

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: JAMES S. RICKARDS MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Ron Forsman

SAC Chair: Kimberly Young

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					Principal of Rickards MS IN 2011-2012 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 46% Math Mastery: 41% Science Mastery: 24% Writing Mastery: 67 AYP: did not make AYP in Reading; did not make AYP in Math In 2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 63% Math Mastery: 65% Science Mastery: 42% Writing Mastery: 83% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, & SWD did not make AYP in Reading; White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, & SWD did not make AYP in Math In 2009-10 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 63% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 40%

Principal	RONALD FORSMAN	Degrees – BA – Math & Finance M Ed. – Ed. Leadership Certifications Math 6 – 12 School Principal all levels Gifted Endorsement Middle Grade Endorsement	9	15	<p>Writing Mastery: 91% AYP: White, Black, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black and SWD did not make AYP in Math In 2008-09 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 65% Math Mastery: 72% Science Mastery: 39% Writing Mastery: 98% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math In 2007-2008 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 61% Math Mastery: 65% Science Mastery: 30% Writing Mastery: 97% AYP: Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, HISPANIC, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math IN 2006-2007 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 64% Science Mastery: 37% Writing Mastery: 91% AYP: Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math IN 2005-2006 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 61% Math Mastery: 61% Science Mastery: 25% Writing Mastery: 82% AYP: Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, HISPANIC, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math IN 2004-2005 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 53% Math Mastery: 60% Science Mastery: N/A Writing Mastery: 79% AYP: ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math IN 2003-2004 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 55% Math Mastery: 57% Science Mastery: N/A Writing Mastery: 84% AYP: ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math</p>
Assis Principal	Denise dePasquale	Degrees BA – Elementary Education M Ed. - Educational Leadership Certifications Educational Leadership K--12 Elementary Education 1 – 6 Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement	8	6	<p>AP of Rickards MS 2007 B MET 82% AYP 2008 B MET 87% AYP 2009 A MET 82% AYP 2010 A MET 63% AYP 2011 A MET 64% AYP 2012 B DID NOT MET AYP IN READING OR MATH</p>
Assis Principal	Andrea Doughty	Degree(s) BA – English M Ed. - Educational Leadership Certifications – Educational Leadership K-12 English 6-12 Psychology 6 -12 ESOL Endorsement	4	6	<p>AP of Boyd Anderson HS 2007 F MET 59% AYP 2008 D MET 62% AYP AP of Rickards MS 2009 A MET 82% AYP 2010 A MET 63% AYP 2011 A MET 64% AYP 2012 B DID NOT MET AYP IN READING OR MATH</p>
		Degree(s) BA – Social			<p>AP of Plantation MS 2004 B MET 80% AYP 2005 C MET 80% AYP</p>

Assis Principal	Kwan Drake	Studies M Ed. – Social Studies Ed. D - Education Certifications – Educational Leadership English 6-12	3	10	2006 A MET 92% AYP 2007 C MET 79% AYP 2008 B MET 95% AYP 2009 C MET 77% AYP AP of Rickards MS 2010 A MET 63% AYP 2011 A MET 64% AYP 2012 B DID NOT MET AYP IN READING OR MATH
-----------------	------------	--	---	----	---

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Charlotte Jackson	Degree(s) BA Certification(s) Marketing 6 – 12 Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement	16	4	2011-2012: Grade B 2010-2011: Grade A AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, & SWD did not make AYP in Reading; 2009-10: Grade A AYP: White, Black, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black and SWD did not make AYP in Math 2008-09: Grade A AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math 2007-08: Grade B AYP: Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, HISPANIC, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math 2006-07: Grade B AYP: Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math

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. Utilize staff at Instructional Staffing for identifying qualified candidates	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
2	2. NESS - Regular meetings of new teachers with Assistant Principal	NESS Liaison & Asst. Principal	Ongoing	
3	3. Buddy Program - Partnering new teachers or teachers with less than 3 years experience with veteran staff	Principal	5/31/2013	
4	4. CURRICULUM SPA Day	Coaches and 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
N/A	N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
50	4.0%(2)	16.0%(8)	48.0%(24)	32.0%(16)	36.0%(18)	200.0% (100)	18.0%(9)	12.0%(6)	70.0%(35)

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
BENICK, STEPHEN	Shaikh, Zulekha	Interim Substitute	<p>PLC's on Mon. and Wednesday and NESS meetings on a monthly basis.</p> <p>* Individual staff development in effective teaching strategies, questioning strategies, differentiated instruction, Marzano's High Yield Strategies, etc.</p> <p>* Modeling of strategies from above</p> <p>* Observation of implementation and feedback</p> <p>* Ongoing throughout the year</p>
Maier, Holly	Bailey, Linda	New Teacher to Rickards Middle	<p>PLC's on Mon. and Wednesday and NESS meetings on a monthly basis.</p> <p>* Individual staff development in effective teaching strategies, questioning strategies, differentiated instruction, Marzano's High Yield Strategies, etc.</p> <p>* Modeling of strategies from above</p> <p>* Observation of implementation and feedback</p> <p>* Ongoing throughout the year</p>
Barrett, Jessica	Samuels, Nakia	New Teacher; New teacher to Rickards Middle	<p>PLC's on Mon. and Wednesday and NESS meetings on a monthly basis.</p> <p>* Individual staff development in effective teaching strategies, questioning strategies, differentiated instruction, Marzano's High Yield Strategies, etc.</p> <p>* Modeling of strategies from above</p> <p>* Observation of implementation and feedback</p> <p>* Ongoing throughout the year</p>
Hargrove, Angella	Gadson, Ann	New Teacher; New teacher to Rickards	<p>PLC's on Mon. and Wednesday and NESS meetings on a monthly basis.</p> <p>* Individual staff development in effective teaching strategies, questioning strategies, differentiated instruction, Marzano's High Yield</p>

		Middle	Strategies, etc. * Modeling of strategies from above * Observation of implementation and feedback * Ongoing throughout the year
Cook, Kris	Rios, Mila	New Teacher to Rickards Middle	PLC's on Mon. and Wednesday and NESS meetings on a monthly basis. * Individual staff development in effective teaching strategies, questioning strategies, differentiated instruction, Marzano's High Yield Strategies, etc. * Modeling of strategies from above * Observation of implementation and feedback * Ongoing throughout the year
McMorris, Brian	Wallace, Angela	New teacher to Rickards Middle	PLC's on Mon. and Wednesday and NESS meetings on a monthly basis. * Individual staff development in effective teaching strategies, questioning strategies, differentiated instruction, Marzano's High Yield Strategies, etc. * Modeling of strategies from above * Observation of implementation and feedback * Ongoing throughout the year
Maier, Holly	Rivera, Jose	Interim Substitute	PLC's on Mon. and Wednesday and NESS meetings on a monthly basis. * Individual staff development in effective teaching strategies, questioning strategies, differentiated instruction, Marzano's High Yield Strategies, etc. * Modeling of strategies from above * Observation of implementation and feedback * Ongoing throughout the year

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I dollars are used to hire additional classroom teachers, lower class size, hire teachers' assistants and to provide additional student support in the classroom. In addition Title 1 funds help provide professional development for staff and parents. For example, Mega Skills training is funded by Title 1, which provides materials and refreshments for parents.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs.

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

Students participate in many violence prevention programs, Silence Hurts and Anti Bullying, are integrated through the Peer Counseling program. Students participate in school wide groups such as Peace Group, Anti – bullying Group, SWAT Group, and SADD Group. In addition students attend fieldtrips promoting anti – bullying and non – violence, such as “Weight of Words”.

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

The career education curriculum is integrated into the Social Studies curriculum as outline by the State.

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Cynthia Birch - ESE Specialist,
Michael Anderson - Guidance Director
Jenny Simon- School Social Worker
Dr. Janie White – School Psychologist
Michelle Tull - ESE Support Facilitator
Denise dePasquale- Laurel - Assistant Principal, ESE Administrator
Charlotte Jackson – Reading Coach
Classroom Teacher - Team Leader.

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 CPST/RtI Team has several functions. All teachers at the start of the school year were given an RtI Manual. This manual contains specific documents which are designed to help teachers respond to student needs at all Tiers. The committee meets once per week, on Wed. to review all cases. Once the Team of teachers have meet to determine that the student is in need of Tier 11, Targeted Interventions, the team CPST/RtI team will meet to discuss that particular case. The ESE Specialist coordinates all meetings which take place once a week on Wednesday. All Intervention strategies and data that have been collected on said student are brought to the meeting as pertinent documentation. Committee will determine if all documentation is in order and strategies have been implemented with fidelity for a period of six weeks. If CPST/RtI Committee has enough data, a prescriptive plan for either behavioral or academic concern will be put into place. Team will monitor success of current plan and revise as needed. All records will be kept in the ESE Specialists office for easy access when meetings take place.

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?

All data from FAIR, FCAT, & BAT assessments are used as our baseline data for Math, Reading, Writing, Science, & Behavioral SIP Goals. For those students who are not responding to Tier 1, "Universal Interventions", then Tier 11, "Targeted" Interventions, and possibly Tier 111, "Intensive" Interventions are put into place to increase the possibility for student success. As SIP is a working document after Interventions have been tried with proven success, they are added to the strategy portion of the SIP Plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Broward Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2 for reading, math, and science), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Mini Assessments, FCAT Simulation Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Early Reading
Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA) End of year: FAIR, FCAT Teachers will also be using Scatter Plots, Frequency Chart, & ABC Charts to collect data on students with behavioral concerns.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The MTSS team will train staff in meetings and as a part of the school – wide Professional Learning Communities Program. Specifically, there will be a school – wide faculty meeting during pre-planning to reacquaint the faculty with the RtI process. Teachers will be given the RtI forms and shown how to observe and collect data and properly fill out the required documentation. The faculty who have not yet been trained will learn about the three tiers and have to proceed according to the identified tier, more importantly what interventions are to be used with what Tier.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Teams will work collaboratively to document all student concerns and communicate regularly with all stakeholders such as parents, guidance, and administration.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Denise dePasquale – Laurel – 6th grade Assistant Principal
Dr. Kwan Drake – 7th grade Assistant Principal
Andria Doughty – 8th grade Assistant Principal
Charlotte Jackson – Reading Coach and Department Head
Michael Anderson – 6th & 7th grade guidance counselor/guidance director
Lauren Barbato – 6th Honors Academy & 8th grade guidance counselor
Michelle Tull – ESE Support Facilitator
Marie Howard – ESE Department Head
Holly Maier – Math Department Head

Deanna Black – Science Department Head
Jessica Barrett – Language Arts Department head
Kim Young – Diversified Arts Department Head
Megan Weller – Social Studies Department Head

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

The LLT meets once per month to review all school data and make sure that it aligns with the Reading Goals. In addition the team works with the Staff Development Committee to plan the trainings that will take place for the year. At the onset of the year, LLT will review master schedule to ensure all students have be placed properly according to the reading

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

Our initiatives are based on the data from FCAT 2.0 We have a school –wide vocabulary program which is initiated through the Reading Dept. A writing program, called “On the Write Track”, to work on Common Core, and continual Unwrapping of the standards to meet student needs.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/8/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

The staff development plan includes on going training for reading strategies.
Training incorporates demonstration and modeling and monitoring with further assistance provide as needed.

*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:	A 20% increase of students will maintain or score A level 3 or above on the 2013 reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27%(200)	56% (497)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited Academic Vocabulary	1.) Weekly WOW and WPOW 2.) Direct instruction of academic and common Core Voc. 3.) Word Walls 4.) School-wide focus calendar with voc. strategies all year. 5.) Direct instruction and practice weekly analogies. 6.) Biweekly assessments to include mini BAT's , which have been updated to address CCSS & include writing across the curriculum.	1.) Reading Coach, 2.) Dept. teachers, 3.) AP, & Principal	1.) Process monitoring of reading students 2.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2 3.) Data Chats 4.) Reading Coach Modeling 5.) Frequent CWT's 6.) Feedback provided by AP & Reading Coach	1.) FAIR 2.) Mini BAT's 3.) Alternate assessments 4.) I – Observation 5.) BAT 1 & 2 6.) FCAT 2.0 Data 7.) Mastery Charts
2	Student's inability to comprehend high level text	1. Continuous use school-wide of close reading strategy. 2. Curriculum alignment to common core levels of complexity. i.e.; Lexiled Novels, articles, & tasks required of students. 3. "On the Write Track" – school – wide initiative to extend 1st block with text dependent questions from various sources.	1.) Reading Coach 2.) AP for Reading 3.) Dept. Head 4.) Teachers	1.) Process monitoring of reading students 2.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2 3.) Data Chats 4.) Reading Coach Modeling 5.) Frequent CWT's 6.) Feedback provided by AP & Reading Coach	1.) FAIR 2.) Mini BAT's 3.) Teacher designed assessments 4.) I – Observation 5.) BAT 1 & 2 6.) FCAT 2.0 Data 7.) Mastery Charts
3	Common Core Standards	1.) Training provided to staff during Pre-planning week on history of Common Core 2.) Training provided on Un-Wrapping of the Common Core Standards 3.) On Going Training to take place during PLC's	1.) AP Reading 2.) Summer Leadership Team 3.) Reading Coach.	1.) Process monitoring of reading students 2.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2 3.) Data Chats 4.) Reading Coach Modeling 5.) Frequent CWT's 6.) Feedback provided by AP & Reading Coach	1.)Alternate Assessments 2.) Mastery Charts 3.) BAT 1&2 4.) Mini BAT's 5.) FCAT 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	35% of the students will earn a level 4 and above on the reading FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18%(135)	28%(248)

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	Training for teachers on transitioning from Sunshine State Standards to NGSS to ensure that students are capable of responding to complexity of questions.	Staff Development calendar with Common Core as the focus. Continuation of districts UnWrapping training.	Reading Coach Administrator Department Chair	Alternative Assessments with a project - based focus. Common Assessments with weekly PLC discussions. Sharing of best practices.	Benchmark Assessments BAT 1 & 2 Mini BATS FCAT
2	8th grade level 4 & 5 students not enrolled in reading per master schedule	Reading through Social Studies content with a reading endorsed teacher, focus CCSS anchor for social studies literacy skills.	1.) Reading Coach 2.) Department Head 3.) AP over Reading	1.) Process monitoring of reading students 2.) Data chats 3.) Reading Coach Modeling 4.) Frequent CWT's 5.) Mastery Charts of anchor standards 6.) PLC's focused on infusing higher order questioning into curriculum 7.) Data analysis of Mini	MINI BAT's Alternate Assessments BAT 1 & 2 FCAT 2.0

				BATs, BAT 1 & 2	
3	Curriculum lacked rigor	Curriculum overhauled to align with common Core complexity levels	1.) Reading Coach 2.) Dept. head 3.) AP over reading 4.) Principal	1.) Frequent Monitoring of standard mastery 2.) PLC's focus on Common Core 3.) Process monitoring of reading students 4.) Data Chats 5.) Reading coach modeling 6.) Frequent CWT's 7.) Constant feedback	1.) Mini BAT's 2.) Alternate assessments 3.) BAT 1 & 2 4.) FCAT 2.0

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in 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:	68% of the students will show learning gains in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%(418)	65% (577)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1.) Limited academic vocabulary	1.) Weekly WOW and WPOW 2.) Direct instruction of academic and common Core Voc. 3.) Word Walls 4.) School-wide focus calendar with voc.	1.) Reading Coach, 2.) Dept. teachers, 3.) AP, & Principal	1.) Process monitoring of reading students 2.) Data Chats 3.) Reading Coach Modeling 4.) Frequent CWT's 5.) Feedback provided by	1.) FAIR 2.) Mini BAT's 3.) Teacher designed tests 4.) I – Observation 5.) BAT 1 & 2 6.) FCAT 2.0 Data

1		<p>strategies all year.</p> <p>5.) Direct instruction and practice weekly analogies.</p> <p>6.) Biweekly assessments to include mini BAT's which have been updated to address CCSS & include writing across the curriculum.</p>		<p>AP & Reading Coach</p> <p>6.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2</p>	<p>7.) Mastery Charts</p>
2	Students who did not maintain a high level or dropped.	<p>1.) Teacher knowledge and monitoring of said students.</p> <p>2.) Enrichment of curriculum to include more rigor.</p> <p>3.) Lexiled Novels used in the class.</p> <p>4.) Reading logs required weekly with incentive program included.</p> <p>5.) Oral reading fluency drills a minimum of two times per week.</p>	<p>1.) Reading Coach,</p> <p>2.) Dept. teachers,</p> <p>3.) AP, & Principal</p>	<p>1.) Process monitoring of reading students</p> <p>2.) Data Chats</p> <p>3.) Reading Coach Modeling</p> <p>4.) Frequent CWT's</p> <p>5.) Feedback provided by AP & Reading Coach</p> <p>6.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2</p>	<p>1.) FAIR</p> <p>2.) Mini BAT's</p> <p>3.) Teacher designed tests</p> <p>4.) I – Observation</p> <p>5.) BAT 1 & 2</p> <p>6.) FCAT 2.0 Data</p> <p>7.) Mastery Charts</p>
3	Student's inability to comprehend at high levels of text complexity.	<p>1.) Teacher knowledge and monitoring of said students.</p> <p>2.) Enrichment of curriculum to include more rigor.</p> <p>3.) Lexiled Novels used in the class.</p> <p>4.) Reading logs required weekly with incentive program included.</p> <p>5.) Oral reading fluency drills a minimum of two times per week.</p>	<p>1.) Reading Coach,</p> <p>2.) Dept. teachers,</p> <p>3.) AP, & Principal</p>	<p>1.) Process monitoring of reading students</p> <p>2.) Data Chats</p> <p>3.) Reading Coach Modeling</p> <p>4.) Frequent CWT's</p> <p>5.) Feedback provided by AP & Reading Coach</p> <p>6.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2</p>	<p>1.) FAIR</p> <p>2.) Mini BAT's</p> <p>3.) Teacher designed tests</p> <p>4.) I – Observation</p> <p>5.) BAT 1 & 2</p> <p>6.) FCAT 2.0 Data</p> <p>7.) Mastery Charts</p>
4	Student's not participating in enough reading outside of the school day.	<p>1.) Teacher knowledge and monitoring of said students.</p> <p>2.) Enrichment of curriculum to include more rigor.</p> <p>3.) Lexiled Novels used in the class.</p> <p>4.) Reading logs required weekly with incentive program included.</p> <p>5.) Oral reading fluency drills a minimum of two times per week.</p>	<p>1.) Reading Coach,</p> <p>2.) Dept. teachers,</p> <p>3.) AP, & Principal</p>	<p>1.) Process monitoring of reading students</p> <p>2.) Data Chats</p> <p>3.) Reading Coach Modeling</p> <p>4.) Frequent CWT's</p> <p>5.) Feedback provided by AP & Reading Coach</p> <p>6.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2</p>	<p>1.) FAIR</p> <p>2.) Mini BAT's</p> <p>3.) Teacher designed tests</p> <p>4.) I – Observation</p> <p>5.) BAT 1 & 2</p> <p>6.) FCAT 2.0 Data</p> <p>7.) Mastery Charts</p>
5	Students oral reading	<p>1.) Teacher knowledge and monitoring of said students.</p> <p>2.) Enrichment of curriculum to include more rigor.</p> <p>3.) Lexiled Novels used in the class.</p> <p>4.) Reading logs required weekly with incentive program included.</p> <p>5.) Oral reading fluency drills a minimum of two times per week.</p>	<p>1.) Reading Coach,</p> <p>2.) Dept. teachers,</p> <p>3.) AP, & Principal</p>	<p>1.) Process monitoring of reading students</p> <p>2.) Data Chats</p> <p>3.) Reading Coach Modeling</p> <p>4.) Frequent CWT's</p> <p>5.) Feedback provided by AP & Reading Coach</p> <p>6.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2</p>	<p>1.) FAIR</p> <p>2.) Mini BAT's</p> <p>3.) Teacher designed tests</p> <p>4.) I – Observation</p> <p>5.) BAT 1 & 2</p> <p>6.) FCAT 2.0 Data</p> <p>7.) Mastery Charts</p>

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:	Students will show a 5% improvement in reading Proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60%(113)	65% (577)

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 oral reading fluency	1.) Reading drills 2.) Jamestown Fluency 3.) Rewards for Social Studies 4.) Phonics for reading 5.) Reading logs w/incentive program	1.) Reading Coach 2.) AP for reading 3.) Principal 4.) ESE Support	1.) OPM through FAIR program 2.) Teacher assessments 3.) SOAR Mentor program 4.) Interim Reports 5.) Pinnacle 6.) Fluency drill feedback 7.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2	1.) FAIR 2.) DAR 3.) Mini BAT's 4.) Drills 5.) BAT 1 & 2 6.) FCAT 2.0
2	Inability to comprehend at high levels of text complexity.	1.) Reading drills 2.) Jamestown Fluency 3.) Rewards for Social Studies 4.) Phonics for reading 5.) Reading logs w/incentive program	1.) Reading Coach 2.) AP for reading 3.) Principal 4.) ESE Support	1.) OPM through FAIR program 2.) Teacher assessments 3.) SOAR Mentor program 4.) Interim Reports 5.) Pinnacle 6.) Fluency drill feedback 7.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2	1.) FAIR 2.) DAR 3.) Mini BAT's 4.) Drills 5.) BAT 1 & 2 6.) FCAT 2.0
3	Students not participating in enough reading outside of the school day.	1.) Reading drills 2.) Jamestown Fluency 3.) Rewards for Social Studies 4.) Phonics for reading 5.) Reading logs w/incentive program	1.) Reading Coach 2.) AP for reading 3.) Principal 4.) ESE Support	1.) OPM through FAIR program 2.) Teacher assessments 3.) SOAR Mentor program 4.) Interim Reports 5.) Pinnacle 6.) Fluency drill feedback 7.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2	1.) FAIR 2.) DAR 3.) Mini BAT's 4.) Drills 5.) BAT 1 & 2 6.) FCAT 2.0

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # The reading department will increase student proficiency in reading by 3.1% each year for the next six years.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	46%					

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:	All subgroups will show 10% improvement in reading proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White – 42%(93) Black – 72% (123) Hispanic – 54% (171) Asian – N/A American Indian – N/A	White – 32% (80) Black – 62% (141) Hispanic – 44% (162) Asian – N/A American Indian – 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	Large population of students whose parents earn below poverty wages and English is not the primary language spoken in the home. This can create a language barrier which could effect student performance.	Assign mentor to Monitor Parent trainings that provide parents will strategies to assist their students with translators as needed.	Administration Department Chairs	Updates during Curriculum Council Meetings SAC Meeting with translators Sign In Sheets Letters sent home & returned	Benchmark Assessments
2	1.) Limited academic voc. 2.) Student's inability to comprehend at high text levels. 3.) Teachers lack of knowledge and experience with such a diverse population.	1.) Direct instruction of voc. 2.) Research based strategies, cloze reading of text. 3.) Paired reading drills 4.) Teachers to participate in PLC's focusing on diverse learners and learning styles.	1.) LLT Designee 2.) Reading Coach 3.) AP over reading 4.) Department Chair	1.) Frequent CWT's 2.) Teacher monitoring of student progress 3.) Utilization of diagnostic assessments 4.) Modeling by Reading Coach 5.) i- Observation 6.) Data analysis of Mini BATs, BAT 1 & 2	1.) BAT 1 & 2 2.) Report Cards 3.) Mini BAT 4.) Diagnostic Assessments 5.) FCAT 2.0

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	65% or more of our ELL students will make satisfactory progress in reading.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
91%(42)	65% (61)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers lack training and resources to meet ELL needs	More staff development to implement a variety of ELL teaching and learning strategies. Year round Vocabulary and Idiom focus Interactive Word Wall instruction Differentiated Instruction ELL Support Facilitator to work with teachers	ELL Contact Person Reading Coach Administrator	Constant monitoring of ELL student success through Team meetings. Frequent Pinnacle checks Parent liaison for parents in need. Monitor with weekly CWT's to review lesson plans to ensure ESOL strategies align with lessons. Ongoing coaching	Benchmark Assessments BAT 1 & 2 FCAT Mini BAT
2	Teachers with limited experience with teaching B2-C1 ELL Students	ELL strategy Training early in the academic school year. ELL specific conversations in PLC's to address any concerns regarding students Peer observations with teachers that show evidence of ELL students	Reading Coach Administrator Department Chairs	Lesson Plan Review Observations CWT's	Benchmark Assessments FCAT Mini BAT
3	Large ELL population with one paraprofessional for support	2.) ELL Para assigned to classes with student needing the most assistance. 3.) Close monitoring of teachers lesson plans	1.) LLT 2.) Reading Coach 3.) ESOL Coordinator 4.) ESOL Para 5.) Administration	1.) Frequent CWT's 2.) Evaluation of lesson plans 3.) Use of materials and audio visuals 4.) Pinnacle notations of student progress 5.) PMP Monitoring of students 6.) Daily assignments 7.) Test, quizzes, and mini - assessments	1.) Report Cards 2.) Ongoing Alternative assessments 3.) Pupil Monitoring plan 4.) All teachers of ELL's must document the strategies used for each lesson 5.) CELLA 6.) Student portfolios

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	65% or more of our students with disabilities will demonstrate reading Proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83%(81)	35% (52)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

		Person or	Process Used to	
--	--	-----------	-----------------	--

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers need additional training on modifying curriculum to accommodate SWD.	more ESE support for SWD by 'Push In' and "Pull-Out". More time during block to work in small group with neediest students. additional teachers training on Accommodations for SWD	ESE Dept. Head Administration ESE Support Staff	CWT's with focus on lesson plan check to ensure documentation of strategies. Discussions and sharing of best practices in team learning communities.	Benchmark BAT 1 & 2 Assessments Pinnacle monitoring/grade pulls to ensure SWD success. Mini BATs
2	Lack of experience with students in mainstream classes that may not be responding to traditional instruction	1.) Explicit instruction modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice	1.) Reading Coach 2.) AP over ESE 3.) ESE Support Facilitator 4.) ESE Specialist	1.) Frequent CWT's 2.) Evaluation of lesson plans 3.) Use of materials and audio visuals 4.) Pinnacle notations of student progress 5.) PMP Monitoring of students 6.) Daily assignments 7.) Test, quizzes, and mini - assessments	1.) Interim Reports 2.) Data reports pulled to determine students in danger 3.) I – Observation 4.) Teacher generated assessments 5.) Mini BAT's 6.) BAT 1 & 2 7.) FCAT 2.0
3	2.) Large ESE caseload w/limited support resources	2.) Teachers will provide visual cues and prompts paired with verbal instruction. 3.) Preferential seating with close proximity to teachers during directions and instructions. 4.) Differentiated instruction for SWD students based on current levels of comprehension and breaking up work into smaller segments	1.) Reading Coach 2.) AP over ESE 3.) ESE Support Facilitator 4.) ESE Specialist	1.) Frequent CWT's 2.) Evaluation of lesson plans 3.) Use of materials and audio visuals 4.) Pinnacle notations of student progress 5.) PMP Monitoring of students 6.) Daily assignments 7.) Test, quizzes, and mini – assessments	1.) Interim Reports 2.) Data reports pulled to determine students in danger 3.) I – Observation 4.) Teacher generated assessments 5.) Mini BAT's 6.) BAT 1 & 2 7.) FCAT 2.0
4	3.) Students with chronic behavioral concerns	5.) MTSS team meets weekly to assist with concerns and documentation according to Tier of support needed	1.) MTSS Team 2.) Reading Coach 3.) AP over Reading 4.) Principal	1.) Process monitoring of RtI 2.) Weekly MYSS Team meetings 3.) Data charts to show student success	1.) Student FBA created 2.) Data reports 3.) I – Observation 4.) Teacher generated assessments 5.) Mini BAT's 6.) BAT 1 & 2 7.) FCAT 2.0

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	62% or more of our economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress on the Reading test
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%(354)	62% (451)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

		Person or	Process Used to	
--	--	-----------	-----------------	--

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents need more training on working with their student and helping them to achieve academic success.	Implement trainings for parents on students success through our Mega Skills programs as well as parent motivational nights	Administration SAC Title I	Parent Survey's Parent Conferences Sign In Sheets to reflect attendance Communication sent home in various formats	Data Chats Benchmark Assessments Mini BATS FCAT Parent Survey
2	1.)Parents have difficulty assisting students with their assignments 2.) Working parents unable to attend important school functions which impact their students success	1.) Parent trainings such as MegaSkills offered with translators provided as needed. 2.) Meetings are scheduled at different times to accommodate working parents. 3.) Various avenues in place to inform parents of important information; such as school's web site, flyers sent home, Marquee, and Parent Link call out.	1.) MegaSkills Team 2.) AP over activities 3.) Reading Coach	1.) Sign In sheets 2.) Agendas 3.) Parent Feedback 4.) SAC/PTSA attendance 5.) Parent involvement % Improved	1.) Sign In sheets 2.) Agendas 3.) Parent Feedback 4.) SAC/PTSA attendance 5.) Parent involvement % Improved

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
PD: History of Common Core	6 – 8 All Subjects	Leadership Staff Development Team	All Staff	Pre- planning/Ongoing	CWT's Reflections Student Work samples	Reading Coach Reading AP Principal
PLC's: Unwrapping the standards for CCSS	6 – 8 Read	AP over reading Reading Coach	Reading Dept. Staff	Mon & Wed PLC's	CWT's Reflections Student Work samples	Reading Coach Reading AP Principal
Socratic Seminar	6 – 8 Read	AP over Read Reading Coach	Reading Dept. Staff	Staff Development days	CWT's Reflections Student work samples	Reading Coach Reading AP Principal

Reading Budget:

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:			To Increase the % of students scoring proficient by 10%		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
44%(13)					
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.) Lack of ELL support for our Creole speaking students. 2.) Teachers having difficulties implementing differentiated curriculum for lower level ELL. 3.) Students feel uncomfortable using ELL dictionaries in regular classroom. 4.) Parents are not fluent in English	1.) Creole & other language dictionaries mandatory in every class. 2.) ELL differentiated instruction 3.) Whole team monitoring and encouragement of students 4.) Increase awareness of ESOL classes for parents. 5.) Invite parents to learn basic conversational English at ELL Parent Night.	1.) Charlotte Jackson 2.) Administration	1.) Classroom Assessments	1.) CELLA 2.) IPT 3.) FCAT 2.0

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:	To increase the % of students scoring proficient by 10%

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

22%(8)

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.) Lack of ELL support for our Creole speaking students 2.) Teachers having difficulties implementing differentiated curriculum for lower level ELL. 3.) Students feel uncomfortable using ELL dictionaries in regular classroom. 4.) Parents are not fluent in English	1.) Creole & other language dictionaries mandatory in every class. 2.) ELL differentiated instruction 3.) Whole team monitoring and encouragement of students 4.) Increase awareness of ESOL classes for parents. 5.) Invite parents to learn basic conversational English at ELL Parent Night	1.) Charlotte Jackson 2.) Administration	1.) Classroom Assessments	1.) CELLA 2.) IPT 3.) FCAT 2.0

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

to increase the % of students scoring proficient by 10%

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

13%(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.) Lack of ELL support for our Creole speaking students 2.) Teachers having difficulties implementing differentiated curriculum for lower level ELL. 3.) Students feel	1.) Creole & other language dictionaries mandatory in every class. 2.) ELL differentiated instruction 3.) Whole team monitoring and	1.) Charlotte Jackson 2.) Administration	1.) Classroom Assessments	1.) CELLA 2.) IPT 3.) FCAT 2.0

1	uncomfortable using ELL dictionaries in regular classroom. 4.) Parents are not fluent in English	encouragement of students 4.) Increase awareness of ESOL classes for parents. 5.) Invite parents to learn basic conversational English at ELL Parent Nigh			
---	---	---	--	--	--

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

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:	There will be a 19% increase in students scoring a level 3 on the FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (171)	60% (533)

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	1a.1. Transition from NGSSS to CCSS.	1a.1. Utilize county support from the district on a weekly basis. The DA personnel can assist the teachers by offering support and strategies that better prepare our students for CCSS. Staff Development for unwrapping the new standards for all math department personnel. PLCs centered on understanding the 8 mathematical practices and the strategies to use in the classroom to promote the practices.	1a.1. Department Chair Administrator	1a.1. Analyze data on an ongoing basis. Staff development implemented through PLC's. Data chats: Interdepartmental Administration to teacher Teacher to student (twice a year	1a.1. Common assessments and BAT Classroom observation Data chat from Administrator Student
2	1a.2. New Personnel in the department who are not familiar with current standards.	1a.2. Induction program for all new teachers that introduces and familiarizes the new staff to Florida standards and Broward County policies and procedures.	1a.2. Department Chair and Administrator	1a.2. CWTs and monthly induction meetings. Weekly check-in meetings with new teacher mentor.	1a.2. Common assessments and BAT. Classroom observation.
3	1a.3. Students' ability to comprehend and solve word problems.	1a.3. Word problems are being incorporated into the daily practice in all math classrooms.	1a.3. Department Chair and Administrator	1a.3. CWTs to observe reading strategies being used and to determine if word problems are being assigned and reviewed with students.	1a.3. Students' ability to comprehend and solve word problems.

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:	There will be a 7% increase in students scoring at a level 4 or 5 on the Mathematics portion of the FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (130)	25% (222)

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	Training for teachers on transitioning from Sunshine State Standards to NGSS to ensure that students are capable of responding to complexity of questions.	Staff Development calendar with Common Core as the focus. Continuation of districts UnWrapping training.	Reading Coach Administrator Department Chair	Alternative Assessments with a project - based focus. Common Assessments with weekly PLC discussions. Sharing of best practices.	Benchmark Assessments BAT 1 & 2 Mini BATS FCAT
2	Teachers need more training on using appropriate strategies to make rigorous material more accessible.	Utilize book trainers from the district on a monthly basis to train staff during DLC's and sharing of best practices.	Math Administrator Department Chair Support Staff Book Trainers	Analyze data on an ongoing basis Weekly CWT's to ensure strategies are documented in lesson plans and being implemented.	BAT 1 & 2 Alternative Assessments
3	2a.2. Students being placed in subject specific classes that do not focus on grade level FCAT skills.	2a.2. Embedding the necessary grade level skills within the curriculum.	2a.2. Department Head and Administrator	2a.2. CWTs to determine if 7th and 8th grade skills are being embedded into curriculum.	2a.2. Common assessments and BAT. Classroom observations. Skill check quizzes based on grade level standards.
	2a.3 Students' ability to comprehend and solve	2a.3 Word problems are being incorporated into the	2a.3 Department Head and Administrator	2a.3 CWTs to observe reading strategies being used and	2a.3 Common assessments and

4	word problems.	daily practice in all math classrooms.	to determine if word problems are being assigned and reviewed with students.	BAT. Classroom Observations.
---	----------------	--	--	---------------------------------

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:	There will be a 15% increase in students making Learning gains on the Mathematics portion of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (361)	65% (577)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	New Generation State Standards for reading this year.	Training for all faculty via staff development calendar	Department Chair	CWT's with lesson plan focus and IFC usage to ensure consistency.	Benchmark Assessment BAT 1 & 2 FCAT
2	3a.2. Students' ability to comprehend and solve word problems.	3a.2. Word problems are being incorporated into the daily practice in all math classrooms.	3a.2. Department Head and Administrator	3a.2. CWTs to observe reading strategies being used and to determine if word problems are being assigned and reviewed with students.	3a.2. Common assessments and BAT. Classroom Observations.
	3a.3. Lack of satisfactory progress in previous year's academic	3a.3. Implementation of SOAR program to work with struggling students on	3a.3. Department Head, Administrator and SOAR coordinator.	3a.3. Weekly check ins with students on progress and to promote productivity	3a.3. Interims and report cards.

3	subjects.	academics and progress.	during academic time. Incentives for good grades and no disciplinary infractions.	Common assessments and BAT.
---	-----------	-------------------------	--	-----------------------------

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:	There will be a 21% increase in students (falling into the lowest 25% category) making gains on the Mathematics portion of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% (96)	70% (155)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack mastery of prerequisite skills. Teachers transitioning to newly adopted math text.	Students receiving additional support in remedial math course. Afterschool tutoring Book trainers working closely with dept. Sharing best practices and concerns during weekly PLC's.	Math Administrator Dept. Chair Book Trainers	Analyze data on an ongoing basis. Staff development implemented through PLC's. CWT's & informal observations focusing on alignment to district IFC's	Common Assessments BAT 1 & 2 FCAT
	4a.1. Transition from NGSSS to CCSS.	4a.1. Utilize county support from the district on a weekly basis. The DA personnel can assist the	4a.1. Administrator Dept. Chair	4a.1. PLC time incorporates the study of the 8 mathematical practices weekly.	4a.1. Common assessments and BAT

2		teachers by offering support and strategies that better prepare our students for CCSS. Staff Development for unwrapping the new standards for all math department personnel. PLCs centered on understanding the 8 mathematical practices and the strategies to use in the classroom to promote the practices.		Interdepartmental meetings with reading colleagues to incorporate reading strategies and to monitor the use of strategies. CWTs to determine if reading and math strategies are being used.	Classroom observations Data chat form Administrator Student
3	4a2. Students ability to comprehend and solve word problems	Word problems are being incorporated into the daily practice in all math classrooms	Department Chair and Administrator	CWTs to observe reading strategies being used and to determine if word problems are being assigned and reviewed with students	Common assessments and BAT Classroom Observations

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # The Math Department will increase students proficiency by 2.9% each year for the next six years.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	41%					

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:	There will be a 10% decrease in students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 49% (108) Black: 77% (133) Hispanic: 56% (180) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: 39% (98) Black: 67% (153) Hispanic: 46% (169) Asian: N/A American Indian: 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	Large population of students whose parents earn below poverty wages and English is not the primary language spoken in the home. This can create a language barrier which could effect student performance.	Assign mentor to Monitor Parent trainings that provide parents will strategies to assist their students with translators as needed.	Administration Department Chairs	Updates during Curriculum Council Meetings SAC Meeting with translators Sign In Sheets Letters sent home & returned	Benchmark Assessments
	5B.1. Per 2012 the percentages of students making satisfactory	5B.1. Utilize county support from the district on a weekly basis. The DA	5B.1. Dept. Chair Administrator	5B.1. PLC time incorporates the study of the 8	5B.1. Common assessments and BAT

2	progress in mathematics: White: 51% Black: 23% Hispanic: 44%	personnel can assist the teachers by offering support and strategies that better prepare our students for CCSS. Staff Development for unwrapping the new standards for all math department personnel. PLCs centered on understanding the 8 mathematical practices and the strategies to use in the classroom to promote the practices.		mathematical practices weekly. Interdepartmental meetings with reading colleagues to incorporate reading strategies and to monitor the use of strategies. CWTs to determine if reading and math strategies are being used.	Classroom observations
3	5B.2. Students' ability to comprehend and solve word problems.	5B.2. Word problems are being incorporated into the daily practice in all math classrooms.	5B.2. Department Head and Administrator	5B.2. CWTs to observe reading strategies being used and to determine if word problems are being assigned and reviewed with students.	5B.2. Common assessments and BAT Classroom observations.
4	5B.3. Lack of satisfactory progress in previous year's academic subjects.	5B.3. Implementation of SOAR program to work with struggling students on academic progress.	5B.3. Math Department Head, Administrator, SOAR Coordinator	5B.3. Weekly check ins with students on progress and to promote productivity during academic time. Incentives for good grades and no disciplinary infractions.	5B.3. Interims and report cards. Common assessments and BAT.

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:	There will be a 27% decrease in ELL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
87% (40)	60% (56)

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	5C.1. Teachers not proficient in the integration of ELL strategies within the classroom.	5C.1. Utilize county support from the district on a weekly basis. The DA personnel can assist the teachers by offering support and strategies that are effective for our ELL population. Staff Development for unwrapping the new standards for all math department personnel. PLCs centered on understanding the 8 mathematical practices and the strategies to use in the classroom to promote the practices.	5C.1. Administrator Dept. Chair	5C.1. PLC time incorporates the study of the 8 mathematical practices weekly. Interdepartmental meetings with reading colleagues to incorporate reading strategies and to monitor the use of strategies. CWTs to determine if reading and math strategies are being used. CWTs to determine if ELL	5C.1. Common assessments and BAT Alternative Assessments (i.e. Cella) Classroom observations

				strategies are being utilized within the classroom.	
2	5C.2. Lack of opportunities for reading and writing in English across the curriculum.	5C.2. Math teachers will incorporate read/write activities throughout each week that allow the students to interpret text written in English.	5C.2. Math Department Head, ELL coordinator, Administrator	5C.2. CWTs to monitor reading/writing opportunities in the math classrooms. Use of home language dictionaries in cooperation with activities.	5C.2. Common assessments and BAT Alternative Assessments (i.e. Cella) Classroom observations
3	5C.3. Students' ability to comprehend and solve word problems.	5C.3. Word problems are being incorporated into the daily practice in all math classrooms.	5C.3. Math Department Chair and Administrator	5C.3. CWTs to observe reading strategies being used and to determine if word problems are being assigned and reviewed with students.	5C.3. Common assessments and BAT Alternative assessments (i.e. Cella) Classroom observations

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:	There will be a 19% decrease in SWD not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89% (89)	70% (104)

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. Transition from NGSSS to CCSS.	5D.1. Utilize county support from the district on a weekly basis. The DA personnel can assist the teachers by offering support and strategies that better prepare our students for CCSS. Staff Development for unwrapping the new standards for all math department personnel. PLCs centered on understanding the 8 mathematical practices and the strategies to use in the classroom to promote the practices.	5D.1. Administrator Dept. Chair	5D.1. PLC time incorporates the study of the 8 mathematical practices weekly. Interdepartmental meetings with reading colleagues to incorporate reading strategies and to monitor the use of strategies. CWTs to determine if reading and math strategies are being used.	5D.1. Common assessments and BAT. Classroom observations.
2	5D.2. Lack of exposure to the text and resources within it.	5D.2. Math teachers will incorporate read/write activities throughout each week that allow the	5D.2. Math Department Chair and Administrator	5D.2. CWTs to monitor reading/writing opportunities in the math classrooms.	5D.2. Common assessments and BAT.

		students to interpret the text and to give a written explanation of material covered.			Classroom observations.
3	5D.3 Students' ability to comprehend and solve word problems.	5D.3. Word problems are being incorporated into the daily practice in all math classrooms.	5D.3. Math Department Chair and Administrator	5D.3. CWTs to observe reading strategies being used and to determine if word problems are being assigned and reviewed with students.	5D.3. Common assessments and BAT. Classroom observations.

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	There will be a 15% decrease in Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%.	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	5E.1. Transition from NGSSS to CCSS.	5E.1. Utilize county support from the district on a weekly basis. The DA personnel can assist the teachers by offering support and strategies that better prepare our students for CCSS. Staff Development for unwrapping the new standards for all math department personnel. PLCs centered on understanding the 8 mathematical practices and the strategies to use in the classroom to promote the practices.	5E.1. Administrator Department Chair. Mathematics Goal #5E: There will be a 15% decrease in Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. PLC time incorporates the study of the 8 mathematical practices weekly. Interdepartmental meetings with reading colleagues to incorporate reading strategies and to monitor the use of strategies. CWTs to determine if reading and math strategies are being used. 2012 Current Level of Performance: *	5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. 2013 Expected Level of Performance: *

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:	There will be a 14% increase in Algebra I students scoring at a level 3 on the Mathematics portion of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

56% (24)			70% (77)		
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. Transition from NGSSS to CCSS	1.1. Utilize county support from the district on a weekly basis. The DA personnel can assist the teachers by offering support and strategies that better prepare our students for CCSS. Staff Development for unwrapping the new standards for all math department personnel. PLCs centered on understanding the 8 mathematical practices and the strategies to use in the classroom to promote the practices.	1.1. Math Department Chair and Administrator	1.1. PLC time incorporates the study of the 8 mathematical practices weekly. Interdepartmental meetings with reading colleagues to incorporate reading strategies and to monitor the use of strategies. CWTs to determine if reading and math strategies are being used.	1.1. Common Assessments and BAT Classroom observations
2	1.2. Students are participating in a specialized instruction that is not based on grade level skills	1.2. Integrate the read/write activities and imbed/scaffold grade level skills into the Algebra curriculum.	Math Department Chair and Administrator	1.2. CWT's to determine if the read/write activities are utilized in the classroom. Monitor skills assessments to determine if students are being exposed to grade level skills.	1.2. Common assessments and BAT. Mini-BAT results Classroom observations

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:	There will be an 11% increase in Algebra I students achieving a level 5 on the Mathematics portion of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (19)	55% (61)

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
	2.1. Transition from NGSSS to CCSS	2.1. Utilize county support from the district on a weekly basis. The DA personnel can assist the teachers by offering support and strategies that better	2.1. Math Department Chair and Administrator	2.1. PLC time incorporates the study of the 8 mathematical practices weekly. Interdepartmental meetings with reading	2.1. Common assessments and BAT. Classroom observations.

1		prepare our students for CCSS. Staff Development for unwrapping the new standards for all math department personnel. PLCs centered on understanding the 8 mathematical practices and the strategies to use in the classroom to promote the practices.		colleagues to incorporate reading strategies and to monitor the use of strategies. CWTs to determine if reading and math strategies are being used.	
2	2.2. Students are participating in a specialized instruction that is not based on grade level skills.	2.2. Integrate the read/write activities and imbed/scaffold grade level skills into the Algebra curriculum.	2.2. Math Department Chair and Administrator	2.2. CWTs to determine if the read/write activities are being utilized in the classroom. Monitor skills assessments to determine if students are being exposed to grade level skills.	2.2. Common assessments and BAT. Mini-BAT results Classroom observations

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	80% of students enrolled in Geometry will score at a level 3 on the Mathematics portion of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	80% (14)

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. Transition from NGSSS to CCSS	1.1. Utilize county support from the district on a weekly basis. The DA personnel can assist the teachers by offering support and strategies that better prepare our students for CCSS. Staff Development for unwrapping the new standards for all math department personnel. PLCs centered on understanding the 8 mathematical practices and the strategies to use in the classroom to promote the practices.	1.1. Math Department Chair Administrator	1.1. PLC time incorporates the study of the 8 mathematical practices weekly. Interdepartmental meetings with reading colleagues to incorporate reading strategies and to monitor the use of strategies. CWTs to determine if reading and math strategies are being used.	1.1. Common Assessments and BAT Classroom observations

2	1.2. Students are participating in a specialized instruction that is not based on grade level skills.	1.2. Integrate the read/write activities and imbed/scaffold grade level skills into the Algebra curriculum.	1.2. Math Department Chair Administrator	1.2. CWTs to determine if the read/write activities are being utilized in the classroom. Monitor skills assessments to determine if students are being exposed to grade level skills.	1.2. Common assessments and BAT. Mini-BAT results Classroom observations
---	--	--	--	---	---

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:	60% of students enrolled in Geometry will score a level 4 or 5 on the Mathematics portion of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	60% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Transition from NGSSS to CCSS	2.1. Utilize county support from the district on a weekly basis. The DA personnel can assist the teachers by offering support and strategies that better prepare our students for CCSS. Staff Development for unwrapping the new standards for all math department personnel. PLCs centered on understanding the 8 mathematical practices and the strategies to use in the classroom to promote the practices.	2.1. Math Department Head Administrator	2.1. PLC time incorporates the study of the 8 mathematical practices weekly. Interdepartmental meetings with reading colleagues to incorporate reading strategies and to monitor the use of strategies. CWTs to determine if reading and math strategies are being used.	2.1. Common Assessments and BAT Classroom observations
2	2.2. Students are participating in a specialized instruction that is not based on grade level skills.	2.2. Integrate the read/write activities and imbed/scaffold grade level skills into the Algebra curriculum.	2.2. Math Department Head Administrator	2.2. CWTs to determine if the read/write activities are being utilized in the classroom. Monitor skills assessments to determine if students are being exposed to grade level skills.	2.2. Common Assessments and BAT Classroom observations

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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
PD: Unwrapping the Benchmarks	6-8 Mathematics	Department Head and Administrator	Math department staff	Ongoing on staff development days	CWTs and Reflections	Math Department Head and Administrator
PLC: Incorporating Reading Strategies	6-8 Mathematics	Reading Department Staff and Reading Coach	Math department staff	Bi-weekly Wednesday PLCs	CWTs	Reading Coach, Math Department Head and Administrator
PLC: 8 Mathematical Practices for Success in CCSS	6-8 Mathematics	Department Head and Administrator	Math department staff	Monday PLCs	Reflections and CWTs	Math Department Head and Administrator

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a:	Increase % of students proficient by 24%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21%(52)	45% (131)

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.) All classrooms in 6th grade building don't have labs	1.) Teachers will use portable labs, i.e. vegetable garden, outside area for more engaging labs.	1.) Science administrator 2.) Science dept. chair 3.) Reading Coach 4.) Principal	1.) Teacher generated assessments 2.) Science Mini BAT's 3.) Monitoring of classes 4.) I – Observation 5.) Documentation from lab sheets	1.) Common Assessments 2.) Results from Mini BAT's 3.) BAT 1 & 2 4.) FCAT 2.0
2	2.) Students lack of knowledge in specific academic vocabulary	2.) Direct instruction of Tier 3 Voc. Pertinent to content comprehension.	1.) Science administrator 2.) Science dept. chair 3.) Reading Coach 4.) Principal	1.) Teacher generated assessments 2.) Science Mini BAT's 3.) Monitoring of classes 4.) I – Observation 5.) Documentation from lab sheets	1.) Common Assessments 2.) Results from Mini BAT's 3.) BAT 1 & 2 4.) FCAT 2.0
3	3.) Teachers lack of knowledge in teacher core literacy skills necessary for academic success.	3.) Extensive training in Common Core literacy standards. 4.) Reading dept. teachers to train content teachers bi – weekly on focus strategies	1.) Science administrator 2.) Science dept. chair 3.) Reading Coach 4.) Principal	1.) Teacher generated assessments 2.) Science Mini BAT's 3.) Monitoring of classes 4.) I – Observation 5.) Documentation from lab sheets	1.) Common Assessments 2.) Results from Mini BAT's 3.) BAT 1 & 2 4.) FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
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:	Increase % of students proficient by 10%

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2%(5)	12% (35)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student's pre-knowledge	All teachers will participate in staff development to address enhancement of scientific concepts	1. Science Dept. Chair 2. Science Administrator	1. Interim Reports 2. Report Cards 3. Frequent CWT's 4. Student Assessment	1. Teacher designed assessments that align to CCSS anchor Science.
2	Limited structured opportunities for students to transfer and apply scientific knowledge to solving real-world problems	Students will participate in community - based competitions and activities to enrich student learning of science and its application to real-world situations, Ex. Science Fair	1. Science Dept Chair 2. Science Administrator 3. Reading Coach	Teachers will engage students in real world competitions/activities as events occur.	Rubrics based on each specific activity completed. Student work/student created artifacts. Lab Journals & Notebooks.
3	Students' inability to select and use scientific problem solving strategies and independent thought process. 4. Teachers lack of experience in dealing with students who are not able to effectively process and solve scientific problems using the scientific method.	Students will participate in essential labs equivalent to support the inquiry processes of scientific thinking and problem solving.	1. Science Dept Chair 2. Science Administrator 3. Reading Coach	3. Teachers will monitor activities designed to enhance inquiry and independent problem solving skills. 4. Progress monitoring of science students, through data chats.	1. Teachers generated assessments and activities

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
Enhancement of Scientific thinking processing skills	6 – 8 Science	Science Dept. Head Science Admin.	Science Department	Monthly District meetings Weekly PLC's	CWT's, data chats,	AP over Science Department Chair
Unwrapping CCSSS Anchors for Science	6 – 8 Science	Science Dept Head	Science Dept.	Monthly District meetings Weekly PLC's	CWT's, Data Chats, lesson Plan review	AP over Science Department Chair
Infusion of high –order thinking skills into curriculum	6 – 8 Science	Science Dept. head	Science Dept.	Monthly District meetings Weekly PLC's	CWT's, Data Chats, lesson Plan review	AP over Science Department Chair

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level

3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	There will be a 13% increase in students scoring a 3.0 and higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%(171)	80% (234)

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.) Students current writing ability	1.) All language arts teachers will participate in staff development to address writing, grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, literature, and reading skills.	1.) LA Dept. Head 2.) Assistant Principal over LA	1.) Frequent CWT's to monitor student engagement and provide feedback to teacher to assist in instruction. 2.) Teacher monitoring of student progress 3.) Utilization of diagnostic assessments to drive instruction, monitor progress, and determine effectiveness of strategy.	1.) School –wide writing prompts 2.) Florida writing assessment rubric 3.) Student writing portfolios
2	2.) Students' lack of exposure to prewriting strategies	2.) Teachers will introduce and model prewriting strategies such as brainstorming, graphic organizers, and outlines.	2.) Language Arts Dept. Head AP over LA	1.) Frequent CWT's to monitor student engagement and provide feedback to teacher to assist in instruction. 2.) Teacher monitoring of student progress 3.) Utilization of diagnostic assessments to drive instruction, monitor progress, and determine effectiveness of strategy.	1.) School –wide writing prompts 2.) Florida writing assessment rubric 3.) Student writing portfolios
3	3.) Students lack of experience in writing on a particular content with logical progression of ideas. 4.) Teacher new to newly adopted writing program, Legacy Writes 5.) Teachers need more CCSSS training for writing	3.) Modeling mini – lessons on the importance of writing content to the central idea or topic and how the organization of the writing affects the logical progression of ideas and the unity of the piece. 4.) Training provided by company authors. 5.) Ongoing training provided on staff development days and PLC days	3.)Language Arts Dept. Head AP over LA 4.) Book Trainers	1.) Frequent CWT's to monitor student engagement and provide feedback to teacher to assist in instruction. 2.) Teacher monitoring of student progress 3.) Utilization of diagnostic assessments to drive instruction, monitor progress, and determine effectiveness of strategy.	1.) School –wide writing prompts 2.) Florida writing assessment rubric 3.) Student writing portfolios

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
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
Legacy Writes	6 - 8	Book Trainers	Language arts teachers	Weekly PLC meetings	Weekly 1 - Observation	AP Language Arts/Dept. head
Unwrapping Anchor Standards	6 - 8	Dept. Head	Language Arts Teachers	Weekly PLC Meetings and Staff Development days	Agendas from meetings Work samples of unwrapping ties into current curriculum	AP Language Arts/Dept. head

Writing Budget:

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	60% of students will score a level 3 or above on Civics EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	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	1.1. This is the first time Civics has been taught	1.1. Use of new civics textbook, publishers technology materials, and BEEP lessons	1.1. Megan Weller – Social Studies Department Head	1.1. Common Assessments	1.1. Civics EOC
2	No Baseline data	1.2. Use classroom tests	Megan Weller - Social Studies Department Head	Common Assessments	Civics EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	30% of students will score at a level 4 or above on the Civics EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	30%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. This is the first time Civics has been taught	2.1. Use of new civics textbook, publishers technology materials, and BEEP lessons	2.1. Megan Weller – Social Studies Department Head	2.1. Common Assessments	2.1. Civics EOC

--	--	--	--	--	--

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:	96% of students will attend school daily.
---------------------------------------	---

2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95%	96%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
83	72
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
26	13

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. Excessive absences due to health concerns: i.e. head lice, immunizations	Social worker home visits Parent trainings offered through Health Services	Administration, Guidance, & School Social Worker	Review attendance in Pinnacle	Pinnacle TERMS BASIS DMS
2	Students' tardiness Pattern of tardiness & non- attendance	1.2. Parent Link call -outs, staff calls, parent conferences, and conferences with administration Social Worker referrals submitted	Teachers, Guidance, School Social Worker	Review attendance records	Compare from previous school year

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
District Attendance Policies	Faculty & Staff	administration	School - wide	Start of school year	Pinnacle TERMS DMS BASIS	Administrators
Attendance Codes	Faculty & Staff	Administration	School -wide	On - going	Pinnacle TERMS DMS BASIS	Administration

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension		Total # of students suspended in school and out of school will be reduced by 20%			
Suspension Goal # 1:					
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
353		250			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
187		100			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
116		75			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
78		65			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	1.) Insufficient implementation of appropriate management techniques	1.) Grade level assemblies addressing student behavior as outlined in the Student Code of Conduct & Proactive Discipline Plan	Administration Department Heads Faculty	1.) Number of referrals reported to administration resulting in consequences.	Monthly data pulls of discipline incidence TERMS DMS BASIS
2	2.) Insufficient time spent reviewing school policies and expectations.	2.) Utilizing new school-wide discipline plan with fidelity	Administration Department Heads Faculty	2.) DMS System	Reduced incidence of referrals in DMS
3	3.) Lack of uniformity in consequences	3.) Administration and teachers will attend discipline matrix training	District Facilitators	Uniformity with consequences	DMS BASIS

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
Rtl Training	All Levels	MTSS Team	Teachers	October 25, 2012	Number and types of referrals written	Discipline Chair AP over Discipline
Staff trained on new proactive discipline plan	All	Discipline Committee AP over committee	School wide	August 16th, 2012 – Pre –planning week	Number and types of referrals written	Discipline Chair AP over Discipline

Suspension Budget:

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	We will maintain or increase our parental involvement for the 2012-13 school year by increasing our volunteer base.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
55%	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	1.)Lack of parental involvement due to work situations	1.) Variation of times and location for meetings and other activities. 2.) Survey parents to find out their interests, talents, and availability 3.) Maintain a system to contact families throughout the year.	1.) AP's 2.) Faculty 3.) Principal	Sign-in sheets, parent focus group meetings, and response forms.	Annual Survey Parent Response
2	2.) .Parents whose primary language is other than English Feel uncomfortable attending meetings	2.) - Provide translators for meetings and conferences including MegaSkills.	1.2. Administrators, guidance counselors, and teachers.	Information log for call-outs. Parent response forms	Annual Survey

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Volunteer Breakfast	All Parents	PTSA/SAC	Parents	10/12/12	Sign –in Minutes Agendas	AP responsible Parental Involvement
ELL Parent Night	All Parents	Charlotte Jackson Jilma Cabral	Parents	11/07/12	Sign In Minutes	AP responsible for parent involvement

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. CTE				
CTE Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
--	---	---	--

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/26/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

- 1.) Anti – Bullying Presentation
- 2.) Presentation of SIP Goals for each content area
- 3.) Dr. Seuss Event

- 4.) Technology Improvements
- 5.) Support of Student Organizational Groups
- 6.) School Incentive Programs

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District JAMES S. RICKARDS MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	63%	65%	83%	42%	253	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	67%			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?	74% (YES)	68% (YES)			142	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					528	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District JAMES S. RICKARDS MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	63%	66%	91%	40%	260	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?	67% (YES)	65% (YES)			132	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					525	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested