction to meet the needs of the students.	Administration and faculty	Use of data from formative and summative assessments and student portfolios to determine strengths and weaknesses.	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports
2	Students not practicing higher order mathematical concepts outside of the school day	Use of Edmodo for homework assistance Use of online textbook tutorials and videos Use of remediation materials if online access is not available	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis of Diagnostic Tests and EDW reports.

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:	In grades 6-8, 40% of students (9)taking the 2012-2013 FAA will score at achievement level 4, 5,and 6 in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Thirty-five percent of students(8) scored at Level 4, 5, and 6 in math on FAA	Forty percent of students(9)taking the 2012-2013 FAA will score at achievement level 4, 5,and 6 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	Lack of knowledge of fluency of facts	Provide differentiated instruction to remediate fluency of facts	Administration and ESE faculty	Meeting IEP goals	IEP, FAA exam

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:	In grades 6-8 students achieving Level 4 or higher in math will increase from 41%(530) to 46%(599).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Forty-one percent of students (530) scored at or above Level 4 in math.	Forty-six percent of students in grades 6-8 will score at Level 4 or higher 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	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Provide differentiated instruction in daily instuction to meet the needs of the students and increase student engagement	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports
2	The inability of the student to apply skills that have been taught when working independently	Utilitize Edmodo and textbook websites as homework help sites. Conferencing with students Cooperative learning	Administration and faculty	Data chat/student conference Use data from formative and summative assessments	Data chat/student conference Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports

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:	In grades 6-8, 35% of students(8)taking the 2012-2013 FAA will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Thirty percent of students (7) scored at or above Level 7 in math	Thirty-five percent of students (8) taking the 2012-2013 FAA will score at or above Achievement Level 7 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	Lack of knowledge of fluency of facts	Provide differentiated instruction to remediate fluency of facts	Administration and ESE faculty	Meeting IEP goals	IEP, FAA exam

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:	In grades 6-8 students making learning gains in math will increase from 69% (847) to 74% (963).

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Sixty-nine percent of students (847) made learning gains in math.	Seventy-four percent(963) of the students will make learning gains in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Provide differentiated instruction in daily instuction to meet the needs of the students and increase student engagement.	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis, diagnostics assessments, and EDW reports
2	Lack of student engagement during class time	Increase use of problem solving through Cooperative learning activities Conferencing with students	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis of Diagnostic Tests and EDW reports.
3	The inability of students to complete assignments outside of the school day.	Provide assistance to students outside of the normal school day.	Administration and Aftercare Director	Utilize data from assessments and student work.	Classroom assessments, Data analysis of Diagnostic Tests and EDW reports.

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:	In grades 6-8, 31% of students (7)taking the 2012-2013 FAA will make learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Twenty-six percent of students (6) made learning gains in math.	Thirty-one percent of students (7)taking the 2012-2013 FAA will make learning gains in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Meeting individual needs of students	Continue to monitor IEP goals by providing differentiated instruction	Administration, ESE faculty, and coordinator	Meeting IEP goals	IEP, FAA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In grades 6-8 students in lowest 25% making learning gains in math will increase from 56%(168) to 61%(182).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Fifty-six percent of students (168) made learning gains in	Sixty-one percent of students in lowest 25% (182) will make

math.	learning gains in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Provide differentiated instruction in daily instuction to meet the needs of the students.	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis, diagnostics assessments, and EDW reports
2	Minimal use of reading strategies in content areas	Increase use of reading strategies in content areas through the use of CRISS and common core objectives	Administration and faculty	Use data from formative and summative assessments	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports
3	The inability of students to complete assignments outside of the school day.	Provide assistance to students outside of the normal school day.	Administration, aftercare Director, and aftercare staff	Use data from assessments and portfolios.	Classroom assessments, Data analysis of Diagnostic Tests and EDW reports.

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 # 5A : School will reduce the achievement gap by 9% each year.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The percentage of students making satisfactory progress in mathematics will increase as follows: White:80% (651) Black:48%(79) Hispanic:73% (169) Asian:89% (46) American Indian:72% (4)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On 2012 FCAT percentage of students making satisfactory progress in mathematics: White:75% (610) Black:43%(71) Hispanic:68% (157) Asian:84% (43) American Indian:67% (4)	The percentage of students making satisfactory progress in mathematics will increase as follows: White:80% (651) Black:48%(79) Hispanic:73% (169) Asian:89% (46) American Indian:72% (4)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The inability of the student to answer higher order questions.	Incorporate higher order questions into lesson plans and daily instruction.	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis of Diagnostic Tests and EDW reports.
2	Minimal use of reading strategies with math word problems	Increase use of reading strategies in content areas through the use of CRISS and common core	Administration and faculty	Use data from formative and summative assessments	Data analysis of Diagnostic Tests and EDW reports.

		objectives			

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 number of ELL students making satisfactory progress in math will increase from 46%(8) to 51%(9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Forty-six percent (8 of ELL students made satisfactory progress in math.	Fifty-one percent (9) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students limited understanding of the English language vocabulary	Provide ELL students with reference materials that are language specific Provide additional vocabulary development Scaffold instruction to assist with vocabulary and language acquisition	Administration and faculty	Monitor vocabulary development through formative assessments and vocabulary notebooks	Teacher assessments, Diagnostics, FCAT, CELLA
2	The inability of the student to process higher order questions.	Incorporate higher order questions into lesson plans and daily instruction. Scaffold daily instruction through cooperative learning and visual examples	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis of Diagnostic Tests and EDW reports.

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 number of SWD students making satisfactory progress in mathematics will increase from 36%(68) to 41%(78).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Thirty-six percent (68)of students with disabilities (SWD) made satisfactory progress in mathematics.	Forty-one percent (78) of SWD students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inability of students to read and perform academic tasks with proficiency.	Scaffold academic instruction Provide differentiated instruction	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis of Diagnostic Assessments and EDW reports
	Insufficient number of	Provide professional	Administration,	Monitor teacher	DOE teacher

2	support personnel available to facilitate learning goals of ESE students	development opportunities to increase number of certified teachers	Department Instructional Leaders	certification information	certifications
3	The inability of the student to process higher order questions.	Scaffold daily instruction through cooperative learning and visual examples Increase use of math manipulatives	Administration and Math Teachers	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis of Diagnostic Tests and EDW reports.

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 number of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in math will increase from 54%(247) to 59%(270).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Fifty-four percent (247) of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in mathematics.	Fifty-nine percent (270) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited access to technology and resources at home	Provide additional access to computers before, during, and after school Peer tutoring Provide homework assistance before and after school	Administration and faculty Before/Aftercare director and staff	Using data from formative and summative assessments and student portfolios	Data analysis of Diagnostic Assessments and EDW reports
2	The inability of the student to process higher order questions.	Scaffold daily instruction through cooperative learning and visual examples Increase use of math manipulatives	Administration and Math Teachers	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis of Diagnostic Tests and EDW reports.

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:	In grades 6-8, 5%(9) of the students will score at Achievement Level 3 on 2013 administration of the EOC Algebra test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Ten percent(11)scored at Achievement Level 3 on 2012 administration of the EOC mathematics test.	Five percent(9) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on 2013 administration of the EOC Algebra test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not processing higher order mathematical concepts outside of the school day	Use of Edmodo for homework assistance Use of online textbook tutorials and videos Use of remediation materials if online access is not available	Administration and math teachers	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports

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:	In grades 6-8, 94%(169) of the students will score at Achievement Level 4 on 2013 administration of the EOC Algebra test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Eighty-nine percent(97)scored at Achievement Level 4 on 2012 administration of the EOC Algebra test.	Ninety-four percent(169) students will score at Achievement Level 4 on 2013 administration of the EOC Algebra test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not processing higher order mathematical concepts outside of the school day	Use of Edmodo for homework assistance Use of online textbook tutorials and videos Use of remediation materials if online access is not available	Administration and Math teachers	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports

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 : We will reduce the achievement gap by 9% for 2012-2013			
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:	Percentage of students making satisfactory progress in Algebra will increase as follows: White:1% (1) Black:0%(0) Hispanic:0% (0) Asian:0% (0)

	American Indian:NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On 2012 FCAT, students making satisfactory progess in Algebra: White:99% (79) Black:100%(5) Hispanic:100% (13) Asian:100% (8) American Indian:NA	The percentage of students that will make satisfactory progress in Algebra: White:100% Black:100% Hispanic:100% Asian:100% American Indian:NA

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	Not all students participate in review sessions	Have students participate in review sessions	Administration and math faculty	EOC data	EOC

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:	The number of ELL students making satisfactory progress in Algebra will remain at 100% (1).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
One hundred percent of ELL students (1) made satisfactory progress in Algebra.	One hundred percent (1) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress 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	Students limited understanding of the English language vocabulary	Provide ELL students with reference materials that are language specific Provide additional vocabulary development Scaffold instruction to assist with vocabulary and language acquisition	Administration and faculty	Monitor vocabulary development through formative assessments and vocabulary notebooks	Teacher assessments, Diagnostics, FCAT, CELLA

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:	The number of SWD students making satisfactory progress in Algebra will remain at 100% (2).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
One hundred percent (2)of Students with Disabilities (SWD) students made satisfactory progress in Algebra.	One hundred percent of SWD students will make satisfactory progress 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	Insufficient certified support personnel available to assist in mainstream classes with SWDs	Provide certified personnel to assist in the mainstream classes with SWDs	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student portfolios	EOC

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:	The number of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Algebra will remain at 100% (15).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
One hundred percent (15) of Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in Algebra.	One hundred percent (15) of Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress 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	Limited access to technology and resources at home	Provide additional access to computers before, during, and after school Peer tutoring Provide homework assistance before and after school	Administration and faculty Before/Aftercare director and staff	EOC data	EOC

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	No data
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data	No data

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Students not processing higher order mathematical concepts outside of the school day	Use of Edmodo for homework assistance Use of online textbook tutorials and videos Use of remediation materials if online access is not available	Administration and math teachers	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports

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:	No data available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data available	No data available

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not processing higher order mathematical concepts outside of the school day	Use of Edmodo for homework assistance Use of online textbook tutorials and videos Use of remediation materials if online access is not available	Administration and Math teachers	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports

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 : We will reduce the achievement gap by 9% for 2012-2013				
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:	No data available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data available	No data available

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	No data available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data available	No data available

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students limited understanding of the English language vocabulary	Provide ELL students with reference materials that are language specific Provide additional vocabulary development Scaffold instruction to assist with vocabulary and language acquisition	Administration and faculty	Monitor vocabulary development through formative assessments and vocabulary notebooks	Teacher assessments, Diagnostics, FCAT, CELLA

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:	No data available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data available	No data available

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Insufficient certified support personnel	Provide certified personnel to assist in	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and	EOC

1	available to assist in mainstream classes with SWDs	the mainstream classes with SWDs		student portfolios	

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:	No data available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data available	No data available

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited access to technology and resources at home	Provide additional access to computers before, during, and after school Peer tutoring Provide homework assistance before and after school	Administration and faculty Before/Aftercare director and staff	EOC data	EOC

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
Pearson Success Net. Edmodo, EDW, Common Core Math standards, Word Problem strategies to understand steps in the process	6-8	PDD Team, Math Instructional Leaders	Math Teachers	PDD, LTM, Math department meetings, faculty meetings	EDW Data, Math Student portfolios	Administration, Depsrtment Leaders, teachers

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:	In grade 8, 53% of students (237) will score at Achievement Level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Forty eight percent (202) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in science.	Fifty three percent of 8th grade students(237)will score at Achievement Level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science test.

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	Inability of students to use and understand content vocabulary.	Increase student engagement activities to enhance acquisition of vocabulary (CRISS strategies, Graphic organizers, journals, visuals, etc.)	Administration, Science, Technology, and PE teachers (Collectively the Learning Team)	Utilize data from assessments and student work.	Data analysis of Diagnostic tests and EDW reports.
2	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Increase use of higher order questioning techniques	Administration and faculty	Use of data from formative and summative assessments and student portfolios to determine strengths and weaknesses.	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports

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.	In grade 8, 48% of students (3) will score at Levels 4,

Science Goal #1b:	5, and 6 on the 2012-2013 FAA in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Forty three percent (3)of students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science on the FAA.	Forty eight percent of 8th grade students (3) will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the 2012-2013 FAA in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack basic science fundamentals	Reread, reteach, rephrase basic science content	Administration, science and ESE teachers	Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA
2	Easy distractability	Break lessons up into smaller segments More use of hands-on activities	Administration, science and ESE teachers	Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	In grade 8 students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science will increase from 19%(78) to 24%(107).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Nineteen percent (78) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in Science.	Twenty four percent (107) of students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 on the 2012-2013 science 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	Inability of students to use and understand science vocabulary.	Provide addtional practice and instruction utilizing appropriate grade-level science vocabulary incorporating Common Core Literacy Standards	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student work.	Data analysis, Diagnostic tests and EDW reports.
2	Lack of evaluative and analytical thinking skills	Utilize the interactive textbook correctly to enhance skills of evaluating, critical thinking, and analyzing.	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student work.	Data analysis, Diagnostic tests and EDW reports.
3	Minimal use of higher order thinking questions in daily instruction.	Increase use of higher order questioning techniques	Administration and faculty	Use data from assessments and student work.	Data analysis, diagnostic assessments, and EDW reports

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:	In grade 8, 19% of students (1) will score at or above Achievement Level 7 on the 2012-2013 FAA in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Fourteen percent (1)of students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in science on the FAA.	Nineteen percent of 8th grade students (1) will score at or above Achievement Level 7 on the 2012-2013 FAA in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Easy distractability	More use of hands-on activities Break lessons up into smaller segments	Administration, science and ESE teachers	Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA
2	Inability of students to use and understand science content vocabulary.	More practice utilizing appropriate science vocabulary.	Administration, science and ESE teachers	Use data from assessments and student portfolios.	FAA
3	Lack of prior knowledge	Provide differentiated instruction in basic science content.	Administration and ESE faculty	Meeting IEP goals	FAA

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
Emphasis on targeting the specific grade level NGSSS	Science Grades 6-8	Science department chair	Science teachers	Bi-weekly LTMs, monthly department meetings, monthly PDD	Administration will conduct targeted walkthroughs to monitor that benchmarks are being taught.	Administration
Utilize Common Core Literacy Standards	Science Grades 6-8	Administration, Department Chair	Science teachers	Bi-weekly LTMs, monthly department meetings, monthly PDD	Administration will conduct targeted walkthroughs to monitor implementation. Meeting agendas and sign in sheets.	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$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:	In grade 8, 95% (425) of students will score at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher on the 2012-2013 FCAT writing test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Ninety-percent(371) of students scored at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	Ninety-five percent (425) of students will score at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher on the 2012-2013 FCAT writing test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The inability of the students to create appropriate quantity of supporting details to develop a structured paragraph and use transitional words, phrases, and sentences in the essay.	Develop brainstorming/pre-writing/organizational skills within paragraphs and recognize relationships between paragraphs through the use of transitions during pullout groups.	Administration, Language Arts teachers, District Writing Specialist, and Reading teachers	Analyze data from PB Writes, FDOE anchor papers and rubrics	PB Writes and formative data from writing portfolios
2	Increased attention to conventions and supporting details with the scoring process	Provide training for Social Studies and Language Arts teachers to increase support and emphasize conventions	Administration, Language Arts teachers, District Writing Specialist, and Social Studies teachers	Analyze data from PB Writes, FDOE anchor papers and rubrics	PB Writes and formative data from writing portfolios

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:	In grades 6-8, 91% of students (6)taking the 2012-2013 FAA will score at achievement Level 4.0 and higher on the FAA writing assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Eighty-six percent (6) of students scored at Achievement Level 4.0 and higher on the FAA writing assessment.	Ninety-one percent of students(6) will score at achievement Level 4.0 and higher on the FAA writing assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Meeting all individual needs for composition writing	Continue to monitor IEP goals and strategies.	Administration, ESE Coordinator, ESE faculty	Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA

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
Training provided to all ELA and Social Studies teachers in Writing conventions and supporting details	Grades 6-8 ELA and Social Studies	ELA Department chair, PDC committee, District Personnel	All ELA and Social studies teachers	PDD, LTMs, teacher workdays, In-class support	Analyze Palm Beach Writes and formative growth data	Administration, ELA, and Social Studies teachers

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

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:	Ninety percent1172) of the students will attend school on a regular basis.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
82%(1196)	90%(1172)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
263	143(11%)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive

Tardies (10 or more)	Tardies (10 or more)
74	32(2.5%)

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	Familial situations beyond the school's control.	Provide community outreach by having a designated faculty member to assist with contact.	Administration	Daily check of school computer database (TERMS).	attendance records

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

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

PD 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:	Implement a school-wide PBS to decrease number of suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
18	The number of in-school suspensions will decrease by at least 10% (16).
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
16	The number of students suspended in-school will decrease by at least 10% (14).
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
503	The number of out-of-school suspensions will decrease by at least 10% (453).
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
217	The number of students suspended out-of-school will decrease by at least 10% (196)

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	Undeveloped school-wide PBS	Develop and implement school-wide PBS	Administration, WPBS committee	Review of Discipline data	EDW 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
Provide training on						

school-wide PBS implementation and Single School Culture activities	All grades/ All subjects	Administration and SWPBS leader	All staff members	PDDs Pre-school meeting Faculty meetings LTMs	Monitor discipline referrals	Administration

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.*	School will maintain criteria in order to be awarded 5 Star School Award for SY 2013.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
School meets criteria for and has been awarded The 5 Star School Award. Criteria includes business partnerships, family involvement, volunteers, student community service, and School Advisory Council.	School will maintain criteria in order to be awarded 5 Star School Award for SY 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Parents job-related	To provide additional	Administration,	Data collection from	Students

1	commitment.	academic assignments to be completed at home.	teachers, and parents	student work	completed work
2	Parents not utilizing Edline web site.	To provide activation codes to parents for Edline access. To provide support to parents and students with Edline access issues.	Administration, teachers and parents	Data analysis of Edline activation.	Parental feedback
3	Information not reaching all stakeholders	To utilize phone callout system, school newsletter, outside marquee, and available technology to disseminate information	Administration and faculty	Collect participation data Family survey	Family survey Sign in sheets

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
Increase Parental usage of Edline	6-8	Edline Coordinator	Parents	SAC meetings Open House Ongoing through newsletters	Parental Feedback/Surveys	Edline Coordinator
Build awareness of school-wide positive behavior support (SWPBS)	6-8	SWPBS committee Administration and faculty	Parents and students	SAC Meetings Open House Ongoing through newsletters and Edline	Parental Feedback/Surveys Track discipline data	Adminstration and SWPBS committee

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:	No baseline data available. Begin administration of Industry Certification

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of capability to administer the assessment	Implement testing when information/tools become available	Administration, Choice Coordinators	Passing rate on Industry Certification Exam	Industry Certification Exam

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
Teacher Industry Certification Process	7-8	TrainU Choice Coordinators	CTE Teachers	TBD	TBD	Administration and Choice Coordinators

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
Science	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	NA	NA	NA	$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 9/24/2012)

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.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Palm Beach School District
WATSON B. DUNCAN MIDDLE SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	83%	86%	74%	326	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	66%	74%			140	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)	69% (YES)			131	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					597	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Palm Beach School District
WATSON B. DUNCAN MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	82%	84%	91%	69%	326	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	66%	76%			142	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)	73% (YES)			135	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					603	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested