FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: KIRBY-SMITH MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: June A. Marshall

SAC Chair: Wilma Starks

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/2/2012

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	June A. Marshall	B.S. Science Education M.Ed. Teaching and Leadership	10	18	Kirby Smith state grades during tenure here: 2007:A, 2008:A, 2009:A, 2010: A, 2011:A, 2012:A In 2012, 75% showed gains in Reading, 72% in Math; Among Lowest Quartile, 75% showed gains in Reading, 70% in Math. KSMS maintained the A grade, earning 644 points, an increase of 80 points over 2011.
Assis Principal	Saundra Moore	B.A. English Education M. Ed. Educational Leadership	9	9	Kirby Smith state grades during tenure here: 2007:A, 2008:A, 2009:A, 2010: A, 2011:A, 2012:A In 2012, 75% showed gains in Reading, 72% in Math; Among Lowest Quartile, 75% showed gains in Reading, 70% in Math. KSMS maintained the A grade, earning 644 points, an increase of 80 points over 2011.
					Kirby Smith state grades during tenure

	Name	Degree(s)/Certification(s)			Prior Performance Record
Assis Principal	Michaela Dougherty	B.A. Elementary Education M. Ed. Educational Leadership	8	9	here: 2007: A, 2008: A, 2009: A, 2010: A, 2011: A, 2012: A In 2012, 75% showed gains in Reading, 72% in Math; Among Lowest Quartile, 75% showed gains in Reading, 70% in Math. KSMS maintained the A grade, earning 644 points, an increase of 80 points over 2011.
Assis Principal	Beverly Crosby	B.S. Intermediate Education M.A. Middle Grades Education Ed.S. Education Leadership and Supervision	1	6	Kirby Smith state grades during tenure here: 2011: A, 2012: A In 2012, 75% showed gains in Reading, 72% in Math; Among Lowest Quartile, 75% showed gains in Reading, 70% in Math. KSMS maintained the A grade, earning 644 points, an increase of 80 points over 2011.

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.

	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)
No data submitted					

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. Kirby Smith participates in all district-led recruitment and transfer programs. We have a strong Professional Development program, supporting new teachers in classroom instruction as well as guiding their process through the TIP and/or AltCert programs under the guidance of CET / FPMS – certified mentors. Kirby Smith traditionally has no difficulty attracting qualified applicants for vacancies. We have a relatively low turnover and the professional climate is such that we have multiple applicants for each vacancy. We maintain a notebook of interested, qualified applicants.	Principal; Administration; Instructional Coach; Professional Development Facilitator (PDF)	Ongoing	
2	2. KSMS participates in teacher intern / pre-intern programs with the University of North Florida, Florida Community College at Jacksonville, Edward Waters College, and Jacksonville University as well as any other college/university who has an agreement with DCPS and whose interns are approved for assignment to schools in this district. This participation and interaction brings highly qualified candidates into our school for pre-service activities, offering the candidate knowledge of our school climate and, at times, leading the intern to apply for full-time position at KSMS after graduation.	PDF; Instructional Coach; Mentors; District Cadre	June 1, 2013	
3	3. Maintain notebook of interested, qualified applicants	Assistant Principal, Curriculum	Ongoing	
4	4. Kirby Smith offers support to teachers through our mentor/buddy-teacher program, PLCs, specific professional development as needed, and the on-going opportunity to earn master points for personal professional reading.	PDF; District Cadre; Instructional Coach; Principal	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
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
54	9.3%(5)	22.2%(12)	38.9%(21)	29.6%(16)	27.8%(15)	100.0%(54)	5.6%(3)	3.7%(2)	16.7%(9)

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
Tom Sterle	Adam Brown	Mentor is CET certified; both teach in same department	Observations, Collaborations, Meetings w/cadre and PDF
Michael Rossi	Nolan Howard	Mentor is CET certified; both teach sixth grade Science.	Observations, Collaborations, Meetings w/cadre and PDF
G. Lee Brooker	Robin Lemons	Mentor is CET certified and National Board Certified; mentor has worked with students at all achievment levels and has excellent classroom management as well as strong instructional skills.	Observations, Collaborations, Meetings w/cadre and PDF
Carol Orso	Amanda Swift	Mentor is CET certified, and is a guidance counselor who has previous experience teaching math at Kirby Smith.	Observations, Collaborations, Meetings w/cadre and PDF
Katrina Stinson	Ashley Ylda	Mentor is CET certified and has long experience at KSMS. Mentor is Guidance counselor, therefore having option to observe/support at varying times	Observations, Collaborations, Meetings w/cadre and PDF

		throughout day.	
G. Lee Brooker	Abigail Lineberry	Mentor is CET and National Board Certified; Mentor/Mentee are in same department, but have different plannings.	Observations, Collaborations, Meetings w/cadre and PDF
Mark St. John	David Smalls	Mentor is CET certified and both teachers are in same department.	Observations, Collaborations, Meetings w/cadre and PDF

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

NA

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Facilitator: Deborah Smith, Apollo;
Nolan Howard, Gemini; Ava Bethel, Atlantis; Ellen Luis-Jorge, Discovery; Nichelle Brown, Endeavor; Greg Kennedy, Voyager;
Terri Hardy, Pioneer; Beverly Crosby, Administration
June Marshall, Principal

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

The MTSS/RtI team will meet at least once a month, on the first non-ED Wednesday of the month, with members involved in on-going collaboration and meetings with other teachers/groups/PLCs at least once a week. The MTSS and the Building Leadership Team should focus meetings and collaborations around the following academic and behavioral questions:

1. What do we expect the students to learn?
2. What are potential barriers to student success in achieving their goals?
3. How do we know they have or have not learned what was expected?
4. What will we do when they do or do not learn?
5. What evidence do we have to support our responses to these questions?

Roles and functions of the Leadership Team include the following:
• Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions;
• Review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks.
• Use data to identify needed professional development and resources
• Collaborate regularly
• Participate in problem-solving planning and implementation
• Share effective practices
• Evaluate implementation
• Practice new processes and skills
• Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

In addition to the oversight work of the MTSS Team, other building instructional teams (such as professional learning communities, small learning communities, grade level teams, and/or content area teams) carry the work forward with smaller groups of students. This academic and behavioral work will include the following, beginning with Tier 1 (core/universal instruction).

• Identifying and analyzing systematic patterns of student need
• Identifying appropriate evidence-based differentiation and intervention strategies
• Implementing and overseeing progress monitoring
• Analyzing progress monitoring data and determining next steps

For the most intensive interventions at Tier 3 in the 2010-11 school years, instructional teams (PLC, grade level teams, and/or content area teams) will provide classroom support for 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 KSMS Building MTSS Team collaborates with other leadership in developing and implementing the School Improvement Plan by analyzing student data and reaching consensus as to goals and strategies that will enable the school to meet those

goals. The School Improvement Plan becomes the guiding document for the work of the school. The MTSS Leadership Team cooperates in regularly revising and updating the plan as the needs of students change throughout the school year. The plan includes a formal review process, which demonstrates how the school has used MTSS to inform instruction and made mid-course adjustments as data were analyzed.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Accelerated Reader/STAR on-line tests, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), District Benchmark Assessments as appropriate, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT—Math, Reading, Science), Benchmark Progress Monitoring Assessment (BPMA—Math)

Midyear: FAIR, District Benchmarks as relevant, STAR Reading Assessments

End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, STAR Reading Assessment

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school's Professional Development Plan supports continuous learning for all educators that results in increased student achievement and includes evidence of instruction's having been scaffolded. MTSS professional learning must be results-driven, standards-based, school-centered, and sustained over time. School Instructional Leadership Teams must establish protocols for on-going assessment and adjusting of the plan to meet school needs.
MTSS Professional Development should include more than scheduled workshops. In addition to traditional MTSS training during pre-planning, early dismissal, and faculty meetings, RtI learning is job-embedded and occurs during the following:
• Professional Learning Communities
• Data Team Meetings
• Team Meetings
• Classroom observations
• Collaborative planning
• Analysis of student work
• Book study
• Literature study
• Action Research

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Specific meeting times are set aside for MTSS leadership collaboration on the first non-ED Wednesday of each month.
District/Other professional personnel with specific training in the area of data research and strategy implementation are brought in to support teachers in the classroom and in their planning.
Team meetings, with support from administration, IC, and others as needed include review of data and success of strategies.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Facilitator
Kristen White, Reading Chair/Discovery; Connie McDonald, Instructional Coach/Media Specialist
Mary Griffin, Atlantis; Timothy Holley, Apollo; Leona Gray, Endeavor; Dezra Beth'a, Voyager; Shirelle Quaintance, Pioneer; Adbul Siddiq, ESE; Kifimbo Parnell, Electives; Saundra Moore, Administration

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

Reading Department PLCs are held bi-weekly and on an as-needed basis to review testing schedules and data, collaborate on lesson planning, organize motivational events, and implement strategies for encouraging the teaching of reading across the curriculum.
Teachers study baseline data for FCAT, STAR Reading, Accelerated Reader, and PMRN as well as READ 180 SAM data to plan for student instruction and implementation of differentiated strategies to increase student literacy skills.

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

- Administer all required/mandated state/district testing.
- Incorporate school-wide implementation of the STAR Reading test to track student growth/needs at all levels.
- Review data from all testing, both mandated and school initiatives.
- Identify lowest quartile students in need of additional support.
- Fully implement the Intensive Reading Program for all Level 1 and 2 students.
- Actively engage all students at all FCAT levels in the Accelerated Reader Program to support continued growth in all reading comprehension strategies
- Support cross-curricular professional development in instructional reading strategies for students at all leavels.

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 students at all FCAT levels are encouraged to read personal choice materials at least 30 minutes per night.
- SSR is incorporated in resource/enrichment activities in team planning.
- Accelerated Reader and STAR Reading are incorporated into resource/enrichment program schoolwide.
- KSMS has an on-going quarterly and summer Reading Rewards program.
- Professional development related to how reading strategies can be incorporated across the curriculum and into extra-curricular/enrichment activities is offered to all teachers and staff.

*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:	Increase the number of students performing at a level 3 or above by at minimum of 6%. Performance weakness among current students on 2012 FCAT: 6th Graders: Literary Analysis-43.6%(160)above standard, 7th Graders: Vocabulary-43.4%(138)above standard, and 8th Graders: Informational Text and Research-43%(111) above standard. Highest Performing Areas were: 6th Graders: Vocabulary-67%(246) above standard, 7th Graders: Reading Application 56.6%(180)above standard, and 8th Graders: Literary Analysis-71.3%(184)above standard. Focus for this year will address these as well as any/all new concerns.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
At Proficiency Level 3 6th Grade 33% (111) 7th Grade 30.5% (85) 8th Grade 25.1% (64) Overall Percentage Proficient (3+) 69% (599)	(719)75% of 959 at or above Level 3

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 Tier 2 vocabulary skills to support reading comprehension across the curriculum.	Imbedding vocabulary instruction and repeated use of Tier 2 words across the curriculum.	PLC Leadership; Literacy Team; Department Chairs; Administration	Observatons of classroom instruction and student responses; Growth in student comprehension.	Benchmarks; LSAs; FCAT; Accelerated Reader quiz and STAR Reading reports
2	1.1. Student population increasing; growing percentage of students not meeting Level 3 expectations	1.1. Intensive Reading (90 mins of reading per day) for Level 1 and some Disfluent Level 2 6th and 7th Graders The EDGE Program for Level 1 and some Disfluent Level 8th Graders FCAT Compass Odyssey Reading non-negotiable Monthly reading strategies in all content areas	1.1. Intensive Reading teachers, ELA/Reading teachers, and all core content area teachers	1.1. Use SRI results from READ 180 students Monitor STAR reading results for Edge students Monitor progress on Compass Odyssey Learning Path SREs Short/Extended Response	1.1. STAR Test Results SRI Results FAIR Results Compass Odyssey
3	1.2. A/B schedule not permitting students sufficient time to read in class and still allow teacher	1.2. All teachers certified in CAR-PD or Reading Comp 2, allowing the building in of reading time and/or	1.2. All teachers	1.2. Monitor Accelerated Reading progress for independent reading	1.2. Accelerated Reader Goals and Proficiency Scores

	to stay on pace with Learning Schedule	allowing for independent reading when classwork completed in all classes			
4	1.3. Students requiring more instruction in Tier 2 and 3 vocabulary to promote comprehension as evidenced by performance on FCAT, Benchmarks, and FAIR tests	1.3. Basic instruction and modeling of Tier 2 words Content vocabulary assignments using Tier 3 words Word Walls Vocabulary Tests on Accelerated Reader	1.3. ELA/Reading teachers All core content area teachers	1.3. Administrative snapshots Teacher observation	1.3. SREs Essays Short/Extended responses FAIR STAR FCAT
5	1.4 Less non-fiction/informationalmaterial used in ELA due to funding shortages for Scholastic Current Event monthly subscriptions, such as USA Today program	Increased use of Media Center with focus on current events and how they apply to course. (i.e. locating, reading, comprehending informational materials) Edge students using USA Today curriculum	Intensive Reading, ELA/Reading teachers, and all core content teachers	Uniform "Current Event" cross-curricular instructional format; one per core class per quarter	Classroom observations Student work

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

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Increase the number of students performing at a level 4 or 5 by at least 1%. Address general concerns of Goal 1, while increasing rigor and incorporating higher level thinking skills and strategies.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36%(310)	37%(338)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of competency in Tier 3 vocabulary and higher level comprehension / thinking skills	Imbed vocabulary instruction across the curriculum, with focus on content-specific vocabulary in each course	PLC Leadership; Department Chairs; Literacy Team; Administration	Observation of classroom instruction and student response and growth	Benchmarks; LSAs; STAR/AR Reports FCAT
2	2.1. Students who meet/exceed state standards needing increased practice in higher order and critical thinking skills	2.1 More time for hands-on activities that promot analysis and synthesis of learned material	2.1 ELA/Reading teachers All core content area teachers	2.1 Performance based artifacts showing mastery in understanding of common core reading standards	2.1 Annotation of Text Paideia Performance-based projects
3	2.2 A/B Schedule not permitting students sufficient time for reading and enrichment in class	2.2 Teams incorporating enrichment activities for those who are working above level and finishing work early	2.2 ELA/Reading teachers All core content area teachers	2.2 Maintaining of high-performing test scores and grades in order to continue participation in enrichment activities	2.2 FCAT Semester grades in core subjects Meeting/Exceeding Reading Goals in AR
4	2.3 The challenge of maintaining/showing growth on FCAT with new scoring ranges, as well as the inability to increase perfect scores	2.3 Providing incentives to challenge students to continue to strive for growth and/or maintain perfect scores	2.3 Administration PTSA	2.3 Growth in subject area FCAT tests	2.3 FCAT

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Increase the number of students making Learning Gainsin reading by at least 2%. Goal 1 performance concerns apply to all subgroups.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	75% (652)				77% (728)

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 and effective use of Tier 2 and 3 vocabulary	Imbed vocabulary instruction and incorporate consistent use of Tier 2 and 3 words across the curriculum	Literacy Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Dept. Chairs; Media Specialist; Administration	Literacy Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Dept. Chairs; Media Specialist; Administration	Literacy Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Dept. Chairs; Media Specialist; Administration
2	Lack of reading comprehension and higher order thinking/reasoning skills	Imbed use of reading strategies across the curriculum; Cross-curricular support of school-wide reading initiatives and Reading Challenge	Literacy Team; MTSS Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Media Specialist; Administration	Literacy Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Dept. Chairs; Media Specialist; Administration	Literacy Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Dept. Chairs; Media Specialist; Administration
3	3.1. Increased enrollment with higher percentage of students who need enrichment for growth in comprehension and extension skills	3.1. Compass Odyssey Reading non-negotiable Learning Path for all students Unit pre-& post-tests using Inform Enrollment in Team UP for bubble students	3.1. All teachers	3.1. Monitor progress on Compass Odyssey Learning Path Using data from pre-test to teach strands that need reinforcing and/or re-teaching Monitoring Proficiency scores in AR Quiz Reports	3.1. Compass Odyssey Unit post-test data Teacher observation
4	3.2. Teachers need practice determining ways to adjust specified Learning Schedule time restraints to reteach/enrich necessary concepts.	3.2. Provide professional development on new reading strategies to the entire staff using Common Core Standards and Next Generation Florida Sunshine State Standards.	3.2. All teachers Department Chairs/Reading Teachers	3.2. Administrative snapshots Teacher observations	3.2. SREs Essays Accelerated Reading Scores Short/Extended Responses

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Increase the number of students in the lowest quartile who make learning gains by a minimum of 3%. Goal 1 performance concerns apply to all subgroups.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (167) of 223	728% (164)of 240

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	Shortage of extended time/resources to provide additional, differentiated support in basic reading comprehension and math skills as needed for individual students	Encourage increased participation in TeamUp; Offer and encourage participation in Help Sessions and Enrichment opportunities; Provide reading materials of high interest at reading levels that will encourage personal reading; Students scheduled into Intensive Reading and Intensive/Double Block Math	MTSS Team; PLC Leadership; TeamUp Leadership; Media Specialist; Administration	Observation of students within the classrooms; Measure increase use of Media Center and Technology available to support growth	FAIR; Benchmarks; LSAs; Compass Odyssey Reports; Accelerated Reader Quiz Proficiency Report and Goals Reports; STAR Reports; FCAT
2	Lack of basic math skills	Participation in TeamUp; Intensive Math; Tutoring; Help Sessions; Demonstrated use of everyday math in all curriculum areas with explanation and discussion as tho "how it works" and how it applies to everyday life;	Math Teachers; Teachers across all curriculum areas; Guidance;	Observation of students within the classrooms; Higher performance on assessments and benchmarks	FAIR; Benchmarks; LSAs; Compass Odyssey Reports; Benchmarks; FCAT
3	4.1. Increase in number of students who entered KSMS as Level 1 or disfluent Level 2 creates need to find ways to adjust Learning Schedule to meet student needs.	4.1 Intensive Reading(90 mins of reading per day) for Level 1 and some disfluent Level 2s Compass Odyssey Reading non-negotiable Teacherto use of data to drive instruction to meet differentiated needs of students Bi-weekly reading strategies using Next	4.1 Intensive reading, ELA/Reading, and all core content area teachers Reading Department Chair/Teachers	4.1 SRI results from READ 180 Utilization of data provided by Compass Odyssey Learning Path, FAIR, and Accelerated Reader SREs Short/Extended Response	4.1 SRI Accelerated Reader / STAR Compass Odyssey Common Assessments Unit Post Test through INFORM

		Generation Sunshine State Standards (to be used on Early Release)			
4	4.2 Lack of extended time to provide research/MTSS/Magnet time for all students	4.2 Provide remediation activities through after school programs like TeamUP, FCAT Academy, and voluntary teacher-provided tutoring and help sessions.	4.2 Classroom eachers TeamUp and After-school program eachers	4.2 Improved scores on FCAT, FAIR, and STAR tests Scores on Unit pre/post tests Rise in percentage of Accelerated Reader quizzes passed Rise in Accelerated Reader Proficiency scores	4.2 Accelerated Reader / STAR FAIR FCAT District pre/post tests
5	4.3 Lack of knowledge of appropriate middle level vocabulary in both Tier 2 and Tier 3	4.3 Basic instruction and modeling of Tier 2 words and content vocabulary assignments using Tier 3 words Word Wall Increased use of AR Teaching utilization of Tiers 2 & 3 vocabulary in student vernacular	4.3 Intensive Reading teachers, ELA/Reading teachers, and all core content area teacher	4.3 SREs Essays Word Walls Vocabulary enriched assignments Administrative snapshots	4.3 SREs Essays Observations Short/Extended responses Monitoring of classroom conversations and discussions for higher-level "accountable talk"

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 # Increase proficiency in all student populations to meet and/or exceed state/national expectations/goals while closing achievement gap between ethnic groups. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	26% Gap	23% Gap	20% Gap	16% Gap	13% Gap	

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:	Maintain or increase proficiency in each subgroup to meet or exceed State Proficiency Targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Below Standard 6th Grade 7th Grade 8th Grade White 7.7.% (10) 10.87% (10) 12.31% (8) Black 42.93% (82) 35.05% (68) 41.88% (67)	Decrease by at least 4% in the number of African-American students not meeting the standard.

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
5B.1. Increase in total student	5B.1 Intensive Reading (90	5B.1 Intensive Reading	5B.1 SRI results from READ	5B.1 SRI

1	population, including increase in number of students scoring at Levels 1 & 2 creating need for teachers to be able to adjust specified Learning Schedule to reteach/enrich necessary concepts	mins of reading per day) for Level 1 and some disfluent Level 2 Compass Odyssey Reading non-negotiable Teacher use of data to drive differentiated instruction that meets the needs of their students Bi-weekly reading strategies using Next Generation Sunshine State Standards while transitioning to Common Core Standards	teachers, ELA/Reading teachers, and all core content area teachers Reading Department Chair/Teachers	180 Monitor progress on Compass Odyssey Learning Path SREs Short/Extended Response STAR data for 8th Grade Intensive Reading students	STAR Compass Odyssey Common Assessments FAIR Exit Slips
2	5B.2 Schedule will not allow students sufficient time to read in class	5B.2 Incorporate independent reading in all core subjects with cross-curricular promotion of Student Reading Challenge	5B.2 All teachers	5B.2 Monitor Accelerated Reading progress for independent reading	5B.2 Accelerated Reader
3	5B.3 Insufficient vocabulary and higher order thinking as demonstrated by FCAT results	5B.3 Incorporation of higher order thinking/questioning strategies Basic instruction and modeling of Tier 2 words Content vocabulary assignments using Tier 3 words MTSS Vocabulary Tests on Accelerated Reading	5B.3 Intensive Reading teachers, ELA/Reading teachers, and all core content area teachers	5B.3 Administrative snapshots Teacher observation	5B.3 SREs Essays AR Reading Goals and Proficiency Scores Short/Extended responses

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:	NA for KSMS AYP Goal 1 performance concerns apply to all subgroups
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2 students in 2011-12	NA for KSMS Total of 6 students in 2012-2013 4 Active, 2 Monitoring

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
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:		N/A for KSMS AYP. Goal 1 performance concerns apply to all subgroups.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
NA		NA			

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	See Goal 1	See Goal 1.	See Goal 1.	See Goal 1.	See Goal 1.
2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:		Increase proficiency in subgroup to meet or exceed State Proficiency Targets.	
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
6th Grade 60.82% (104) 7th Grade 64.47% (98) 8th Grade 59.68% (74)		65% at all grade levels at or above standard	

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Time constraints in adhering to district Learning Schedule while differentiating to meet student needs.	5E.1 Intensive Reading(90 mins of reading per day) for Level 1 and some disfluent Level 2 Compass Odyssey Reading non-negotiable Teachers use the data to drive instruction that meets the needs of their students Bi-weekly reading strategies using Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (to be used on Early Release)	5E.1 Intensive Reading teachers, ELA/Reading teachers, and all core content area teachers Reading Department Chair/Teachers	5E.1 SRI results from READ 180 / STAR results from EDGE Monitor progress on Compass Odyssey Learning Path SREs Short/Extended Response	5E.1 SRI Compass Odyssey Common Assessments STAR FAIR
	5E.2 Parent support/involvement and resources to enhance parent education	5E.2 Easy access to information and guidance for parents Teacher Websites	5E.2 All Teachers Media Specialist/Instructional Coach	5E.2 Tracking Website hits Accelerated Reader Widgets	5E.2 Accelerated Reader STAR

2		Open House Parent Support Nights Accelerated Reading Home Connect STAR/SRI/FAIR data letters with parent tips included	Administration	Sign in Sheets at school functions	FAIR FCAT SRI
3	5E.3 Vocabulary development and higher order thinking weaknesses as demonstrated by FCAT data	5E.3 Higher order thinking/reading strategies. Basic instruction and modeling of Tier 2 words Content vocabulary assignments using Tier 3 words Word Wall Vocabulary Tests on Accelerated Reading	5E.3 Read 180 teachers, ELA/Reading teachers, All core content area teachers	5E.3 Administrative snapshots Teacher observation	5E.3 SREs Essays Classroom presentations Short/Extended responses Accelerated Reader Proficiency Reports AR/STAR data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Learning Community for creating assessments, reviewing student work, analyzing data, and planning instruction	ALL	Department Chair Administrator	Reading and ELA Teachers in all grade and performance levels	Early Dismissal and as needed	STAR AR FAIR Benchmarks Pre-Post Tests Class Assessments LSA results	Lead Teacher Administration Leadership Team

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teacher Collaboration for planning and assessing student work	TDE Substitutes	School or District Budget	$2,000.00
Reading Celebrations	Reading Rewards and Recognition of Student Achievement in meeting AR Reading Goals	School and SAC	$5,000.00
Renaissance Learning STAR Reading and Accelerated Reader Program	On-line Reading Program / System for assessing student comprehension and growth in reading skills	School and SAC	$6,800.00
	Mobile Cart with Neo-2s for		

Neo-2 Mobile Lab and Update	classroom reading and writing support	School and PTSA/SAC	$5,200.00
Current Reading Materials available for student check-out through Media Center	Books and Reading/Research Materials for student check-out and novel sets / other resources for teacher check-out in support of instruction	Media Center and School	$3,500.00
			Subtotal: $22,500.00

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
School-Based Instructional Coach	Cost of one School-based instructional coach divided between departments	District/School Budget	$22,000.00
			Subtotal: $22,000.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $44,500.00

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:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
</table>

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

CELLA Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
		Grand Total:	$0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	To increase those students that scored a level 3 in mathematics by percentages required to meet State Proficiency Expectations. Greatest Weaknesses on FCAT 2012: 6th Grade: Geometry and Measurement 38.4%(141) 7th Grade: Fractions, Ratios, and Proportions 23%(73) 8th Grade: Ratios and Proportional Relationships 27.5%(71) Greatest Strenghts: 6th Grade: Base Ten and Fractions 470.1%(173) 7th Grade: Expressions and Equations 40.3%(128) 8th Grade: Geometry and Measurement 35.7%(92)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (563)	75% (719 of 959)

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 Tier 2 vocabulary skills to support reading comprehension across the curriculum.	Imbedding vocabulary instruction and repeated use of Tier 2 words across the curriculum.	PLC Leadership; Literacy Team; Department Chairs; Administration	Observatons of classroom instruction and student responses; Growth in student comprehension.	Benchmarks; LSAs; FCAT; Accelerated Reader quiz and STAR Reading reports
2	1.1. Gap in expectations between 5th and 6th grades	1.1 Differentiate instruction with rotation model	1.1 Department Chair Instructional Coach Administration	1.1 Quarterly Assessments Benchmarks	1.1 District Benchmark Agile Mind Compass Odyssey
3	1.2 Poor basic math skills and number sense	1.2 Administer a diagnostic assessment at the beginning of year to identify specific math skills and content weaknesses and use this information as the foundation for students' curricular and instructional planning.	1.2 Classroom teachers Department Chair	1.2 Quarterly Assessments	1.2 District Benchmark Compass Odyssey

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	To increase the number of students that scored a Level 4 or 5 by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31%(269)	33%(316 of 959)

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 competency in Tier 3 vocabulary and higher level comprehension / thinking skills	Imbed vocabulary instruction across the curriculum, with focus on content-specific vocabulary in each course	PLC Leadership; Department Chairs; Literacy Team; Administration	Observation of classroom instruction and student response and growth	Benchmarks; LSAs; STAR/AR Reports FCAT
2	2.1. Increased complexity of FCAT Grade 6 compared to Grade 5	2.1. Differentiate instruction by rotation model based on FCAT strands	2.1. Department Chair Administration	2.1 Benchmarks Assessments	2.1 Benchmarks FCAT
3	2.2. A/B Schedule does not allow for Math instruction on daily basis	2.2.School-created schedules designed to meet the specific needs of their students	2.2. District staff School Administration	2.2. Benchmarks	2.2. Quarterly Assessments

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Our goal is for all students to make at least a 1-year gain; but we want to have at least a 3% increase in Learning Gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (624 of 866)	75% (719 of 959)

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 and effective use of Tier 2 and 3 vocabulary	Imbed vocabulary instruction and incorporate consistent use of Tier 2 and 3 words across the curriculum	Literacy Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Dept. Chairs; Media Specialist; Administration	Literacy Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Dept. Chairs; Media Specialist; Administration	Literacy Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Dept. Chairs; Media Specialist; Administration
2	Lack of reading comprehension and higher order thinking/reasoning skills	Imbed use of reading strategies across the curriculum; Cross-curricular support of school-wide reading initiatives and Reading Challenge	Literacy Team; MTSS Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Media Specialist; Administration	Literacy Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Dept. Chairs; Media Specialist; Administration	Literacy Team; Reading Department; PLC Leadership; Dept. Chairs; Media Specialist; Administration
3	3.1. Deficiencies in Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary Development as they affect knowledge of mathematical terms and ability to understand concepts and problems.	3.1. Modeling of Tier 3 Words in math application; Use of Word Wall	3.1. Classroom teachers; Department Chair	3.1. Quarterly Assessments	3.1 District Benchmark; Compass Odyssey
4	3.2 Deficiencies in basic -- elementary and foundational -- math skills	3.2 Intensive math instruction; FCAT Warm-ups; FCAT Explorer	3.2 Classroom teachers; Department Chair	3.2 Quarterly Assessments	3.2 District Benchmark; Compass Odyssey
5	3.3 Gap in Expectations between 5th and 6th Grades	3.3 Pre-/Post-Assessments; Planning instruction based on data; Exit Slips; Use of Gizmos, Compass Odyssey, and FCAT Explorer	3.3 Classroom teachers; Department Chair	3.3 Quarterly Assessments	3.3 District Benchmarks; Compass Odyssey; FCAT

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Goal is to have the lower quartile improve in Math such that at least 3% more students show gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70%(152)	73%(168)

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	Shortage of extended time/resources to provide additional, differentiated support in basic reading comprehension and math skills as needed for individual students	Encourage increased participation in TeamUp; Offer and encourage participation in Help Sessions and Enrichment opportunities; Provide reading materials of high interest at reading levels that will encourage personal reading; Students scheduled into Intensive Reading and Intensive/Double Block Math	MTSS Team; PLC Leadership; TeamUp Leadership; Media Specialist; Administration	Observation of students within the classrooms; Measure increase use of Media Center and Technology available to support growth	FAIR; Benchmarks; LSAs; Compass Odyssey Reports; Accelerated Reader Quiz Proficiency Report and Goals Reports; STAR Reports; FCAT
2	Lack of basic math skills	Participation in TeamUp; Intensive Math; Tutoring; Help Sessions; Demonstrated use of everyday math in all curriculum areas with explanation and discussion as tho "how it works" and how it applies to everyday life;	Math Teachers; Teachers across all curriculum areas; Guidance;	Observation of students within the classrooms; Higher performance on assessments and benchmarks	FAIR; Benchmarks; LSAs; Compass Odyssey Reports; Benchmarks; FCAT

3	4.1. Deficiences in Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary Development (Math terms and general vocabulary)	4.1. Modeling of Tier 3 words in math applications; Effective use of Word Walls; Purchase of more computers for each classroom; Repair old computers to make the accessible for student use	4.1. Classroom teachers; Department Chair; School Technology; Administration	4.1 Quarterly Assessments	4.1 Materials inventory; Classroom visits
4	4.2. Lack of study, time management, organizational, note and test-taking, and self-motivational skills among students	4.2. Offer instruction in study skills and time management; Student preview of tests to assess time needed to complete each section; Employ Cornell System for note-taking during class/study sessions	4.2. Classroom teachers; Department Chair; School Technology; Administration; Guidance Counselor	4.2. Quarterly Assessments	4.2. District Benchmark; Compass Odyssey
5	4.3 Deficient background in basic math skills	4.3 Compare data from pre-/post-tests and other assessments; Provide assistance/support in areas of deficiency; Use of Compass Odyssey and Explorer; Learning Gizmos to reinforce skills and instill confidence	4.3 Classroom teachers; Department Chair; School Technology; Administration	4.3 Quarterly Assessments	4.3 District Benchmarks; Compass Odyssey; FCAT
6	4.4 A/B Class Schedule	4.4 Create more flexible schedule to allow time for accommodating student needs through Differentiated Instruction	4.4 Classroom teachers; Department Chair; School Technology; Administration	4.4 Quarterly Assessments	4.4 District Benchmarks; Compass Odyssey; FCAT

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : To imbed instruction in fractions, basic skills, and number sense to increase student performance school-wide, while closing achievement gaps based on ethnicities from 35% in 2012 to 31% in 2013.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	35% Gap	31% Gap	27% Gap	22% Gap	18% Gap	

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:	Maintain or increase proficiency in each subgroup to meet or exceed State Proficiency Targets, while decreasing percentage of African-American students not meeting at least the Level 3 standard.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Below Standard 6th Grade 7th Grade 8th Grade White 9%(11) 16%(15) 8%(5) Black 42%(80) 53%(102) 44% (90)	37% or fewer of African-American students will perform at "Below Standard" Levels.

			Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		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	Deficiency among lower performing students in basic math skills	5B.1 Use of Intensive Math instruction. FCAT warm-ups, compass odyssey, Gizmos, STAR Math, FCAT explorer; Teacher use of pre- and post- assessments; Use of exit slips; Collaboration about the data; After-school tutoring; Learning/Study Group collaboration with fellow teachers within department; PLC district training; attending math in-service, ongoing assessment and remediation throughout the year	5B.1. Classroom teachers; Department Chair; Administration	5B.1. Focus Walks; Data from pre and post test; exit slips; Teacher collaboration	5B.1. Benchmarks; Pre- and post-test data; FCAT data
2	Lack of parental involvement and support	Parent nights and informational sessions to equip parents with needed information and to encourage their support of students	MTSS Leadership; Teachers; Administration	Parent involvement increase; better student participation; learning gains	Attendance rosters; Progress reports; Benchmarks

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	N/A for KSMS AYP. Our goal is for all students to make at least a one-year gain. We want to have at least a 4% increase in learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A 5 students only	N/A 2 students only

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	N/A for KSMS AYP. Our goal is for all students to make at least a one-year gain. We want to have at least a 4% increase in learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A		N/A		

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Our goal is to enrich basic math and test-taking skills such that all students make at least a 1 year gain, and that all subgroups show percentages to meet State Proficiency Expectations.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (232)	86%(400)

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	5D.1. Poor Basic Math Skills	5D.1. Regular assessment, comparison of pre and post-test performance on common assessments, skill-building in deficient area, Compass-Odyssey and explorer Learning Gizmos to reinforce math skills and confidence. Use Intensive math instruction. FCAT warm-ups, Compass Odyssey, Gizmos, STAR Math, FCAT explorer. Have teacher create pre and post test assessments, exit slips, and talk about the data. After-school tutoring, learning study group collaboration with fellow teachers within department, PLC district training, attending math in-service, ongoing assessment and remediation throughout the year.	Classroom teachers	Administer regular assessments; Observe student performance;	Benchmarks; FCAT

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:	To see the percentage of students scoring At/Above Proficiency to increase by at least to a minimum of 95%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41.5% (27) in Level 3 on FCAT 2012	43% (51) at Level 3 in 2013

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Tier 2 vocabulary skills to support reading comprehension across the curriculum.	Imbedding vocabulary instruction and repeated use of Tier 2 words across the curriculum.	PLC Leadership; Literacy Team; Department Chairs; Administration	Observatons of classroom instruction and student responses; Growth in student comprehension.	Benchmarks; LSAs; FCAT; Accelerated Reader quiz and STAR Reading reports
2	Lack of study and organizational skills	Instruction in good organizational skills and study habits; Preview of materials/assignments with guidance in determining time required to be successful on assignments	PLC Team; Algebra Teachers; Math Lead/Chair	Teacher Assessments; Quarterly Assessments	District Benchmarks; FCAT

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:	To increase the number of students scoring in Level 4 by 2%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% (34)	55% (66)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of competency in Tier 3 vocabulary and higher level comprehension / thinking skills	Imbed vocabulary instruction across the curriculum, with focus on content-specific vocabulary in each course	PLC Leadership; Department Chairs; Literacy Team; Administration	Observation of classroom instruction and student response and growth	Benchmarks; LSAs; STAR/AR Reports FCAT
2	Lack of understanding of fractions; students want to convert all fractions to decimals.	Imbed instruction in fractions and other missing skills in regular classroom instructions. Differentiate instruction in pull-out groups to address specific needs.	Classroom Teacher; Administrator	Observation of student work time; Assessments; Benchmarks	Assessments; FCAT

3	Lack of motivation to increase already high FCAT performance	Imbedding of creative, engaging activities to raise student motivational level and relate learning to real life	PLC Team; Algebra Teachers; Math Lead/Chair Administration	Assessments; Teacher Observation of Student Engagement; Benchmarks	Benchmarks; FCAT

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 :	To imbed instruction in basic number skills and math sense in order to see overall student growth in achievement levels and to support the reduction of the achievement gap by 3%, from 23% in 2012 to 20% in 2013.		
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	23%	20%	17%	14%	11%	

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:	To embed basic math, number sense, and higher level reasoning skills such that the number of students scoring below the proficiency level will decrease by at least 4%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black Students 35% (34) at Levels 1 or 2	31%(37)

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 without necessary background in basic math or higher order reasoning skills	Implement instruction in fractions and basic math skills and number sense; Incorporated activities to increase cognitive critical thinking skills	Classroom teacher; PLC teams; Administration	Benchmarks; Classroom Assessments	Benchmarks; FCAT

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of basic math, study and organizational skills PLC Team; Algebra Teachers; Math Lead/Chair Teacher Assessments; Quarterly Assessments District Benchmarks; FCA	Instruction in basic math skill missing; Instruction in good organizational skills and study habits; Preview of materials/assignments with guidance in determining time required to be successful on assignments	PLC Team; Algebra Teachers; Math Lead/Chair	Teacher Assessments; Quarterly Assessments	District Benchmarks; FCA

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:	To increase the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 on the Geometry assessment to at least 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%(25)of 65 students scored at Level 3 on Algebra EOC in Spring 2012. (Current Geometry classes) 100% of last year' Geometry students scored at Level 3 or Above (ON TARGET) on Spring EOC, 2012	100% (63)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Tier 2 vocabulary skills to support reading comprehension across the curriculum.	Imbedding vocabulary instruction and repeated use of Tier 2 words across the curriculum.	PLC Leadership; Literacy Team; Department Chairs; Administration	Observatons of classroom instruction and student responses; Growth in student comprehension.	Benchmarks; LSAs; FCAT; Accelerated Reader quiz and STAR Reading 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:	To increase the number of students scoring at Levels 4 or 5 to 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
94% (65) students scored at Levels 4 or 5 on 2012 EOC.	95% (60)

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 competency in Tier 3 vocabulary and higher level comprehension / thinking skills	Imbed vocabulary instruction across the curriculum, with focus on content-specific vocabulary in each course	PLC Leadership; Department Chairs; Literacy Team; Administration	Observation of classroom instruction and student response and growth	Benchmarks; LSAs; STAR/AR Reports FCAT
2	Lack of higher level critical thinking skills interferes with practical application and extension of concepts learned.	Include real-life applications in classroom discussions; Offer increased opportunities for students to engage in projects requiring skills application	Geometry teacher PLC Administration	Observation of student performance; Benchmark scores	Benchmarks; EOC; FCAT

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target					
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A :				

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	All students taking Geometry in 8th grade will score at/above proficiency on both EOC and FCAT exams.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, all Geometry students scored at/above proficiency.	Maintain 100% proficiency rate; increase %age of Levels 4/5 by at least 5%.

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Academy of Math	7th Grade	Math Lead/Dept. Chair	Math Teachers	October 2012	Student Data	Math Lead Teacher Administration

Agile Mind	All	Math Lead/Dept. Chair	Intensive Math Teachers	September 2012	Student Data	Math Lead Teacher Administration
Training on Odyssey	All	Math Lead/Dept. Chair	All grade levels	September 2012	Student Data	Math Lead Teacher Administration
PLC Training	6th Grade	District Coach	6th Grade, MJ/1	Monthly, beginning September 2012	Focus Walks Student Data	Math Lead Teacher Administration
PLC/Early Release - School Based	All	Each Grade Level and Course	All Grade Levels	All Early Release Dates	Focus Walks Student Data	Math Lead/Dept. Chair
Attend NCTM Conference	All	Math Teachers	All Math teachers	October 2012	Sharing of Information	Math Lead/Dept. Chair

Mathematics Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Algebra'sCool / Math'sCool Programs	Instructional Videos	School Budget/PTSA/SAC	$3,500.00
		Subtotal:	$3,500.00

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Effective Data	E-Instruction systems to help with assessments	SAC/School Budget	$5,000.00
Student Involvement with Technology	Mimios	SAC/School Budget	$5,000.00
Student Involvement with Technology	E-instruction mobile		$5,000.00
		Subtotal:	$15,000.00

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Training/{PLC)/Odyssey	Substitutes	School Budget	$2,000.00
Attend NCTM Conference	Substitutes and Registration/Costs	School Budget/SAC	$1,750.00
School-Based Instructional Coach	Cost of one School-based instructional coach divided between departments	District/School Budget	$22,000.00
		Subtotal:	$25,750.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
		Grand Total:	$44,250.00

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:	The goal is to increase the level of performance at Proficiency Level 3 by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

54%(138)	59%	

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anticipated Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of Tier 2 vocabulary skills to support reading comprehension across the curriculum.</td>
<td>Imbedding vocabulary instruction and repeated use of Tier 2 words across the curriculum.</td>
<td>PLC Leadership; Literacy Team; Department Chairs; Administration</td>
<td>Observatons of classroom instruction and student responses; Growth in student comprehension.</td>
<td>Benchmarks; LSAs; FCAT; Accelerated Reader quiz and STAR Reading reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1.
Lack of Vocabulary/Reading Skills</td>
<td>1.1.
Identify Science Related Vocabulary; Provide more opportunities for content reading</td>
<td>1.1.
Classroom teachers; Dept. Chair; Administration</td>
<td>1.1.
Benchmarks</td>
<td>1.1.
District Benchmarks; FCAT results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2.
Lack of motivation among some students to achieve highest possible FCAT score and recognize connection of content to real life</td>
<td>1.2.
Stress importance of test for determining HS course selections; Begin early in year to enhance and excite learning using scientific skills by promoting science projects</td>
<td>1.2.
Classroom teachers; Dept. Chair; Administration</td>
<td>1.2.
FCAT Practice Test scores</td>
<td>1.2.
FCAT Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3.
Deficiency in retaining concepts from previous grades</td>
<td>1.3.
Create warm-ups to reinforce previous years' benchmarks and implement FCIM calendar;
Use 5th Grade FCAT science scores to identify deficiencies that need re-teaching/ additional support.</td>
<td>1.3.
Classroom teachers; Dept. Chair; Administration</td>
<td>1.3.
Pre-tests and quizzes</td>
<td>1.3.
Classroom Observations; Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4
Deficiency in comprehension of content and understanding questions while making connections to real world phenomenon</td>
<td>Identify science-related vocabulary; Provide additional opportunities for content-area reading; identifying FCAT weaknesses from 8th grade data and reteaching using differentiated methods in all grade levels</td>
<td>Classroom teachers; Dept. Chair</td>
<td>Benchmarks</td>
<td>District Benchmarks; FCAT Results</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The target is to raise the percentage of students scoring in Levels 4 and 5 by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 5: 5.5%(14) Level 4: 14.2%(36)	Level 5: 7.5% Level 4: 16.2%

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 competency in Tier 3 vocabulary and higher level comprehension / thinking skills	Imbed vocabulary instruction across the curriculum, with focus on content-specific vocabulary in each course	PLC Leadership; Department Chairs; Literacy Team; Administration	Observation of classroom instruction and student response and growth	Benchmarks; LSAs; STAR/AR Reports FCAT
2	2.1. Lack of student motivation to achieve highest possible FCAT score	2.1. Provide engaging activities to increase knowledge and motivation.	2.1. Classroom teachers; Dept. Chair; Guidance Counselor; Administration	2.1. FCAT Practice Test scores	2.1. FCAT; Benchmarks
3	2.2. Lack of time for enrichment activities/research	2.2. Provide enrichment activities planned and coordinated with cross-curricular cooperation within teams	2.2. Dept. Chair Team teachers	2.2. Student work	2.2. Increase of test scores; Higher level of student engagement; Higher quality student work
4	2.3 Varied needs within class requiring differentiated instruction to challenge high-performing students	2.3 Use of data in planning to increase rigor and encourage use of higher order thinking skills	Classroom teachers	2.3 Student work	2.3 Warm ups, classwork with teacher monitored verbal evaluation, homework and projects.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiation	All Grade Levels	Science Lead	Science department teachers	Early Release PLCs	Teachers correctly interpreting data to determine needs and plan instruction accordingly	Administration; PLC Leadership
Content Reading and Vocabulary	All Grade Levels	Science Lead; Instructional/Reading Coach; District Coaches	Science teachers	Early Release PLCs	Teachers incorporating Reading comprehension support into daily instruction	Instructional Coach; Administration
New CarPD Training	All Grade Levels	District-provided Facilitators	Science teachers	TDE	Teachers incorporating reading instruction into science instruction	Instructional Coach; Administration
Enrichment	All Grade Levels	Science Lead	Science Department teachers	Early Release PLCs	Teacher-created, employed activities requiring higher-level critical thinking skills to produce resulting in more student engagement and higher quality student work	Administration; PLC Leadership

---

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
After-school Tutoring	Teachers	SAI	$2,000.00
Hands-on Activities	Purchase of Materials	Science Dept. Funds	$4,500.00
			Subtotal: $6,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CPS Systems	Improve expertise of teachers on systems	Science Dept. Funds	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Technology/Science Conference	FCTS	School Budget/SAC	$1,200.00
School-Based Instructional Coach	Cost of one School-based instructional coach divided between departments	District/School Budget	$22,000.00
			Subtotal: $23,200.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $31,200.00

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	To increase percentage of students achieving at level 4 and above., specifically by addressing: Focus: Addressing the prompt as presented and staying on topic, and Support: Including stronger support for ideas expressed by giving specific details, better descriptions, and using more engaging presentation.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77%(197) at 3.5+	75% at Level 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	1.1. Students needing remediated writing instruction and skills development	1.1. On-going assessments and data driven planning; Writing practice across both grade levels and curriculum areas; Intensive Writing Workshops offered as after-school turtorials; Writing enrichment activities	1.1. Classroom teachers; Departmental leadership; Administration	1.1 School-wide administration of District Writing Assessments; Data from district and school-based writing assessments	1.1. Writing Rubric
2	1.2. Shortage of computers to use in preparing for on-line testing	1.2. Acquire additional NEO and/or utilize existing NEOs; Updated computers/systems in Media Center and classrooms	1.2. District Staff School Staff w/Partners	1.2. Assessment Results	1.2. Reports of writing assessment results
3	1.3. Lack of student motivation to increase already passing scores	1.3. Set expectations to reach a goal of Level 6; Communicate requirements of the	1.3. Teachers Administrators	1.3. Increased Scores on District Writing	1.3. FCAT; State Wrting Rubric

		rubric clearly			
4	1.4. Lack of background knowledge in preparation for writing prompt	1.4. Teaching how to analyze and respond to the prompt to fit individual student experience	1.4. Teachers; TeamUP Facilitator	1.4. On-going Writing Assessments	1.4. State Writing Rubric and Sample Papers; FCAT Scores
5	1.5. Change in scoring rubric now emphasizing conventions	1.5. Teaching specific grammar and mechanics skills in realtionship to writing across the curriculum; Collaborate with core and elective teachers on the high expectations of the writing rubric	1.5. All subject area teachers	1.5. Ongoing daily monitoring and assessment of written products; Maintenance of consistent expectations for grammar and mechanics	1.5. Essays; Reports; Short and Extended Responses; Assessments; FCAT

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

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Rubric and Instructional Strategies	All/All	ELA Lead Teacher/Chair; Instructional Coach; Select teachers	All teachers in cross-curricular overview; All new/in-need-of-assistance teachers in in-depth study of rubric and strategies	November 2012	Student Writing Assessment Data Modeling; Observations	ELA Lead; Instructional Coach; Administration
					Collaborative	

PLC Rubric Scoring Workship	All/All	Various teachers	All ELA; Others as needed	November 2012	assessment sessions; Looking at student work together; PLC collaborative analysis of Writing Data	ELA Lead; Selected teachers; Instructional Coach; Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Student use of technology to advance skills	Computer-based writing program, MyAccess to work with NEO-2 labs	SAC/School Budges	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mobile Labs	NEO mobile labs to support writing instruction across curriculum	School/SAC	$7,000.00
			Subtotal: $7,000.00
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: $8,000.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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
Lack of Tier 2 vocabulary skills to support reading	Imbedding vocabulary instruction and repeated use of Tier 2	PLC Leadership; Literacy Team; Department	Observatons of classroom instruction and student responses;	Benchmarks; LSAs; FCAT;

| 1 | comprehension across the curriculum. | words across the curriculum. | Chairs; Administration | Growth in student comprehension. | Accelerated Reader quiz and STAR Reading 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 Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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:	KSMS will lower the number of students absent more than 10 days by 5%, and lower the number of students tardy more that ten times by 5%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
98.75%	99%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
5% (41)	4% (36)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
11% (92)	5% (46)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Usual flu season, colds, viruses, and other communicable illnesses	1.1. School nurse and assistant have presented information to students promoting safe practices/health standards in preventing spread of colds, viruses, and flus. Teachers are encouraged to stock hand sanitizers and to advise children who are sick to stay home so as not to further spread a communicable illness.	1.1. School nurse Counselors Attendance Clerk Teachers	1.1. Promotion of good health and sanitation practices Observation of students who are not well to enlist support of school nurse and contact parents; Teacher-teams monitor attendance through Genesis and notes home	1.1. Genesis Notes from home OnCourse Communications/notes home to parents
	1.2. Family planned	1.2. Remind parents of the	1.2. Counselors	1.2. Clerk maintains daily	1.2. Genesis

2	absences and/or skipping	importance of regular attendance and keep them updated as to excessive or unexplained/unexcused absences; Parents have calendar of school events on website for planning purposes	Attendance Clerk Teachers Social Worker	attendance; monthly reports are run; Schedule attendance committee meeting with parents of children with excessive absences; Counsel parents as to the importance for the child and the legal issues related to school attendance for all children under the age of 16.	Notes from home OnCourse Communications/notes home to parents
3	1.3 Elimination of district magnet transportation	1.3 Assist parents in finding alternative transportation.	1.3 Transportation Department; School Administration; SAC/PTSA	1.3 Attendance / tardy records; Observation of traffic patterns	OnCourse Genesis

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
Attendance Laws and Policies	All Staff	Guidance Counselor	All teaching staff	January 2013	Collaboraton between guidance and teachers	Guidance; Administration; Truancy Officer; Teachers

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Availability of Hand Sanitizer on campus	Necessary supplies and reward programs	School Budget/SAC	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Reduce number of suspensions – both in and out of school – by 5%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
499	474
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
201	190
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
97	90
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
120	114

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Referrals for Class 1 repeat violations	1.1 Teachers have been asked to implement team interventions for repeated Class 1 violations. Foundations has developed an electronic system for the shared documentation of Class 1 violations school wide. This data will be used by teams and administrators to identify behavioral red flags and develop effective intervention strategies. Positive interventions, increased parent contact, team behavior contracts and peer counseling will be implemented before a student accumulates marks on their record.	1.1. Foundations Chair Administration	1.1. Data reports compiled every nine weeks will document changes in behavioral patterns by team. Each teams intervention strategy can be evaluated and adjusted based on this data.	1.1. Quarterly reports; Genesis data evaluation

2	1.2. Students fail to read and understand the Code of Student Conduct.	1.2. Assembly for distribution and explanation; Teacher follow-up discussions of expectations	1.2. Administrators Teachers	1.2. Quarterly Genesis Reports; Data Evaluation	1.2. Discipline data
3	1.3. Referrals for Class 2+ Repeat Offenders	1.3. Offer SOS (Student Option for Success) consistently; Progressive discipline for repeat offenders	1.3. Admin	1.3. Quartery Genesis Data Evaluation	1.3. Genesis

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
Faculty Powerpoint with changes to Code of Conduct; Collaborative planning and implementation of classroom Code of Conduct	All	Administration	All	August, 2012	Follow up meetings	Administrators; Teachers
Training for electronic documentation	ALL	District Personnel	ALL	September 2012; January 2013	Email support; Weekly Reports; 9-weeks Reports	Administrators

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
Presentation (Powerpoint) on Electronic Reporting System	PowerPoint	NA - Volunteers	$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

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.*	Increase the level of parent involvement (attendance and participation in school activities) by 5%..
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
70%	75%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Regularly scheduled opening and dismissal times create challenges in scheduling evening events at times convenient to parent schedules.	.1. Strategically schedule evening events to better accommodate parent participation. Publicize events well in advance to allow for parents to plan ahead.	1.1. Administration/Support/Leadership Team	1.1. Use volunteer/visitor sign-in more efficiently	.1. Sign-in sheets
2	1.2. Communication	1.2. Increase number of parents on e-mail listing. Increased encouragement of students to take hand-outs home to parents	1.2. Administration; Team Leaders; Classroom teachers; Guidance Counselors	1.2. Use volunteer/visitor sign-in more efficiently	1.2. Sign-in sheets
3	1.3. Non-use of available technology	1.3. Encourage increased use of website	1.3. Technology contact and PTSA / SAC rep	1.3. System data	.3. Log-on 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
Training in Communication Systems	All	Tech Support; Administration; District Coaches	School-Wide or "As Needed"	December 2012	Communication Logs	Administration

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:	To imbed instruction in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics across the curriculum and to provide enrichment activities and hands-on technology experience as well as magnet elective courses in all these areas.

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 funding for additional electives and enrichment activities.	To imbed enrichment in these areas across the curriculum and to offer electives within teams, taught by academic teachers, as possible to supplement elective offerings	Administration STEM committee	Increase in elective offerings and enrichment activities offered by teams	Field Trip lists; Course Master; Student Participation in Enrichment Programs
	Shortage of technology available	Seek out funding for additional computers,	Administration STEM committee	Increased use of technology and	Technology usage;

| 2 | | printers, mobile labs, lcd projectors, mimios, and other needed technology | Classroom teachers | technology-based learning across the curriculum | Elective offerings |

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:	Increase student awareness of skills and education required to enter the work force in career of their choice and to provide all 8th graders with curriculum or enrichment activities to support this awareness.
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 student training on necessary technology to do required research	Offer instruction and advice on particular sites; Give students opportunity to use available technology and equipment for hands-on experience	Teachers; Administration	Assessments	Teacher-created Assessments

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Teacher Collaboration for planning and assessing student work	TDE Substitutes	School or District Budget	$2,000.00
Reading	Reading Celebrations	Reading Rewards and Recognition of Student Achievement in meeting AR Reading Goals	School and SAC	$5,000.00
Reading	Renaissance Learning STAR Reading and Accelerated Reader Program	On-line Reading Program / System for assessing student comprehension and growth in reading skills	School and SAC	$6,800.00
Reading	Neo-2 Mobile Lab and Update	Mobile Cart with Neo-2s for classroom reading and writing support	School and PTSA/SAC	$5,200.00
Reading	Current Reading Materials available for student check-out through Media Center	Books and Reading/Research Materials for student check-out and novel sets / other resources for teacher check-out in support of instruction	Media Center and School	$3,500.00
Mathematics	Algebra'sCool / Math'sCool Programs	Instructional Videos	School Budget/PTSA/SAC	$3,500.00
Science	After-school Tutoring	Teachers	SAI	$2,000.00
Science	Hands-on Activities	Purchase of Materials	Science Dept. Funds	$4,500.00
Writing	Student use of technology to advance skills	Computer-based writing program, MyAccess to work with NEO-2 labs	SAC/School Budges	$1,000.00
Attendance	Availability of Hand Sanitizer on campus	Necessary supplies and reward programs	School Budget/SAC	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $34,500.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Effective Data	E-Instruction systems to help with assessments	SAC/School Budget	$5,000.00
Mathematics	Student Involvement with Technology	Mimios	SAC/School Budget	$5,000.00
Mathematics	Student Involvement with Technology	E-instruction mobile		$5,000.00
Science	CPS Systems	Improve expertise of teachers on systems	Science Dept. Funds	$1,500.00
Writing	Mobile Labs	NEO mobile labs to support writing instruction across curriculum	School/SAC	$7,000.00
Suspension	Presentation (Powerpoint) on Electronic Reporting System	PowerPoint	NA - Volunteers	$0.00
				Subtotal: $23,500.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	School-Based Instructional Coach	Cost of one School-based instructional coach divided between departments	District/School Budget	$22,000.00
Mathematics	Training/ {PLC)/Odyssey	Substitutes	School Budget	$2,000.00
Mathematics	Attend NCTM Conference	Substitutes and Registration/Costs	School Budget/SAC	$1,750.00
		Cost of one School-		

Mathematics	School-Based Instructional Coach	based instructional coach divided between departments	District/School Budget	$22,000.00
Science	Technology/Science Conference	FCTS	School Budget/SAC	$1,200.00
Science	School-Based Instructional Coach	Cost of one School-based instructional coach divided between departments	District/School Budget	$22,000.00
				Subtotal: $70,950.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $128,950.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ȷ◌ Priority	ȷ◌ Focus	ȷ◌ Prevent	ȷ◌ NA

Are you a reward school: ȷ◌ Yes ȷ◌ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/2/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Projects are/will be planned throughout the year as needed and as funds allow throughout the year in support of the School Improvement Plan.	$4,500.00
Purchase of needed technology in support of SIP	$5,500.00

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

Support of Kirby Smith Reading Challenge
Assistance in acquisition of additional technology
Volunteer support in all areas of school life as needed
Support of cross-curricular enrichment activities

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District KIRBY-SMITH MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	74%	70%	92%	59%	295	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	64%	69%			133	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?	69% (YES)	67% (YES)			136	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					564	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District KIRBY-SMITH MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	72%	91%	53%	287	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	64%	68%			132	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?	57% (YES)	58% (YES)			115	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					534	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested