

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: MCI NTOSH MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Harriet D. Moore

SAC Chair: David Schatz

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 11/8/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Melanie Taylor	MBA - Rice University BS - Univ. of wisconsin Ed. Leadership Math 6-12 Math 5-9 ESE K-12 Nat'l Board ESE Endorsement	1	1	Assistant Principal McIntosh Middle School 2011-2012: Grade A, High Standards Reading 64%, High Standards Math 69%, High Standards Writing 87%, High Standards Science 58%. Behavior/Intervention Specialist 2010-2011 Sarasota Middle School: Grade A, High Standards Reading 88%, High Standards Math 89%, High Standards Writing 98%, High Standards Science 83%. 87% overall AYP criteria achieved.
Assis Principal	David Schatz	MA - JFK University M.Ed. - USF EdS - Argosy University BS - Arizona State K-12 Guidance Ed. Leadership MGIC 5-9 K-6 Elem ESOL Endorsed Reading	7		Language Arts/Reading teacher: Grade A 2004-2012, 2011-2012, High Standards Reading 64%, High Standards Math 69%, High Standards Writing 87%, High Standards Science 58%. 2011-2012, High Standards Reading 76%, High Standards Math 79%, High Standards Writing 93%, High Standards Science 62%. 82% overall AYP criteria achieved.

		Endorsement			
Principal	Dr. Harriet Moore	B.A. Psychology & Education - Georgia State University; Master of Education Administration & Supervision National Louis, University; Education Specialist- Educational Leadership; Doctorate of Education - Educational Leadership; State of Florida Principal Certification	1	14	<p>Program Director/Principal of Phoenix Academy 2011-2012: NG Reading Satisfactory; 2012 22% (2011/18%); High Performing Quality: N; AMO=22 (Target=25) Did not meet Target: Improving in Reading: Y; Math Satisfactory; 2012 34% (2011/15%); High Performing Quality: N; AMO=34 (Target AMO=22) Met Target AMO; Writing Satisfactory: 74%</p> <p>Assistant Principal of Riverview High School</p> <p>2009-2011: Grade B: Reading Proficiency: 59% and 59% made learning gains; Math Proficiency for grade 9-10: 80%; Writing Proficiency- 94%; Science Mastery: 40%. AYP = 72%, 81% of total students & 87% of white students made AYP. Black, Hispanic, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading or math. 2008-2009: Grade: B, Reading Mastery: 58%; Math Mastery: 86%; Writing Mastery 90 %; Science Mastery: 48%. AYP: 77%, Hispanic, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading & math. Black did not make AYP in math. 2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 64%, Math Mastery 85%; Writing Mastery 84%; Science Mastery 59%; AYP 90 %; White, Black made AYP in reading. Only SWD did not make AYP in math.</p>

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)
	NA				

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	Regular meetings with staff - both individually and in small group	Principal	Ongoing	
2	Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Principal/Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
3	Provide targeted professional development	Principal/Assistant 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
7 instructional staff members are teaching out-of-field	Out-of-field staff members are participating in professional development in the areas of reading, gifted education, and ESOL in order to fulfill requirements to be highly-qualified, in-field teachers

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
60	0.0%(0)	13.3%(8)	46.7%(28)	40.0%(24)	51.7%(31)	98.3%(59)	11.7%(7)	6.7%(4)	23.3%(14)

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
No data submitted			

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team is comprised of general education personnel that facilitate MTSS/PS-RtI as a related but distinct process from the CARE (Children at Risk in Education) eligibility determination process. At McIntosh Middle School the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team is composed of:

- Principal/Assistant Principals: Provide support in instructional resources, strategies and overall data demographics.
- General Education Teachers: Provide information regarding classroom instructional strategies, interventions, daily monitoring and progress.
- School Guidance Counselors: Provide information related to services, groups and intervention strategies. Also facilitate student identification.
- Behavior Specialist: Identifies, facilitates and coordinates resource and strategy implementation.
- Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Liaison: Provides information regarding current IEP, related strategies and on-going reviews.
- School Social Worker: Serves as family liaison providing information related to social services and related topics.

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

- The team meets regularly to engage in the following:
- Review summative and formative data to identify school, grade, and class level academic and social/emotional needs of individual students.
 - Based on data review, instructional strategies will be identified and a timeline for implementation constructed.
 - Student progression will be monitored and individual cases reviewed periodically to determine progress and reassess further instructional interventions.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement

plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The school based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team has been the driving force behind the development of student achievement interventions and progress monitoring thereby directly impacting the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The team assists teachers, and through them students, in achieving AYP goals. Information derived through the MTSS/RtI process feeds the identification of school wide needs in the areas of professional development and resource development.

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.

The school uses a variety of reports provided by the Office of Research, Assessment and Evaluation to monitor the achievement of students at all Tiers. Disaggregated AYP data by subgroup, grade level, content and benchmark is utilized. The state FAIR reading assessments are used for all Tiers in reading and the Florida Achieves Science assessments and the District Mathematics Benchmark assessments are utilized at all Tiers for Science and Math. Formative and summative assessment data collected at the classroom level is also utilized at all Tiers. Behavior data is tracked via RtI database, District database and school specific data tracking.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI Positive Behavior Support Model is being reinforced with interactive student lessons on the McIntosh School-Wide Behavior Expectations through our Community of Caring Classes. Staff professional development on the MTSS/RtI/PBS model will continue through regularly scheduled staff development meetings throughout the year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Administration will collaborate with instructional staff in regular review and improvement of MTSS, fund-raising for incentives and reinforcement of students and staff meeting expectations and improving deficiencies.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

McIntosh Middle Schools Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is comprised of:
Dr. Harriet Moore Principal
Melanie Taylor Assistant Principal
David Schatz Assistant Principal
Deanne Nelson Media Specialist
Noel Gilliland Language Arts Curriculum Leader

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

Content curriculum is developed through monthly and weekly meetings and is based on the district Instructional Focus Calendars. Each grade level Curriculum Leader works weekly through their PLC meetings with classroom teachers to make decisions involving scheduling of classes, grade and content specific curriculum, school-wide strategies, test data analysis, formative and summative common classroom assessments, and district wide initiatives.

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

McIntosh Middle School will continue the integration of the IEngage/Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model; implementing teacher modeling, guided practice, productive group work and independent practice. The Compass Odyssey Learning computer program, Florida Achieves Focus testing, FAIR testing and the Fusion instructional model will all be utilized to maximize achievement of students. The Word of the Week (WOW) will be implemented in every classroom across the campus to build word part knowledge and vocabulary. Weekly PLCs will continue their work in common formative and summative assessments, lesson design and implementation, data analysis and development of strategies for targeting areas of student weakness. The StarBooks program will continue with a school-wide read aloud of John Grisham's Theodore Boone in the fall and another

selection in the spring.

Independent student reading will be encouraged through the Choice Books program, student literacy letters and our Book Pass program.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/28/2012)

*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.

All core instructional staff will continue to integrate the iEngage/Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model in their classrooms to include a daily Content Purpose and Language Purpose.

The Word of the Week (WOW) will be implemented in all classrooms across campus to build word part knowledge and vocabulary.

CAR-PD and FOR-PD training will be offered to all instructional staff within the district.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 32%(291) Level 3,4,5 - 64%(575)	Level 3 - 36% Level 3,4,5 - 68%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The teachers in two of our Intensive Reading classrooms are relatively inexperienced.	They will participate in weekly grade level/content specific PLC meetings, and be provided on-going professional development to target identified needs.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, LA Department Chair, Media Specialist	Classroom walkthroughs, teacher conferences, regular meetings with PLC members	Disrict provided classroom walkthrough and evaluation forms.
2	The pacing of instructional focus differs from classroom to classroom thereby producing varied emphasis on certain outcome measures.	Teacher Curriculum Writing Committees developed and refined a district wide Instructional Focus Calendar that will be followed by all classroom teachers.	Principal and Assistant Principals	Administration will be aware of district IFCs, upcoming focus items, and monitor implementation during classroom walkthroughs.	Classroom walkthrough form and attendance at PLC meetings.
3	The iEngage/Gradual Release of Responsibility model is not consistently being implemented across all classrooms.	Teacher Curriculum Writing Committees have written Content Purpose, Language Purpose and Productive Work Outcomes across the curriculum to guide teachers. Professional development will continue to be provided on the GRR model.	Principal and Assistant Principals	Administration will review and give feedback on Content Purpose, Language Purpose and Productive Group Outcomes statements posted on boards during classroom walkthroughs. Administrations will also check for fidelity to the GRR model during walkthroughs.	Classrooms walkthrough form.
4	6th grade reading teachers are transitioning from the StoryTown reading program to the Fusion instructional model	Provide targeted professional development to 6th grade reading teachers on the Fusion model	Principal, Assistant Principals, District staff	Classroom walkthroughs, results of formative and summative assessments	FAIR data, formative and summative assessment data, FCAT scores

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:	
-----------------------------------	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 32%(284) Level 3,4,5 - 64%(575)	Level 4,5 - 34% Level 3,4,5 - 68%

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 are scheduled into classes heterogeneously, requiring teachers to differentiate their instruction with varying degrees of success.	Teachers will learn effective grouping strategies and differentiating techniques.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs.	Differentiated products and/or processes will be evident in both lesson plans and classroom practices.
2		Teachers will incorporate higher order questioning and increased rigor throughout their lessons.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Classroom walkthroughs. Monitor FAIR data.	Classroom walkthrough form. FAIR progress monitoring data.

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%(551)	70%

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 need consistent use of high impact instructional strategies.	Teachers will continue to implement GRR strategies with fidelity.	Principal, Assistant Principals	Classroom walkthroughs, review of lesson plans, monitor PLCs	Classroom walkthrough form, FAIR data
2		Teachers will effectively utilize Florida Achieves (Focus) assessment tool.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Media Specialist.	Review Focus results, review FAIR data, classroom walkthroughs.	Focus results, FAIR data, classroom walkthrough form.

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64%(139)	68%

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 in the lowest quartile may be significantly behind their peers who are at or above proficiency levels.	Students from the lowest quartile will be scheduled into Fusion courses or into separate reading courses.	Administration, Scheduling registrar	Monitor placement	Crosscheck student schedules with FCAT results.
2	Students in the lowest quartile need continuous progress monitoring in order to target instruction to their specific needs.	Instruction can be personally targeted and monitored through the Compass Odyssey Learning program	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinator, Media Specialist	Progress monitoring through FAIR, Compass and Focus reports	FAIR reports, Focus reports, Compass reports
3	Students lack access to age appropriate material and motivation of read.	Through StarBooks program and the "Choice" books program students will have access and choices in reading material.	Media Specialist	Monitor book selection in Media Center.	Literacy Letters, Book Passes

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year projection (2016-2017) is					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	65	68	72	75	78	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your
--	--

Reading Goal #5B:	school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 74%(428) Hispanic 57%(86) Black 26%(17) Asian 87%(14)	White 76% Hispanic 57% Met AMO Target Black 45% Asian 66% Exceeded AMO Target

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	ESOL students struggle with learning English and it's grammatic norms and confusing exceptions.	Low scoring ESOL students will be placed in Fusion classes with small group, differentiated instruction.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinator, Media Specialist, ESOL Liaison	Results of Focus, Compass and FAIR assessments.	Focus, Compass, and Fair reports.
2	Low achieving students are in need of reading remediation	Provide all students scoring at Level 1 or 2 Intensive Reading instruction	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair, Media Specialist, Intensive Reading teachers	Review of Focus, Compass, FAIR and classroom assessments	Focus, Compass, FAIR and FCAT

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26%	47%

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	ELL is currently not a subgroup represented on the McIntosh Middle School campus for AYP purposes.				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

30% (51)			40%		
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	We need to effectively assess and target instruction for these at risk learners.	Teachers will learn to evaluate results of Focus, Compass and FAIR assessments in order to design effective lessons for all learners.	Principals, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Media Specialist, ESE Liaison	Classroom walkthroughs and observational data will be reviewed.	Focus, Compass and FAIR assessment scores and lesson plans.
2		Fusion teachers will effectively utilize rotations in order to facilitate small group instruction.	Principals, Assistant Principals	Classroom walkthroughs and observational data will be reviewed.	Classroom walkthrough forms.
3		Instructional staff needs regularly scheduled opportunities to share ideas and strategies with each other.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Media Specialist	Curriculum Coordinators and Administration	Notes from PLC meetings.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016- 1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54%	58%

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 are in need of structured instruction utilizing best practice teaching strategies.	Fully implement district Instructional Focus Calendar	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Leaders, Media Specialist	Classroom walkthroughs and review of lesson plans.	Classroom walkthrough forms and lesson plans.
2		Teachers will implement the Fusion instructional model with fidelity.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Leaders, Media Specialist	Classroom walkthroughs and review of lesson plans.	Classroom walkthrough forms, observational notes and lesson plans.
3		Teachers will fully implement the Engage/Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Leaders, Media Specialist.	Classroom walkthrogus and review of lesson plans.	Classroom walkthrough forms, observational notes and lesson plans.

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
iEngage/Gradual Release of Responsibility Instructional Framework	Grade 6-8	Principal, Assistant Principals, District staff	All ELA teachers who have fully completed the iEngage/GRR instructional framework training	2-4 trainings, October/November 2012	Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, lesson plans review	Principal, Assistant Principals
Targeted reading professional development for Fusion teachers	Grades 6-8	District Staff	All Fusion reading teachers	One-half day training September 2012	Monitoring FAIR, Focus and Compass data	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair, Media Specialist
Focused professional development on text complexity, teaching and assessing reading, writing and literacy	Grades 6-8	Tim Shanahan	ELA Curriculum Coordinators	Full day, November 1, 2012	Classroom walkthroughs, formative and summative assessment results	Principal, Assistant Principals
Targeted reading professional development for ELA teachers	Grades 6-8	District staff	All non-Fusion ELA teachers	One-half day training September 2012	Monitoring of FAIR, Focus and Compass data	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair, Media Specialist

Reading Budget:

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.				
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.				
CELLA Goal #2:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.				
CELLA Goal #3:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 38%(338) Level 3,4,5 - 68%(612)	Level 3 - 42% Level 3,4,5 - 72%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers need to utilize best practices in instruction preparation and delivery.	Math teachers will participate in training and work to fully implement the Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Classroom walkthroughs, observational notes and lesson plans.	CWT forms and lesson plans.
2	Students require regular practice and feedback on FCAT style mathematics assessments.	Students will participate in progress monitoring testing 3 times annually in district provided Benchmark assessments.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Review of Benchmark assessment results.	District provided Benchmark assessment results.
3	Math curriculum implementation timeline is inconsistent and not fully aligned to district and State outcome measures.	All math teachers will follow the teacher created, district Instructional Focus Calendars.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Review of weekly PLC meetings, classroom walkthroughs and observational notes.	PLC notes, CWT data and administration observation.
4	There is a need for consistent utilization of classroom based common assessments.	Math teachers will work to create common, classroom based assessments aligned with NGSSS.	Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair	Discussions within weekly PLC meetings.	PLC notes and administration participation in regular PLC meetings.

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 31% (274) Level 3,4,5 - 68%(612)	Level 4,5 - 33% Level 3,4,5 - 70%

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	There is a need for consistent utilization of classroom based common assessments.	Math teachers will work to create common, classroom based assessments aligned with NGSSS.	Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair	Discussions within weekly PLC meetings.	PLC notes provided to administration.
2	Students require regular practice and feedback on FCAT style mathematics assessments.	Student will participate in progress monitoring 3 times annually in district provided Benchmark assessments.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators.	Review of Benchmark assessment results.	District provided Benchmark assessment results.
3	Teachers need time together to develop instructional strategies for higher achieving students.	Teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings to share ideas and results.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators.	Review of PLC notes and lesson plans.	PLC notes and lesson plans.
4	Math curriculum implementation is inconsistent and not fully aligned with district and State outcome measures.	All math teachers will follow the teacher created, district Instructional Focus Calendar.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators.	Review of weekly PLC meetings, classroom walkthroughs and observational notes.	PLC notes and CWT data.
5	Teachers need to utilize best practices in instruction preparation and delivery.	Math teachers will participate in training and work to fully implement the Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators.	Classroom walkthroughs, observational notes and lesson plans.	CWT forms and lesson plans.

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (573)	73%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Math curriculum implementation is inconsistent and not fully aligned to district and State outcome measures.	All math teachers will follow the teacher created, district, Instructional Focus Calendar.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators.	Review of weekly PLC notes, classroom walkthroughs and observational notes.	PLC notes and CWT data.
2	Teachers need to utilize best practices in instruction preparation and delivery.	Math teachers will participate in and work to fully implement the Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators.	Classroom walkthroughs, observational notes and lesson plans.	CWT forms and lesson plans.
3	There is a need for consistent utilization of classroom based common assessments.	Math teachers will work to create common, classroom based assessments aligned with the NGSSS.	Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair	Discussions within weekly PLC meetings.	PLC notes provided to administration.
4	Students require regular practice and feedback on FCAT style mathematics assessments.	Students will participate in progress monitoring testing 3 times annually with district provided Benchmark assessments.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators.	Review of district Benchmark assessment results.	District provided Benchmark assessment results.
5	Students are in need of remediation and are unable to receive it during the regular school day.	Before school "Renaissance Math" will provide tutoring two days per week before school.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Math Department Chair	Participation level in program and observation of students' success after attendance.	Common assessment data within individual classrooms.

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lower quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (132)	63%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need instruction and reinforcing practice targeted towards building proficiency with their specific mathematical weaknesses.	Intensive math instructors will utilize the Compass Odyssey Learning Program to provide individualized lessons, practice and reinforcement.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Intensive math teachers	Intensive math teachers will review weekly progress reports on students progress with the Compass program.	Compass reports.
2	There is a need for consistent utilization of classroom based common assessments.	Math teachers will work to create common, classroom based assessments aligned with the NGSSS.	Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair	Discussions within weekly PLC meetings.	PLC notes provided to administration.
3	Students struggle with basic number factors and number sense.	Low scoring students will participate in the FASTMATH online tutorial program to build math fact fluency and number sense.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Intensive math teachers	Intensive math teachers will monitor progress through weekly progress reports.	Multiple level progress reports provided by FASTMATH program.
4	Math curriculum implementation is inconsistent and not fully aligned to district and State outcome measures.	All math teachers will follow the teacher created, district, Instructional Focus Calendar.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Review of weekly PLC meetings, classroom walkthroughs and observational notes.	PLC notes, CWT data.
	Students require regular practice and feedback on	Students will participate in progress monitoring	Principal, Assistant Principals,	Review of Benchmark assessment results.	District provided Benchmark

5	FCAT style mathematics assessments.	testing 3 times annually in district provided Benchmark assessments.	Curriculum Coordinators		assessment results.
6	Teachers need to utilize best practices in instruction delivery and preparation.	Math teachers will participate in training and work to fully implement the Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Classroom walkthroughs, observational notes and lesson plans.	CST forms and lesson plans.
7	Students are in need of remediation outside of the school day.	Provide "Renaissance Math" before school, two days a week, with math teachers offering tutoring.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Department Chair	Participation and observations by tutoring teachers.	Common assessment data from individual classrooms.
8	Students are in need of remediation outside of the school day.	Provide "Renaissance Math" before school, two days a week, with math teachers offering tutoring.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Department Chair	Participation and observations by tutoring teachers.	Common assessment data from individual classrooms.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year projection (2016-2017) is				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	69	72	75	77	80	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 78% (454) Hispanic 62% (89) Black 36%(23) Asian 80%(13) American Indian n/a	White 79% Hispanic 60% Exceeded AMO Target Black 48% Asian 76% Exceeded AMO Target 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	Students struggle with learning gaps and lack of readiness for current grade level curriculum demands.	Provide remediation through Intensive Math classes for low achieving students.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Intensive Math teachers.	Review of formative and summative assessments within the Intensive Math classrooms and regular math classrooms.	Formative and summative grades in CrossPointe grade book, end of quarter results and FCAT scores.
2	Students are challenged by day-to day math curriculum demands.	Provide individual and small group tutoring support through before school Renaissance Math program two mornings per week.	Principal, Assistant Principal, classroom and Renaissance Math teachers.	Review of formative and summative assessments from classroom teachers.	Formative and summative classroom assessments, quarterly grades, FCAT scores.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016- 1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37%	49%

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	ELL is not an AYP group currently represented on the McIntosh Middle School campus.				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016- 1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (47)	39% Exceeded AMO Target

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	There is a need for consistent utilization of classroom based common assessments.	Math teachers will work to create common, classroom based assessments aligned with the NGSSS.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Discussions within weekly PLC meetings.	PLC notes provided to administration.
2	Math curriculum implementation timeline is inconsistent and not fully aligned to district and State outcome measures.	All math teachers will follow the teacher created, district Instructional Focus Calendar.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Review of weekly PLC meetings, classroom walkthroughs and observational notes.	PLC notes, CWT data.
3	Many Students With Disabilities lack proficiency with basic number facts and number sense.	Students will utilize the FASTMATH online tutorial program to build math fact fluency and number sense.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Intensive Math teachers.	Intensive Math teachers will run weekly progress monitoring reports.	FASTMATH online progress monitoring reports.
4	Students need targeted instruction in identified math skill deficiencies.	Teachers will design student specific learning paths for students using the Compass Odyssey Learning program.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Intensive Math teachers	Intensive math teachers will use formative classroom assessments and Compass reports to evaluate student	Classroom grade reports and Compass reports.

				progress.	
5	Students require regular practice and feedback on FCAT style mathematics assessments.	Students will participate in progress monitoring testing 3 times annually in district Benchmark assessments.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Review of Benchmark assessment results.	District provided Benchmark assessment results.
6	Teachers need to utilize best practices in instruction delivery and preparation.	Math teachers will participate in training and work to fully implement the Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators	Classroom walkthroughs, observational notes and lesson plans.	CWT forms and lesson plans.

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60%	63%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 27%(20) Level 3,4,5 - 100%(75)	Level 3 - 27% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

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 may be placed in advanced courses when they are not developmentally/academically ready.	Only place students in advanced math classes after review of a spectrum of data - FCAT, grades, prognosis test results, teacher recommendation, etc. Monitor their progress regularly.	Principal, Assistant Principals, math department chair and math teachers	Review placements from year to year. Review quarterly grade reports. Teacher monitoring of each students progress.	FCAT scores, quarterly and end of course grades, classroom assessments

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 73%(55) Level 3,4,5 - 100%(75)	Level 4,5 - 75% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

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	Rigor needs to be increased.	Embed technology into lessons that exposes students to a wider range of real world, relevant math problems	Principal, Assistant Principals, math teacher	Student engagement and level of thinking skills required to perform work.	Classroom walkthroughs, review of student performance, quarterly grades

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
iEngage (Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model)	Grades 6-8	Principal, Assistant Principals, District personnel	Math teachers at all grade levels who have not been fully trained	October-November 2012	Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings	Principal, Assistant Principals

Mathematics Budget:

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

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:		By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Level 3 - 38% ((109) Level 3,4,5 - 58% (167)		Level 3 - 42% Level 3, 4,5 - 62%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Science curriculum has been realigned by content area.	Provide instructional staff regularly scheduled opportunities to share ideas and information with each other	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum coordinators	Administration to review weekly PLC notes.	PLC notes, District Benchmark results and results of common assessments.
2	Students need to experience science with hands-on lessons.	Instructional staff will work collaboratively to design experiential learning opportunities for students.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chairs	Classroom walkthroughs and review of lesson plans.	Classroom walkthrough forms, District Benchmark results and common assessment results.
	Instructional staff needs to fully implement the Next	Utilize IFC with linked benchmarks to guide lesson planning and	Principal, Assistant Principals,	Classroom walkthroughs, observational notes,	CWT forms, lesson plans, District

3	Generation Sunshine State Science Standards and the district Instructional Calendar.	common assessment development.	Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chairs	review of lesson plans and weekly PLC notes.	Benchmark results and common assessment results.
4	Instructional staff needs to utilize instructional best practices for lesson delivery.	Teachers will fully implement the iEngage/ Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chairs	Classroom walkthroughs and observational notes.	CWT forms, District Benchmark results and common assessment results.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in 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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 20% (58) Level 3,4,5 - 58% (167)	Level 4,5 - 24% Level 3,4,5 - 62%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Science curriculum has been realigned by content area.	Provide instructional staff regularly scheduled opportunities to share ideas and information with each	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators,	Administration to review weekly PLC notes.	PLC notes, District Benchmark results and results of

		other.	Department Chairs		common assessments.
2	Students need to be challenged by lessons where they "experience" and "discover" science for themselves.	Instructional staff will work collaboratively to design experiential learning opportunities for students.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chairs	Classroom walkthrough and review of lesson plans.	CWT forms, District Benchmark and common assessment results.
3	Instructional staff needs to fully implement the Next Generation Sunshine State Science Standards and the district Instructional Calendar.	Utilize IFC with linked benchmarks, to guide lesson planning and common assessment development.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chairs	Classroom walkthroughs, observational notes, review of lesson plans and weekly PLC notes.	CWT forms, lesson plans, District Benchmark results and common assessment results.
4	Instructional staff needs to utilize instructional best practices for lesson delivery.	Teachers will fully implement the iEngage/Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional model.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chairs	Classroom walkthroughs and observational notes.	CWT forms, District Benchmark results and common assessment results.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in 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
------------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	---

iEngage/Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional framework	Grades 6-8	Principal, Assistant Principal, District staff	Science teachers who have not been fully trained on the iEngage/Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional framework	2-4 sessions scheduled in October/November 2012	Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, lesson plan review	Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Coordinators, 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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
87%(249)	89%			
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 need regular practice and feedback from FCAT type writing assessments.	Utilize common writing assessments four times annually with scoring and feedback provided to students.	Principal, Assistant Principals, curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair	Review and comparison of practice writing scores by administration.	Excel score spreadsheet.
2	Students need to build vocabulary and decoding skills.	Instructional staff will utilize our daily Word of the Week (WOW) program to build recognition of roots, prefixes, suffixes, etc.	Principal, Assistant Principals, curriculum Coordinator, Department Chair	Review of student WOW notebooks, practice writing scores and FAIR assessments.	WOW notebooks, writing score spreadsheets, Fair assessment data.
3	Instructional staff needs regularly scheduled opportunities to share effective teaching strategies with each other.	Create, support and monitor effective content-based PLC groups.	Principal, Assistant Principals, curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair	Administration walkthroughs and participation in PLC meetings.	Results of practice prompts and FCAT Writing.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
iEngage/Gradual Release of Responsibility Instructional framework	Grades 6-8	Principal, Assistant Principal, District staff	All ELA teachers who have not completed iEngage/Gradual Release of Responsibility Instruction Framework training	2-4 sessions in October/November 2012	Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, lesson plans	Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair

Targeted PD regarding critical writing components and scoring elements	Grades 6-8	Principal, Assistant Principal, District Staff	All ELA teachers	One-half day on varying dates in September 2012	Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, lesson plans, review of student practice writing performances	Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Coordinators, Department Chair, Media Specialist
Focused professional development on Writing	Grade 8	District Staff	All 8th Grade ELA teachers	Full day, November 29, 2012	Review results of district writing practice	Principal, Assistant Principals

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.				
Civics Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	<p>ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage.</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.</p>
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
98.7% (966/979)	100%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
411	372
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Lack of parental	Families will be notified	Attendance	Attendance monitoring	District absence

1	knowledge of student absence. School unable to contact parent in timely manner. Parents absent from home during school hours.	when their student is not in school. Counseling will be provided to students displaying poor attendance patterns. School social worker and truancy officer will intervene as needed.	Secretary, Guidance, Counselors, Principal, Assistant Principals, SWST Team,	and updating of parent contact numbers.	report provided to School Wide Support Team
2	Parents and families need information and support when dealing with truancy issues.	Students with chronic absences will be brought up at School Wide Support Team meeting and an intervention strategy will be developed and monitored.	SWST Team, Attendance Secretary, District Truancy Officer	Documentation of SWST meetings, student meetings and parent meetings.	District absence report

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions				
154	105				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School				
89	89				
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
200	151				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
108	59				
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	Staff reductions. Student awareness of school-wide expectations.	Proactively teach school-wide behavior expectations through Positive Behavior Support and Community of Caring	Principal, Assistant Principals, Behavior Specialist, Guidance Counselors, Classroom teachers	Monthly tracking of referrals and "on-calls".	Monthly referral reports.
2	Emphasis on keeping students in classrooms. Professional development regarding PBS, school wide expectations and progressive behavior plan.	Provide positive and proactive classroom management training and assistance to teachers in need.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Behavior Specialist, Guidance Counselors	Monitor monthly referrals and "on-calls".	Monthly referral reports.

(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
PBS/RtI/MTSS training	Grades 6-8	Principal, Assistant Principals, Behavior Specialist, Guidance Counselors	All teachers, Gades 6-8	Ongoing throughout year within PLC groups	Monitor data in RtI database	Principal, Assistant Principals, Behavior Specialist, Guidance Counselors

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>For grades 6-8, we will see a 10% increase in the number of parent volunteer hours on the MMS campus in school year 2011-2012.</p>
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
2,764.5 hours	3,041 hours

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	Parents may not be aware of the need, the process or the availability of opportunities to volunteer on the MMS campus.	Parents will be actively recruited at Back to School Orientation, Open House, Hawks Night and Literacy Night.	Administration, Instructional Staff and PTO.	Volunteer records will be tracked quarterly to measure progress towards goal.	Year end parent involvement records.
2		The school will implement an outreach program through the school's website, the monthly newsletter, flyers sent home with students and ConnectEd phone calls.	Administration and PTO.	Volunteer records will be tracked quarterly to measure progress towards goal.	Year end parent involvement records.

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

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

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

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

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 11/8/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Monies will be used to provide continuous development and implementation of professional development and materials required to increase student achievement.	\$2,109.00

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) performs an important function in assuring the success of McIntosh School. Listed below are some of the functions of the SAC:

- Assist preparation of School Improvement Plan (SIP)

- Input into the spending of School Improvement funds
- Review of Annual Operating Budget
- Facilitate community outreach
- Review annual progress towards achievement of the goals of the school.

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

Sarasota School District MCINTOSH MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	76%	79%	93%	62%	310	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	61%	77%			138	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	62% (YES)	78% (YES)			140	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					588	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District MCINTOSH MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	76%	93%	61%	309	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%	76%			140	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	57% (YES)	74% (YES)			131	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					580	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested