FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: LAWTON CHILES MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Nelson Izquierdo

SAC Chair: Gary L. Shotwell

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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)
Principal	Nelson Izquierdo	BS in Secondary Education -Social Studies, St Thomas University; MS in Educational Leadership, Nova University, Principal Certification State of Florida	2	11	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades C D D C F High Standards –Read 42% 19% 18% 16% 17% High Standards –Math 35% 51% 58% 54% 33% Lng Gains – Read 57% 41% 37% 12% 58% Lng Gains – Math 56% 60% 72% 74% 58% Gains Read-25 66% 55% 76% 52% 69% Gaines Math-25 59% 69% 76% 81% 70%
		BS in Therapeutic Recreation, Florida International			

Assis Principal	Yanelys Canales	University; Master of Science in Special Education, Nova University; Specialist in Educational Leadership, Nova University; Certification – ESOL, Varying Exceptionalities, Reading Endorsement, Educational Leadership K-12 State of Florida	9	7	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades C C C B A High Standards –Read 42% 60% 60% 62% 59% High Standards –Math 35% 49% 56% 57% 58% Lng Gains – Read 57% 59% 61% 61% 64% Lng Gains – Math 56% 52% 66% 63% 70% Gains Read-25 66% 64% 62% 68% 77% Gaines Math-25 59% 55% 67% 66% 73%
Assis Principal	Israel Sosa	BS in Health Science, Jersey City State College; Master of Arts in Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language, Jersey City University, Certification – Health Science, Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language, Educational Leadership K-12 State of Florida.	3	10	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades D C D C D High Standards –Read 32% 43% 41% 38% 36% High Standards – Math 35% 43% 39% 37% 37% Lng Gains –Read 63% 63% 59% 15% 52% Lng Gains –Math 65% 66% 64% 59% 60% Gains Read-25 66% 77% 74% 74% 61% Gaines Math-25 73% 71% 66% 64% 69%

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Rachel Rhodes	BS in English from Florida Memorial University, MS in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University, Certification – English 6-12, ESOL, Reading Endorsement	11	3	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades C C C B A High Standards –Read 42% 60% 60% 62% 59% High Standards –Math 35% 49% 56% 57% 58% Lrng Gains – Read 57% 59% 61% 61% 64% Lrng Gains – Math 56% 52 % 66% 63% 70% Gains Read-25 66% 64% 62% 68% 77% Gaines Math-25 59% 55% 67% 66% 73%

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Create effective environment for professional cooperation and collaboration	Principal	June 6, 2013	
2	2. Empowering Teachers to participate in school decision making processes	Principal	June 6, 2013	
3	3. Recognize teachers on an ongoing basis for contributing to positive and rigorous learning environment	Principal	June 6, 2013	

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
0	Not Applicable

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
42	0.0%(0)	4.8%(2)	31.0%(13)	64.3%(27)	38.1%(16)	76.2%(32)	19.0%(8)	9.5%(4)	19.0%(8)

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

At Lawton Chiles Middle School services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities during school tutoring pull-out and push-in programs, after-school programs, Saturday Academy or summer school. The district coordinates with Title II and
Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to students and families. The School based Title I Community Involvement Specialist (CIS), serves as a bridge between the home and school through home visits, telephone calls, school site and community parenting activities. The CIS schedules meetings and activities, encourages parents to support their child's education, provides materials, and encourages parental participation in the decision making processes at Lawton Chiles Middle School. Curriculum Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Parents participate in the design of Lawton Chiles Middle School's Parent Involvement Plan (PIP – which is provided in three languages at all schools), the school improvement process and the life of the school and the annual Title I Annual Parent Meeting at the beginning of the school year. The annual M-DCPS Title I Parent/Family Involvement Survey is intended to be used toward the end of the school year to measure the parent program over the course of the year and to facilitate an evaluation of the parent involvement program to inform planning for the following year. An all out effort is made to

inform parents of the importance of this survey via CIS, Title 1 District and Region meetings, Title 1 Newsletter for Parents, and Title 1 Quarterly Parent Bulletins. This survey, available in English, Spanish and Haitian-Creole, will be available on line and via hard copy for parents (at schools and at District meetings) to complete. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program; Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and delinquent students. In addition, the Student Service counselors and selected Instructional personnel at Lawton Chiles Middle School will implement prevention programs throughout the school year focusing on bullying, anger management, conflict resolution, alternative to suspension, character education, and at-risk screening.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Lawton Chiles Middle School provides services and support to migrant students and parents. The District Migrant liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs and conducts a comprehensive needs assessment of migrant students to ensure that the unique needs of migrant students are met. Students are also provided extended learning opportunities (before-school and/or after-school, and summer school) by the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.

Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:
• training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESO training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.

Title III

Lawton Chiles uses Title III funds to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learner (ELL) and Recently Arrived Immigrant Children and Youth by providing funds to implement and/or provide :
• tutorial programs (6-8)
• parent outreach activities (6-8) through the Bilingual Parent Outreach Program (The Parent Academy)
professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers

Title X- Homeless

• Miami-Dade County Public School's School Board approved the School Board Policy 5111.01 titled, Homeless Students. The board policy defines the McKinney-Vento Law and ensures homeless students receive all services they are entitled to.
• The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.
• Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assists schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students. All schools are eligible to receive services and will do so upon identification and classification of a student as homeless.
• The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless and are provided with all entitlements.
• Project Upstart provides a homeless sensitivity, awareness campaign to all the schools - each school is provided a video and curriculum manual, and a contest is sponsored by the homeless trust-a community organization.
• Project Upstart provides tutoring and counseling to twelve homeless shelters in the community.
• The District Homeless Student Liaison continues to participate in community organization meetings and task forces as it relates to homeless children and youth.
Lawton Chiles Middle has a school based homeless coordinator trained on the McKinney-Vento Law ensuring appropriate services are provided to the homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Lawton Chiles Middle School will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.

Violence Prevention Programs

Not Applicable

Nutrition Programs

1) Lawton Chiles Middle School adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.

3) The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted
in the District's Wellness Policy.

Housing Programs

Not Applicable

Head Start

Not Applicable

Adult Education

Not Applicable

Career and Technical Education

Lawton Chiles utilizes the Florida Choices Assessment to match students with their skills and interests to career pathways available to the students in the academies, magnet and IB programs at the high school level.

Job Training

Not Applicable

Other

Not Applicable

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The Lawton Chiles Middle School RtI Leadership Team will consist of the following:
• Principal
• Assistant Principals
• Reading Coach
• EESAC Chairperson
• Department Chairpersons in Language Arts/Reading, Mathematics, Science), Social
Studies, Electives, SPED, Student Services RTI leadership is vital, therefore, in
building our team we have considered the following:
• Administrator(s) who will ensure proper RTI implementation, commitment and resource
allocation;
• Teacher(s) and Coaches who share the common goal of improving instruction for all
students utilizing data analysis and problem solving techniques; and Team members who
will work to build staff support, productivity, and sustainability over time. RTI
leadership is vital, therefore, in building our team we have considered the following:
• Administrator(s) who will ensure proper RTI implementation, commitment and resource
allocation;
• Teacher(s) and Coaches who share the common goal of improving instruction for all
students utilizing data analysis and problem solving techniques; and
• Team members who will work to build staff support, productivity, and sustainability
over time.

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 RtI Leadership Team is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention. The RtI Leadership Team members are linked to all the different school teams/groups such as Education Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC), grade level teams, department staffs, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to ensure all RtI efforts are organized, coordinated, and implemented.

The following steps will be considered by the school's RtI Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problems solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring. The Leadership

will:
1. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following questions:
• What will the students learn? (curriculum based on standards which must be mastered by students)
• How will we determine if the students have learned? (establish schedule of common assessments for the standards)
• How will we respond when students have not learned? (develop an intervention problem solving and monitoring system to deal with students not meeting mastery)
• How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (developing enrichment opportunities for students who have mastered required standards)
2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs
3. Hold regular meetings a minimum of twice a month
4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress
5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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 roles of the membership are as follows:
1. The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessments of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation and communicates with parents regarding school based RtI plans and activities.
2. The Assistant Principals will assist the principal in all duties as related to RtI. Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation and communicates with parents regarding school based RtI plans and activities.
3. The Reading Coach will provide guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning and creating intervention plans. Develops, leads and evaluate school core content standards/programs: Identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with personnel to identify appropriate, evidenced based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening series for children to be considered "at-risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
4. The Department Chairpersons will be responsible for the following functions:
• Implement RtI requirements at the instructional level
• Gather individual student data
• Evaluate RtI progress by monitoring academic and behavior data
• Monitor and respond to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.
5. The EESAC Chairperson will be responsible for providing updates to the EESAC on RtI efforts and to relay EESAC recommendations and concerns to the RtI Leadership Team.
The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.

The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the of instruction and intervention and set clear expectations for instructional delivery.

The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based upon data collected from common assessments.

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.

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students
to
• adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to met the specific needs of students
• adjust the delivery of behavior management system,
• adjust the allocation of school based resources
• drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
• create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions.

2. Lawton Chiles Middle School utilizes the EDUsoft Assessment Management System to manage
the following data:
Academic
• FAIR Assessment
• Interim assessments
• State/Local Mathematics and Science Assessments
• FCAT
• Student grades
• School site specific assessments

Behavior
• Student Case Management System
• Detentions
• Suspensions/expulsions
• Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative content
• Office referrals per day per month
• Team climate surveys
• Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

RtI professional development and support will include:
1. training for all administrators in the MTSS/RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
2. providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures;
and providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The plan to support the MTSS/RtI is to ensure that all students requiring support are identified and provided with assistance utilizing the multi-tiered approach. The MTSS/RtI process will include collaboration of professionals that have a good understanding of the student's needs including strengths and weaknesses that will be able to make recommendations to better meet the student's needs. The multi-tiered approach will be documented utilizing the appropriate paperwork and the team members will ensure that the student is receiving the services and that follow-up occurs as needed.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team is an extension of the school's Leadership Team and is also linked to the school's MTSS/RtI Leadership Team. The Lawton Chiles
Literacy Leadership Team will consist of the following:
• Principal (Nelson Izquierdo)
• Assistant Principal for Curriculum (Yanelys Canales)
• Assistant Principal (Israel Sosa)
• Reading Coach (Rachael Rhodes)
• Media Specialist (Vivian Marques)
• EESAC Chairperson (Gary Shotwell)
• Department Chairpersons in Language Arts/Reading(Michelle Delgado), Mathematics (Cheryl Thames), Science (Patricia Bennett), Social Studies (Brian Firtell), Electives (Linda Carter), SPED (Francoise Guillen), ESOL (Silvia Padron-Salgado), Student Services (Laura Lotito).

The LLT is vital therefore in building our team we considered selecting a cross section of faculty and administrators that represent highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum.

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

The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge with in the Lawton Chiles community and focus on areas of literacy across the school. The following steps will be considered by the school's Literacy Leadership Team to implement and monitor literacy initiative success. The Leadership will:
• Hold regular meetings a minimum of once a month
• Assist the Administrators and Reading Coach in the implementation of the Comprehensive Research-Based Reading Plan (CRRP)
• Analyze student data and classroom observations to determine professional development for faculty members in literacy strategies
• Create capacity of reading knowledge and focus on areas of literacy concern across the entire school curriculum
• Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on literacy best practices

The roles of the membership are as follows:
1. The Principal provides a common vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas, and provides necessary resources to the LLT to ensure the District and School CRRP initiatives are accomplished
2. The Assistant Principals will assist the principal in all duties as related to LLT
3. The Reading Coach will work with the LLT to guarantee fidelity of the K-12 CRRP, share her expertise in reading instruction, assessment and Observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions; and provide motivation and promote a spirit of collaboration with in the LLT to create school-wide focus on literacy and reading achievement by establishing model classrooms; conferencing with teachers and administrators; and providing professional development
4. The Media Specialist provides classroom media resources and support to all instruction staff as required, maintains an open access media center for student use, promotes literacy through media center events such as the Book Fair, and supports and monitors the Accelerated Reader Program
5. The Department Chairpersons will ensure the fidelity of the school CRRP within their department staff, monitor utilization of classroom literacy strategies, and coordinate literacy strategy training with the LLT
6. The EESAC Chairperson will be responsible for providing updates to the EESAC on LLT efforts and to relay EESAC recommendations and concerns to the LLT Leadership Team.

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

The Lawton Chiles LLT will implement initiatives that are aligned to the District K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan 2012-2013.
The major emphasis for the Lawton Chiles Literacy Initiative will focus primarily on developing fluency in the classroom environment through the following strategies:
• Organizing and structuring the classrooms so students are grouped to facilitate collaboration
• Teacher instruction focuses more on modeling and thinking aloud to demonstrate literacy strategies.
• Utilization of word walls in all content areas
• Writing across the curriculum utilized as a daily strategy in all classrooms
• Classroom libraries maintained with fiction and non-fiction books to encourage reading opportunities
Rewards program for participation in the Reading Plus Program

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

*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.

Not 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.

Faculty members will be provided with an overview of the District Comprehensive Research-Based Reading Plan (CRRP) and the school's CRRP. Faculty members will be afforded the opportunity to participate in applicable professional development

which supports the CRRP. The Reading Coach will facilitate how to use literacy strategies in the classrooms based upon reports from Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Florida Oral Reading Assessment (FORF), district interim assessments, and computer based skills programs. The LLT will monitor the implementation of school-wide literacy strategies through all classrooms. To incorporate reading into the classroom and connect it to the curriculum in all classes, the following literacy strategies will be utilized:

• Journal writing
• Graphic organizers
• Word Walls
• Summarization techniques
• Note taking techniques – Power notes, Two column notes
• Reciprocal Teaching.

Student improvement in reading fluency skills will be monitored through data reports produced through the school's CRRP assessments and through observations of individual student progress in daily classroom activities requiring literacy skills.

*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?

Not Applicable

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?

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 24% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 11 percentage points to 35%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24%. (222)	35%. (321)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.A.1 The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test for Grade 6 was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Students need additional support in identifying the author's purpose through context clues.	1A.1. Provide students with a variety of instructional CRISS strategies that include the use of graphic organizers, summarization activities, anchoring conclusions back to the text, making inferences, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, opinion proofs, and text marking. Students will be given sample passages to aid the reader in utilizing these reading strategies.	1A.1. Literacy Leadership Team	1A.1. Grade-level teams will review and adjust instruction based on results of common formative assessment data and student work on a monthly basis to determine progress.	Evaluation Tool 1A.1. Formative: Student work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	1A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test for Grade 7 was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary. Students need additional support in identifying context clues to determine the meaning of words in a passage.	1A.2. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include concept maps, personal dictionaries, word walls, instruction in shades of meaning and context, and determining root words derived from Greek And Latin origin and multiple meaning words. Students will be given the opportunity to apply these reading strategies using a variety of texts.	1A.2. Literacy Leadership Team	1A.2. Grade-level teams will review and adjust instruction based on results of common formative assessment data and student work on a monthly basis to determine progress.	1A.2. Formative: Student work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
	1A.3. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test for Grade 8 was Reporting Category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process.	1A.3. Provide students with a variety of activities to aid the reader in understanding the structure of the text through locating and verifying details from charts, diagrams,	1A.3. Literacy Leadership Team	1A.3. Grade-level teams will review and adjust instruction based on results of common formative assessment data and student work on a monthly basis to determine progress.	1A.3. Formative: Student work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments.

3	Students need additional support to understanding of how to use text features to aid the reader's understanding.	captions, graphs, illustrations; critically analyzing text to build strong arguments to support answers, and synthesizing details to draw conclusions. Specific instructional strategies should include the use of reciprocal teaching, note-taking skills, summarization skills, opinion proofs and question and answer relationships.			Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
4					

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:	Not Applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 18% of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 4 percentage point to 22%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (161)	22% (202

	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
	2A.1. The areas of minimal growth as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test	2A.1. Provide the students with a variety of instructional strategies that utilize more rigorous higher	2A.1. RMTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2A.1. Grade-level teams will review and adjust instruction based on results of common	2A.1. Formative: Student work samples and scores on common

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	for grade 6 was, Category 2 Reading Application. These students need additional support to determine author's perspective/bias, and develop conclusions and determine appropriate inferences from the text.	order thinking skills and questioning using DOK (Depth of Knowledge) chart. Specific strategies should include prediction charts, questioning the author, and Cloze passages		formative assessment data and student work on a monthly basis to determine progress.	in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, Achieve 3000, FCAT Explorer, Compass Learning, and Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
2	2.A.2. The areas of minimal growth as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test for grade 7 was Category 2 Reading Application. These students need additional support to determine author's perspective /bias, and develop conclusions and determine appropriate inferences from the text.	2.A.2. Provide the students with a variety of instructional strategies that utilize more rigorous higher order thinking skills and questioning using DOK (Depth of Knowledge) chart. Specific strategies should include prediction charts, questioning the author, and Cloze passages.	2.A.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2.A.2. Grade-level teams will review and adjust instruction based on results of common formative assessment data and student work on a monthly basis to determine progress.	2A..2 Formative: Student work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments Achieve 3000, FCAT Explorer, Compass Learning, and Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
3	2.A.3. The areas of minimal growth as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test for grade 8 was Category 2 Reading Application. These students need additional support to determine author's perspective /bias, and develop conclusions and determine appropriate inferences from the text.	2.A.3. Provide the students with a variety of instructional strategies that utilize more rigorous higher order thinking skills and questioning using DOK (Depth of Knowledge) chart. Specific strategies should include prediction charts, questioning the author, and Cloze passages.	2A..3. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2.A.3. Grade-level teams will review and adjust instruction based on results of common formative assessment data and student work on a monthly basis to determine progress.	2.A.3. Formative: Student work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments Achieve 3000, FCAT Explorer, Compass Learning, and Reading Plus. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

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:	Not Applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 58% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 10 percentage points to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (503)	68% (590)

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 3.A.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test, the percent of students making learning gains increased by 15 percentage points when compared to the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading Test. The area of deficiency as noted on 2012 FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application. . These students need additional support to determine author's perspective/bias, and develop conclusions and determine appropriate inferences from the text.	3.A.1. Identify students who have a history of minimal or no learning gains and provide access to a Community School fee supported tutorial program after-school two days per week in addition to providing the students a variety of strategies in the classroom that emphasize Making inferences, drawing conclusions, using graphic organizers to analyze text, understanding text structures and summarizing text.	3.A.1. Literacy Leadership Team	3.A.1. Literacy Leadership Team will review results of student work and common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward benchmark proficiency and to adjust instruction as needed.	3.A.1. Formative: Student work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, tutorial program assessments, and district interim assessments, Summative: The FAIR and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

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:	Not Applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 66% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 71%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (158)	71% (170)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.A.1.
As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test, the percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains increased by 2 percentage points as compared to the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading Test. The area of deficiency Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary. These students need additional support in identifying context clues to determine the meaning of words in a passage.</td>
<td>4.A.1.
Identify lowest performing students in grades 6-8 based on instructional needs. Schedule these students in intensive reading classes. Incorporate the use of push in tutorial assistance within the classroom, and utilize computer assisted instruction programs such as FCAT Explorer and Compass Odyssey Learning, in addition to providing the students a variety of strategies in the classroom that emphasize concept maps, personal dictionaries, word walls, instruction in shades of meaning and context, and determining root words derived from Greek And Latin origin and multiple meaning words. Students will be given the opportunity to apply these reading strategies using a variety of texts.</td>
<td>4.A.1.
Literacy Leadership Team</td>
<td>4.A.1.
Literacy Leadership team will review results of student work and common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward benchmark proficiency and to adjust instruction as needed.</td>
<td>4.A.1.
Formative: FAIR Data, student work samples, and student scores on common in-house mini- assessments, district interim assessments, Compass Odyssey program and FCAT Explorer student achievement reports.

Summative: The FAIR and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.</td>
</tr>
</table>

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 focus is to increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above and to reduce the proportion of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years (by 2016-2017) using 2010-2011 as the baseline year. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	53%	58%	62%	66%	70%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 53% of students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 20 percentage points to 73%. The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 32% of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 14 percentage points to 46%. The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 54% of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 11 percentage points to 65%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 53% (19) Black 32% (145) Hispanic 54% (226)	White 73% (26) Black46% (209) Hispanic 65% (272)

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	5B.1. White: This subgroups had the an area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test which was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application. These students need additional support in determining author's perspective/bias, and develop conclusions and determine appropriate inferences from the text. Black: This subgroups had the an area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test which was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application. These students need additional support in determining author's perspective/bias, and develop conclusions and determine appropriate inferences from the text. Hispanic: This subgroups had the an area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test which was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application. These students need additional support in determining author's perspective/bias, and develop conclusions and determine appropriate inferences from the text.	5B.1. Implement a rotation schedule for small group instruction during Reading and Language Arts instructional blocks. Provide tailored instruction based upon common mini-assessments and student achievement reports produced from computer based programs such as Compass Odyssey and FCAT Explorer, in addition to providing the students a variety of strategies in the classroom that emphasize the use of graphic organizers, summarization activities, anchoring conclusions back to the text, making inferences, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, opinion proofs, and text marking. Students will be given sample passages to aid the reader in utilizing these reading strategies.	5B.1. Literacy Leadership Team	5B.1. Literacy Leadership Team will review results of student work and common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward benchmark proficiency and to adjust instruction as needed.	5B.1. Formative: Student work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, Compass Odyssey program and FCAT Explorer student achievement reports. Summative: The Fair and the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

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 results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 15% of students in the English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 15 percentage points to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (6)	30% (12)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application. These students need additional support to determine author's perspective/bias, and develop conclusions and determine appropriate inferences from the text	5C.1. The student will analyze a variety of text structures (e.g., comparisons/contrast, cause /effect, chronologic, graphic organizers and the use of task cards.al order, argument/support, lists) and text features (main headings with subheadings), and explain their impact on meaning in text. The student will be introduced to Venn Diagrams	5C.1.MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5C.1 MTSS/RTI team will review results of student work and common assessment dta such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward benchmark proficiency and to adjust instruction as needed.	5C.1. Formative: Student work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, and district interim assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment and The FAIR.

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 results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 17% of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 12 percentage points to 29%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (15)	29% (26)

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
	5D.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application. These students need	5D.1. The student will analyze a variety of text structures (e.g., comparisons/contrast, cause /effect, chronologic, graphic organizers and the use of	5D.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5D.1. MTSS/RtI team will review results of student work and common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim	5D.1. Formative: Student work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, and district interim

1	additional support to determine author's perspective/bias, and develop conclusions and determine appropriate inferences from the text.	task cards.al order, argument/support, lists) and text features (main headings with subheadings), and explain their impact on meaning in text. The student will be introduced to Venn Diagrams		assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward benchmark proficiency and to adjust instruction as needed.	assessments.

Summative:
2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment and The FAIR. |

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 results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 39% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 14 percentage points to 53%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 39% (292) | 53% (396) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1.
The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application. These students need additional support to determine author's perspective/bias, and develop conclusions and determine appropriate inferences from the text. | 5E.1.
Provide tailored instruction based upon common mini-assessments and student achievement reports produced from computer based programs such as Compass Odyssey and FCAT Explorer, in addition to providing the students a variety of strategies in the classroom that emphasize the use of graphic organizers, summarization activities, anchoring conclusions back to the text, making inferences, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, opinion proofs, and text marking. Students will be given sample passages to aid the reader in utilizing these reading strategies. | 5E.1.
MTSS/RtI Leadership Team | 5E.1.
MTSS/RtI team will review results of student work and common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward benchmark proficiency and to adjust instruction as needed. | 5E.1.
Formative:
Student work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, and district interim assessments.

Summative:
2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment and The FAIR. |

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards	Grades 6-8	District	Grade 6-8 Teachers	November 6 2012	Mini-Assessments, classroom walk-throughs and student work folders	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team
CAT 2.0 Focus Content	Grades 6-8	Reading Coach	Grade 6-8 Teachers	September 26, 2012	Mini-Assessments, classroom walk-throughs and student work folders	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team
Explicit Reading Instruction	ades 6-8	Reading Coach	Grade 6-8 Teachers	September 26, 2012	Mini-Assessments, classroom walk-throughs and student work folders	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Listening/Speaking indicate that 43% of English Language Learner (ELL) students achieved proficiency level. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school's year is to increase our proficiency level rate to 45%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
43% (16)	

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. 1.1. According to the 2012 CELLA Listening/Speaking results, the section in need of the greatest improvement is the Listening Comprehension – Extended speech. The speaking section in need of the greatest improvement is Speaking – Extended Speech.	1.1. Implement the Inside Hampton Brown Phonics Kit, Classroom Libraries Folktales and CDs, Language and Selection CDs,. Provide opportunities for students to engage in computer assisted programs like achieve 3000. Utilize the following teaching strategies: LEA (language Experience Approach) modeling, total physical response, cooperative learning (group reports/projects, role-play, and repetition. Include differentiated instruction in classroom to target skill deficiencies. Build background knowledge through the use of videos, class discussions, oral presentations, and Discovery Education.	1.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team ELL Chairperson	1.1. MTSS/RtI team will review results of student work and common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, Hampton Brown chapter assessments, classroom observations; computer assisted program such as Achieve 3000/TEENBIZ and Reading plus, student achievement reports, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward English language proficiency and to adjust instruction as needed.	1.1. Formative: Hampton Brown unit Assessments, Student work samples and demonstrated oral and written language skills, Florida Assessment for Instructional Reading, District Interim Assessments, Achieve 3000 student reports. Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Reading exam (ELL) indicate 21% of students in the English Language Learner achieved proficiency in Reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the proficiency rate of ELLs to 23%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
21% (8)	

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	2.1 According to the 2012 CELLA Reading results, the set of benchmarks in need of the greatest improvement are Cluster 1: Vocabulary and Cluster 2: Reading Application.	2.1. Activate Prior Knowledge , Word Banks/Vocabulary, Notebooks, Focus on Key Vocabulary, use of Task Cards, Graphic Organizers, Reciprocal Teaching, Cooperative learning (Groups Reports/Projects) and visual clues. Utilize	.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and ELL Chairperson	2.1. MTSS/RtI team will review results of student work and common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, Hampton Brown chapter assessments, classroom observations; computer assisted program such	2.1. Formative: Hampton Brown unit Assessments, Student work samples and demonstrated oral and written language skills, Florida Assessment for Instructional

				Heritage Language/English Dictionary summarizing. Provide opportunities for the students to engage in computer assisted programs like Achieve 3000.			as Achieve 3000 and Reading plus, Inside Assessment Handbook, Inside Practice Handbook, student achievement reports, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward English language proficiency and to adjust instruction as needed.	Reading, District Interim Assessments, Achieve 3000 student reports. Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA writing exam (ELL) indicate 5% of students in the English Language Learner achieved proficiency in Reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the proficiency rate of ELLs to 23%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

5% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Students inability to answer questions in English related to English grammar, sentence structure, write sentences and paragraphs. Lack of vocabulary preventing ELL students to write expository /persuasive essay	2.1. Explicit instructions in spelling, rules/strategies, root words, prefixes, suffixes, Greek and Latin root words, and multiple meaning. Provide opportunities for students to engage in computer assisted programs like Achieve 3000.	2.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and ELL Chairperson	2.1. MTSS/RtI team will review results of student work and common assessment data, Student Writer's Notebook/Journal, in-house mini-assessments, student achievement reports, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward English language writing proficiency and to adjust instruction as needed.	.1. Formative: Hampton Brown unit Assessments, Student work samples and demonstrated oral and written language skills, Teacher made tests and projects, Florida Assessment for Instructional Reading, District Interim Assessments, Writing E-Folio, Achieve 3000 student reports. Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test indicate that 24% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 34%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24%. (224)	34%. (312)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test for Grade 6 was Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving problems using a geometric formulas, converting and comparing measurements in U.S. customary and metric units, and plotting ordered pairs on a coordinate plane.	1A.1. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include utilizing manipulatives to explore area and volume; to compare, contrast and convert units of measure utilizing U.S. customary units and metric units; and to incorporate more student time for computer assisted instruction programs such as Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO and Riverdeep which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement.	1A.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1A.1. Grade-level teams will review and adjust instruction based on results of common formative assessment data and student work on a monthly basis to determine progress.	1A.1. Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	1A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test for Grade 7 was Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving problems using a geometric formulas, converting and comparing measurements in U.S. customary and metric units, and plotting ordered pairs on a coordinate plane.	1A.2. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include utilizing manipulatives to explore area and volume; to compare, contrast and convert units of measure utilizing U.S. customary units and metric units; and to incorporate more student time for computer assisted instruction programs such as Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO and Riverdeep which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement.	1A.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	A.2. Grade-level teams will review and adjust instruction based on results of common formative assessment data and student work on a monthly basis to determine progress.	1.2 Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments. Summative: 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment
	1A.3. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test for Grade 8 was	1A.3. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include utilizing computer assisted instruction	1A.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1A.3. Grade-level teams will review and adjust instruction based on results of common formative assessment	1A.3. Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-

| | | | | data and student work on a monthly basis to determine progress. | assessments, district interim assessments.

Summative:
2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment |
| 3 | Reporting Category of Expressions, Equations and Functions. Students need additional support in interpreting slope-intercept and x and y intercepts when graphing linear equations for real world problems, and translating tabular, graphical, and algebraic representations of linear functions. | programs such as Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO and Riverdeep which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement by solving real world problems through systems of linear equations and producing coordinate plane representations of those equations and solutions. In addition, students will utilize Scholastic Math Magazines to reinforce basic math skills. | | | |

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:	Not Applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 11% of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5). Our goal for the 2012-2012 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 4 percentage point to 15%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
11%. (98)	15%. (138)

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
	2A.1. The areas of minimal growth as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test were the same for	2A.1 Provide students with scheduled classroom time to develop appropriate geometric exploration projects to solve real	2.1. MTSS/RtL Leadership Team	2A.1 MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house	2A.1. Formative: Student authentic work samples, projects and scores on common

1	grade level 6, Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving real world problems using a geometric formulas and linear functions.	world problems and utilize computer assisted instruction programs such as The National Library of Visual Manipulatives, GIZMO which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement and equip the students with strategies to solve real world problems..		mini-assessments, district interim assessments, topic assessments, Problem Solving Protocol Sheets, math notebooks, computer assisted program student achievement reports, projects, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	2A.2. The areas of minimal growth as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test were the same for grade level 7, Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving real world problems using a geometric formulas and linear functions.	2A.2. Provide students with scheduled classroom time to develop appropriate geometric exploration projects to solve real world problems and utilize computer assisted instruction programs such as GIZMO which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement.	2A.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2A.2. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports, projects, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	2A.2. Formative: Student authentic work samples, projects and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
3	2A.3. The areas of minimal growth as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test were the same for grade level 8, Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving real world problems using a geometric formulas and linear functions.	2A.3. Provide students with scheduled classroom time to develop appropriate geometric exploration projects to solve real world problems and utilize computer assisted instruction programs such as GIZMO which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement.	2A.3 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2A.3. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports, projects, and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	2A.3. .Formative: Student authentic work samples, projects and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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:	Not Applicable.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test indicate that 56% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 10 percentage points to 66%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%. (483)	66%. (570)

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	3A.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test, the percent of students making learning gains decreased by 4 percentage points when compared to the 2010-2011 FCAT Mathematics Test. The area of largest deficiency was the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving problems using a geometric formulas, converting and comparing measurements in U.S. customary and metric units, and plotting ordered pairs on a coordinate plane.	3A.1. Identify students who have a history of minimal or no learning gains and provide access to a Community School fee supported tutorial program after-school two days per week in addition to providing the students a variety of strategies in the classroom that emphasize utilizing manipulatives to explore area and volume; to compare, contrast and convert units of measure utilizing U.S. customary units and metric units; and to incorporate more student time for computer assisted instruction programs such as Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO and Riverdeep which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement.	3.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	3A.1. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	3A.1 Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment..

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:	Not Applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test indicate that 59% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 69%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (136)	69% (159)

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	4A.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test, the percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains increased by 4 percentage points as compared to the 2010-2011 FCAT Mathematics Test. The area of deficiency was the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving problems using a geometric formulas, converting and comparing measurements in U.S. customary and metric units, and plotting ordered pairs on a coordinate plane.	4A.1 Identify lowest performing students in grades 6-8 which will receive push in tutorial assistance within the classroom. Special technology based instruction classes will be made available to reinforce identified areas of deficiency with emphasis on exploring area and volume measurement of different geometric real world objects utilizing formulas to calculate solutions to problems. Utilization of Compass Odyssey, and GIZMO will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement	4A.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	4A.1 MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	4A.1 Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, Compass Odyssey program, FCAT Explorer program, tutorial assessments and student achievements reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal #
	5A : The focus is to increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above and to reduce the proportion of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years (by 2016-2017) using the 2010-2011 as the baseline year.

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

	43%	48%	54%	59%	64%		

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 results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 41% of students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 28 percentage points to 69%. The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 26% of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 12 percentage points to 38%. The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 46% of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points to 56%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 41% (15) Black: 26% (118) Hispanic: 46% (193)	White: 69% (25) Black: 38% (173) Hispanic: 54% (226)

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	5B.1. White: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test for this subgroups was the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving problems using a geometric formulas, converting and comparing measurements in U.S. customary and metric units, and plotting ordered pairs on a coordinate plane. Black: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test for this subgroups was the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving problems using a geometric formulas, converting and comparing measurements in U.S. customary and metric units, and plotting ordered pairs on a coordinate plane. Hispanic: The area of deficiency as noted on	5B.1. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include utilizing manipulatives to explore area and volume; to compare, contrast and convert units of measure utilizing U.S. customary units and metric units; and to incorporate more student time for computer assisted instruction programs such as Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO, FASTT Math, and Riverdeep which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement.	5B.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5B.1. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	5B.1. Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, Compass Odyssey program, FCAT Explorer program, tutorial assessments and student achievements reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test for this subgroups was the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving problems using a geometric formulas, converting and comparing measurements in U.S. customary and metric units, and plotting ordered pairs on a coordinate plane.

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 results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 18% of students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 24 percentage points to 42%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (7)	42% (17)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving problems using a geometric formulas, converting and comparing measurements in U.S. customary and metric units, and plotting ordered pairs on a coordinate plane.	5C.1. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include utilizing manipulatives to explore area and volume; to compare, contrast and convert units of measure utilizing U.S. customary units and metric units; and to incorporate more student time for computer assisted instruction programs such as Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO, FASTT Math, and Riverdeep which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement	5C.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5C.1. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	5C.1. Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

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 results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 10% of students in the Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 13 percentage points to 23%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

10% (9)			23% (21)		

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving problems using a geometric formulas, converting and comparing measurements in U.S. customary and metric units, and plotting ordered pairs on a coordinate plane.	5D.1. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include utilizing manipulatives to explore area and volume; to compare, contrast and convert units of measure utilizing U.S. customary units and metric units; and to incorporate more student time for computer assisted instruction programs such as Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO and FASTT Math and Riverdeep which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement.	5D.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5D.1. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	5D.1. Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, Compass Odyssey program, FCAT Explorer program, tutorial assessments and student achievements reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 33% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 12 percentage points to 45%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (247)	45% (337)

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. Students need additional support in solving problems using a geometric formulas, converting and comparing measurements in U.S. customary and metric units, and plotting ordered pairs on a coordinate plane.	5E.1. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include utilizing manipulatives to explore area and volume; to compare, contrast and convert units of measure utilizing U.S. customary units and metric units; and to incorporate more student time for computer assisted instruction programs such as Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO, FASTT Math. and Riverdeep which will provide authentic and rigorous student	5D.2. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5E.1. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	5E.1. Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, Compass Odyssey program, FCAT Explorer program, tutorial assessments and student achievements reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

| | | engagement. | | | Mathematics Assessment |

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:	The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment indicate that 64% (27) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving Level 3 proficiency at 64% .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (27)	64% (27)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 2 Polynomials.	1.1. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include vocabulary and additional practice in solving problems with polynomials including FAIL Method and factoring. Students will also be exposed to virtual manipulatives and educational videos that will reinforce learned concepts.	1.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1.1. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	1.1. Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, Compass Odyssey program, FCAT Explorer program, tutorial assessments and student achievements reports. Summative: 2013 Algebra I EOC Assessment.

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:	The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment indicate that 33% of students achieved above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving above proficiency (levels 4 and 5) at 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (14)	33% (14)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 2 Polynomials.	2.1. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include vocabulary and additional practice in solving problems with polynomials including FAIL Method and factoring. Students will also be exposed to virtual manipulatives and educational videos that will reinforce learned concepts.	2.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2.1. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, Compass Odyssey program, FCAT Explorer program, tutorial assessments and student achievements reports. Summative: 2013 Algebra I EOC Assessment

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal #
	3A : The focus is to increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above and to reduce the proportion of students scoring at level 1 and 2 by 50% over six years (by 2016-2017) using 2010-2011 as the base line year.

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment indicate that 46% of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieving level 3 proficiency by 8 percentage points to 54%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Hispanic: 46% (13)	Hispanic: 54% (16)

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	3B.1. According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 2 Polynomials.	3B.1. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include utilizing manipulatives to explore area and volume; to compare, contrast and convert units of measure utilizing U.S. customary units and metric units; and to incorporate more	3B.1 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	3B.1. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports and	3B.1. Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments. Summative:

| | | student time for computer assisted instruction programs such as Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO, FASTT Math and Riverdeep which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement. | | teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction. | 2013 Algebra EOC Assessment |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment indicate that 33% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieving level 3 proficiency by 12 percentage points to 45%.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	33% (9)	45% (12)

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	3E.1. According to the results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 2 Polynomials.	3E.1. Provide students with a variety of instructional strategies that include vocabulary and additional practice in solving problems with polynomials including FAIL Method and factoring. Students will also be exposed to virtual manipulatives and educational videos that will reinforce learned concepts	3E.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	3E.1. MTSS/RtI team will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports and teacher feedback on student progress on a monthly basis to determine progress toward proficiency and determine adjustments to classroom and tutorial instruction.	3E.1. Formative: Student authentic work samples and scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, Compass Odyssey program, FCAT Explorer program, tutorial assessments and student achievements reports. Summative: 2013 Algebra EOC Assessment

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:	Not Applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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:	Not Applicable	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Not Applicable	Not Applicable	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # Not Applicable 3A :

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	Not Applicable	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Not Applicable Not Applicable	Not Applicable	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	Not Applicable

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	Not Applicable

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	Not Applicable

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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
FASTT Math Training	Grades 6-8	Marta Acosta FASTT Math	Grade 6-8 Mathematics Teachers	October 25, 2012	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments, computer program reports	Administrator, Math Chairperson
Summer MATH Institute	Grades 6-8	District	Grade 6-8 Mathematics Teachers	June 11-14th, 2012 June 18-21st, 2012	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments, computer program reports	Administrator, Math Chairperson
Common Core Standards	Grades 6-8	Math Dept Chair	Grade 6-8 Mathematics Teachers	November 6, 2012	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments, computer program reports	Administrator, Math Chairperson
Discovery	Grades 6-8	District	Grade 6-8 Mathematics Teachers	December 13, 2012	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments, computer program reports	Administrator, Math Chairperson
Edusoft	Grades 6-8	Math Dept Chair	Grade 6-8 Mathematics Teachers	November 6, 2012	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments, computer program reports	Administrator, Math Chairperson
FCAT 2.0 Item Specs	Grades 6-8	Math Dept Chair	Grade 6-8 Mathematics Teachers	September 10, 2012 September 24, 2012 October 1,2012	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments, computer program reports	Administrator, Math Chairperson

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate 28% of students achieved proficiency (FCAT level 3). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 32%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28%.(88)	32%.(102)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was the Nature of Science category. The students demonstrated a lack of proficiency in identifying experimental variables and constructing valid conclusions based upon collected data. The students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and available hands-on and computer based activities that are linked to increased rigor through inquiry-based learning which reinforces the content in this category	1A.1. Students will be scheduled on a weekly basis to complete hands-on inquiry based activities using the 5E model, and computer assisted instruction programs such as Riverdeep and GIZMO which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement in the deficient areas of the Earth and Space Science category	1A.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1A.1. The MTSS/RtI Team will review the results of common assessments, inquiry based activities, student lab reports, and results from computer assisted programs on a monthly basis to ensure adequate student progress and will adjust classroom instruction as needed.	1A.1. Formative: Student scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, projects, Riverdeep, and GIZMO program student achievement reports, and teacher assessment of lab reports and science journals. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science

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:	Not Applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

| | 1 | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicates 8% of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT level 4 and 5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving above proficiency by 2 percentage points to 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (27)	10% (33)

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	2A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was the Nature of Science category. The students demonstrated a lack of proficiency in identifying experimental variables and constructing valid conclusions based upon collected data. The students need additional exposure to instructional strategies and available hands-on and computer based activities that are linked to increased rigor through inquiry-based learning which reinforces the content in this category.	2A.1. Students will be scheduled on a weekly basis to complete hands-on inquiry based activities using the 5E model, and computer assisted instruction programs such as Riverdeep and GIZMO which will provide authentic and rigorous student engagement in the deficient areas of the Earth and Space Science category.	2A.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2A.1. The MTSS/RtI Team will review the results of common assessments, inquiry based activities, student lab reports, and results from computer assisted programs on a monthly basis to ensure adequate student progress and will adjust classroom instruction as needed.	2A.1. Formative: Student scores on common in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, projects, Riverdeep, and GIZMO program student achievement reports, and teacher assessment of lab reports and science journals. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

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:	Not Applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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
Fair Game Principle FCAT 2.0	Grades 6-8	Science Department Chairperson	Grade 6-8 Science Teachers	September 26, 2012	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments	Administrator, Science Dept Chair
Implementation of Scientific Writing in Interactive Notebooks	Grades 6-8	Science Department Chairperson	Grade 6-8 Science Teachers	October 25, 2012	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments, Science Fair Projects	Administrator, Science Dept Chair
5-E Instructional Model	Grades 6-8	Science Department Chairperson	Grade 6-8 Science Teachers	September 11, 2012 September 19, 2012 September 26, 2012	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments	Administrator, Science Dept Chair
FCAT 2.0 Item Specifications	Grades 6-8	Science Department Chairperson	Grade 6-8 Science Teachers	September 11, 2012 September 19, 2012 September 26, 2012	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments	Administrator, Science Dept 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

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 73% of students scored level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring level 4 or higher from 3% to 76%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (233)	76% (242)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Writing Test was in Writing Applications. Students need additional support mechanics and conventions, substantive body paragraph support, figurative language and other literary devices, vocabulary and voice. The key challenge lies in promoting originality, solid content and rich language while establishing and honing skills.	1A.1. During effective writing instruction students will use a variety of tools and strategies to develop and refine their writing samples. Students will be exposed to polished writing samples and teacher modeling through whole class discussions. They will deconstruct an essay, develop it one component at a time, from pre-writing to complete draft, with ample and explicit attention devoted to each paragraph. Emphasis will be placed on structure, content voice, language , mechanics and conventions. Adequate practice will follow, assessed and reinforced through mini-conferences and written feedback. The students will then engage in peer editing and publishing.	1A.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1A.1. Language Arts Teachers will Administer and score student's monthly classroom writing prompts and will collect writing trend data. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will review the writing trend data on a monthly basis to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention focus as needed.	1A.1 Formative: Students' scores on District Baseline and Post writing tests and monthly student writing assessments.. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test

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:	Not Applicable

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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
Next Generation Writing/The Writing Process	Grade 6-8 Teachers	Grade 8 Language Arts Teachers	School Wide Grades 6-8	October 25, 2012	Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of the writing instruction	Adminstrators, Language Arts Dept Chairperson
State Scoring Rubric	Grade 6-8 Teachers	Grade 8 Language Arts Teachers	School Wide Grades 6-8	October 25, 2012	Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of the writing instruction	Adminstrators, Language Arts Dept Chairperson

Writing Budget:

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Civics Baseline Assessment indicate that 0% of the students achieved a level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (24)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The Civics baseline test indicates that the students are most deficient in evaluating constitutional rights and their impact on individuals and society.	1.1. Utilize District published lesson plans with assessments to establish constitutional inquiry through on-line investigation and classroom projects. Provide students with classroom time to discuss constitutional issues that are currently in the news.	1.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	1.1. MTSS/RtI will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports, student projects, and teacher feedback on benchmark proficiency on a monthly basis and to adjust instruction and intervention as needed.	1.1. Formative: Student work samples, projects and scores on the District Interim Assessments, and common .in-house assessments. Summative: 2013 Civics EOC Field Test or District Spring Assessment

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:	The results of the 2012 Civics Baseline Assessment indicate that 0% of the students achieved a level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (24)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	
	Person or	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The Civics baseline test indicates that the students are most deficient in evaluating constitutional rights and their impact on individuals and society.	2.1. Utilize District published lesson plans with assessments to establish constitutional inquiry through on-line investigation and classroom projects. Provide students with classroom time to discuss constitutional issues that are currently in the news.	2.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	2.1. MTSS/RtI will monitor results of common assessment data such as tutorial assessments, in-house mini-assessments, district interim assessments, computer assisted program student achievement reports, student projects, and teacher feedback on benchmark proficiency on a monthly basis and to adjust instruction and intervention as needed.	2.1. Formative: Student work samples, projects and scores on the District Interim Assessments, and common .in-house assessments. Summative: 2013 Civics EOC Field Test or District Spring Assessment

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
Project Citizen "We the People" Discovery Education	Grade 7 Teachers	District	Grade 7 Social Studied Teachers	Oct 25th, 2012 Nov 6, 2012 Dec 13, 2012 Feb 1, 2013 Feb 14, 2013 May 2, 2013	Student work folders, classroom walk-throughs, mini-assessments	Administration, Social Studies Dept Chair

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

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase attendance to 95.25% by minimizing absences due to illness and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated. In addition, our goal for this school year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 9.5 percent.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94.75% (909)	95.25% (913)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
250	238
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
204	194

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Absences caused by long outdoor suspensions continue to account for a large percentage of absences. Additionally the number of late school buses arrivals accounts for a large percentage of the tardies.	1.1. Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of absences to the Truancy Child Study Team (TCST) for intervention services. Utilize the Connect-Ed System to inform parents on a daily basis about their child's absence. Work with students being suspended to incorporate Positive Behavior System (PBS).	1.1. Assistant Principal/Attendance Clerk	1.1. The Attendance clerk will ensure daily attendance reports are given to the faculty and weekly updates to Administration. Weekly reviews of the attendance data by administration and the TCST will be analyzed and adjustments to the incentives program and attendance contracts will be implemented. The entire faculty will be updated during each faculty meetings.	1.1. TCST logs and daily attendance rosters

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
PBS System	Grades 6-8	PBS Committee	All teachers and school staff	August 16, 2012	Administrators will monitor the implementation of the PBS to ensure effectiveness	Administrators and PBS Committee

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PBS SYstem	Student Incentives	EESAC	$500.00
		Subtotal: $500.00	
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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: $500.00	

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	The goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of students suspended outdoor by 10% and suspended indoors by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
153	138
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

113	102
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
323	291
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
186	167

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The total number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions At least 50% of the out-of school suspensions were attributed to SPED students whose violations of the Student Code of Conduct mandated out-of school suspensions.	1.1. Provide incentives to students for compliance through the use of a Positive Behavior System Program. Additionally enhance in-class rewards on a monthly basis to acknowledge exemplary compliance with the Code of Student Conduct. Additionally the continued use of the Extended Detention Center to provide opportunities for behavior modification in lieu of school suspensions.	1.1. Administrative Team	1.1. Administrators will monitor COGNOS Report on Student outdoor suspension rate on a monthly basis and adjust PBS to reinforce positive behavior and reduce suspensions.	1.1. Participation Log for students who are recognized for complying with the Student Code of Conduct along with the monthly COGNOS suspension 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						

Suspension Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP)
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
See Title I PIP	See Title I PIP

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/Plan	1.1 See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/Plan	1.1 See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/Plan	1.1 See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/Plan	1.1 See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/Plan

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
See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/ Plan	See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/ Plan	See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/ Plan	See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/ Plan	See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/ Plan	See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/ Plan	See Title I Parent Involvement Policy/ Plan

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Present Effective Parent Academies	Money to support adminsitrative costs of conducting the Parent Academies	EESAC	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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: $500.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students enrolled in advanced math and science courses in grades 6 and 7 from 200 to 250 a 25% increase and high school honors level science and mathematics courses from 150 to 180 a 20% increase. Additionally it is our goal to increase the number of students who participate in after-school competitions such as SECME and the Mathematics Brain Bowl from 15 to 20 a 33% increase.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1.1. There are not enough opportunities for students to participate	1.1. Students will be provided with opportunities to engage	1.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, SECME Sponsor,	1.1. Student participate in STEM activities will be monitored on a monthly	.1. Formative: participate logs of students involved

1	in competitions related to Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, and the availability of school technology is limited.	in hands-on, real world STEM applications through projects, activities and competitions. Students will utilize technology in the classroom for actual and virtual presentations of their work.	Science Fair Coordinator, Science Dept Chair	bases by MTSS/RtI Leadership Team to ensure all students are being offered the opportunity to participate in competitions, utilize classroom technology and enhance their real technological skills. Utilization of technology will be adjusted as required to ensure that all students are being afforded the opportunity.	with in-house after-school STEM activities and student presentations using current electronic technology. Summative: participate logs of students competing in District wide competitions in Math and Science and the awards they receive for their efforts.

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
Science Fair Competition	Grades 6-8	Science Fair School Coordinator	Grade 6-8 Science Teachers	September 26, 2012	Classroom walk-throughs, student projects, and student work folders	Administration and Science Dept Chairperson
Gizmo	Grades 6-8	Faculty members competent in Gizmo	Grade 6-8 Science and Mathematics Teachers	October 26, 2012	Classroom walk-throughs, and student work folders.	Administration, Science and Mathematics Department Chairpersons
CPO Science	Grade 8 Honors	Vendor and District	Grade 8 Honors Physical Science Teachers	June 2012 and August 2012	Classroom walk-throughs, student work folders, student inquiry projects , interactive science journals	Administration and Science Dept Chairperson

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
1	1.1. The identification of students Who would like to join the FBLA Club and participate in CTE projects and activities.	1.1. Students will be recruited from the Business Technology classes to join the FBLA club and will be provided with opportunities to participate in school based activities and feeder pattern activities. Articulation programs with our feeder high schools will be implemented to ensure their future students have knowledge of what is available at that level and what they can do at the middle school level to prepare for the high school business technology experience.	1.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and FBLA Sponsor	1.1. Effectiveness of the program will be evaluated monthly by the MTSS/RtI based upon the enrollment of students in the FBLA Club and the number of activities that the students are able to participate in.	1.1. FBLA student participation roster and planned competitions and activities participation.

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
Attendance	PBS SYstem	Student Incentives	EESAC	$500.00
Parent Involvement	Present Effective Parent Academies	Money to support adminsitrative costs of conducting the Parent Academies	EESAC	$500.00
				Subtotal: $1,000.00

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: $1,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

j̇n Priority	j̇n Focus	j̇n Prevent	j̇n NA

Are you a reward school: j̇n Yes j̇n No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

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
Support of Parent Academy	$500.00
Support of Student Incentives for SPOT Success Program	$500.00
Support of unplanned activities and projects deemed necessary based upon on-going changes to the SIP	$2,500.00

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

The Educational Excellence School Advisory Council will conduct the following this upcoming school year:
• Implementation and periodic review of the school improvement plan
• Review and evaluate data provided by school leadership team to ensure the effectiveness of allocation of resources for support of the school improvement plan
• Maintain and improve contacts within the local business community to obtain more partners
• Sponsor activities to increase parental involvement in school related programs and functions
Assist the school to create and analyze school climate surveys for parents and students.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District
LAWTON CHILES MIDDLE SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	60%	49%	77%	46%	232	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	59%	52%			111	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?	64% (YES)	55% (YES)			119	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					462	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
LAWTON CHILES MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	60%	56%	88%	30%	234	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%	66%			127	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	62% (YES)	67% (YES)			129	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					490	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested