FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: WESTWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Alachua

Principal: James TenBieg

SAC Chair: Joseph Swails

Superintendent: Daniel Boyd

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 11/8/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Lisa Peterson	Bachelor's, Master's, & Specialist's Degrees in education from the University of Florida	6	12	"A" for 2001-2002, "A" for 2002-2003, "B" for 2003-2004, "B" for 2004-2005, "A" for 2005-2006, "A" for 2006-2007, "A" for 2007-2008, "A" for 2008-2009, "A" for 2009-2010, "A" for 2010-2011, "A" for 2011-2012. AYP = No for 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, & 2011-2012. FCAT in 2011-2012 - 56% meeting high standards in reading, 60% meeting high standards in math, 81% meeting high standards in writing, 43% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2010-2011 – 71% meeting high standards in reading, 75% meeting high standards in math, 91% meeting high standards in writing, 52% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2009-2010 – 69% meeting high standards in reading, 70% meeting high standards in math, 88% meeting high standards in writing, 52% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2008-2009 – 71% meeting high standards in reading, 62% meeting high standards in math, 97% meeting high standards in writing, 50% meeting high standards in writing, 50%

			# of	# of	Prior Performance Record

					meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2007-2008 — 71% meeting high standards in reading, 66 % meeting high standards in math, 95% meeting high standards in writing, 52% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2006-2007 — 69% meeting high standards in reading, 65 % meeting high standards in math, 95% meeting high standards in writing, 50% meeting high standards in science.
Assis Principal	Bruce D. Johnson	Bachelor's, Master's, & Specialist's Degrees in education from the University of Florida	7	7	"A" for 2001-2002, "A" for 2002-2003, "B" for 2003-2004, "B" for 2004-2005, "A" for 2005-2006, "A" for 2006-2007, "A" for 2007-2008, "A" for 2008-2009, "A" for 2009-2010, "A" for 2010-2011, "A" for 2011-2012. AYP = No for 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, & 2011-2012. FCAT in 2011-2012 - 56% meeting high standards in reading, 60% meeting high standards in math, 81% meeting high standards in writing, 43% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2010-2011 — 71% meeting high standards in reading, 75% meeting high standards in math, 91% meeting high standards in writing, 52% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2009-2010 — 69% meeting high standards in reading, 70% meeting high standards in math, 88% meeting high standards in writing, 52% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2008-2009 — 71% meeting high standards in reading, 62 % meeting high standards in math, 97% meeting high standards in writing, 50% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2007-2008 — 71% meeting high standards in reading, 66 % meeting high standards in math, 95% meeting high standards in writing, 52% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2006-2007 — 69% meeting high standards in reading, 65 % meeting high standards in math, 95% meeting high standards in writing, 50% meeting high standards in science.
Principal	James TenBieg	Bachelor's & Master's degrees in education from the University of South Florida.	13	20	"A" for 2001-2002, "A" for 2002-2003, "B" for 2003-2004, "B" for 2004-2005, "A" for 2005-2006, "A" for 2006-2007, "A" for 2007-2008, "A" for 2008-2009, "A" for 2009-2010, "A" for 2010-2011, "A" for 2011-2012. AYP = No for 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, & 2011-2012. FCAT in 2011-2012 - 56% meeting high standards in reading, 60% meeting high standards in math, 81% meeting high standards in writing, 43% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2010-2011 — 71% meeting high standards in reading, 75% meeting high standards in math, 91% meeting high standards in writing, 52% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2009-2010 — 69% meeting high standards in reading, 70% meeting high standards in math, 88% meeting high standards in writing, 52% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2008-2009 — 71% meeting high standards in reading, 62 % meeting high standards in math, 97% meeting high standards in writing, 50% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2007-2008 — 71% meeting high standards in reading, 66 % meeting high standards in math, 95% meeting high standards in writing, 52% meeting high standards in science. FCAT in 2006-2007 — 69% meeting high standards in reading, 65 % meeting high standards in math, 95% meeting high standards in writing, 50% meeting high standards in science.

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.

			# of	# of Years as	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Years at Current School	an Instructional Coach	Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
reading	Gail Billingsley	Masters in reading	3	3	

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	Background education check for each hire	Beverly Finley	Ongoing	
2	Professional Development Plan	Administrative Staff	Ongoing	
3	District Recruitment Fair	District Personnel and Administrative Staff	Yearly	
4	Grade Level Teams for support	Team Leaders, Principal, AP's.	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
There are no instructional staff members who are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating.	

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
62	8.1%(5)	25.8%(16)	37.1%(23)	41.9%(26)	62.9%(39)	100.0%(62)	25.8%(16)	9.7%(6)	21.0%(13)

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
Jared Feria	Mary Alvarez	Beginning teacher program	Conferencing, workshops, observations with feedback.
Jared Feria	Robert Cecil	Beginning teacher program	Conferencing, workshops, observations with feedback.
Jared Feria	Matthew Floyd	Beginning teacher program	Conferencing, workshops, observations with feedback.

| Jared Feria | Ryan McNickle | Beginning teacher program | Conferencing, workshops, observations with feedback. |

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Student Services Team (Assistant Principal of Curriculum,Assistant Principal of Administration, Counselors, Deans, School Nurse, Behavior Resource Teacher, Resource Officer) Team Leaders, and Teachers.

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?

Student Services Team members or Individual Grade Level Teams identify students who are not making adequate progress. An intervention plan is developed and implemented. Porgress is monitored and the plan may be refined if necessary. The APC provides curricular support and the APA provides behavioral support. School counselors provide training and support in the RtI process, work with teachers through the problem solving cycle; and facilitate the communication with the team leaders and/or parents.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The school-based RtI Leadership Team will serve as the hub for data and data analysis as well as the chief conduit for the flow of information and training. The team or its sub-committees will meet regularly to analyze data, discuss and implement intervention strategies, monitor progress, evaluate effectiveness, communicate with other agencies, schools, and district personnel, and identify areas of need with regard to professional development. The overarching motivation will focus on how to best help Westwood's students.

The general education teachers will serve as content area experts. They will be involved in data collection, implementation of Tier 1 instruction and interventions, and collaboration with other staff members to implement pier 2 interventions.

The exceptional student education teachers (ESE) will participate in data collection, will integrate instruction into Tier 2 and 3 activities, and will collaborate with general education teachers with activities such as co-teaching.

The school psychologist will be involved with data collection and analysis as well as consultation on appropriate Tier 2 and 3 interventions.

Deans and guidance counselors will be involved with data collections and analysis, intervention strategies, progress monitoring, as well as provide a conduit to appropriate outside agencies that may be an aspect of appropriate intervention strategies.

The school-based RtI Leadership Team will share data with Westwood's School Advisory Council. This will occur throughout the 2010-2011 school year so goals can be re-examined if necessary. Resources/monies can be allocated to areas of need.

MTSS Implementation

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

The various data streams that will inform RtI decisions include (but are not limited to) Ontrack Testing, F.A.I.R. testing, FCAT data, annual learning gains, FCAT simulations, students of concern as recognized through team meetings, the guidance department, and student services meetings, and teacher-generated assessments either by hand or software (i.e. Testmaker Pro, FCAT Explorer).

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Westwood staff has previously received training in RtI by district employee Michelle Crosby. In addition, information will be sent through PIC leadership meetings, team meetings, department meetings, Google Mail, and Westwood's own (password-protected) Google site. Decisions on professional development will manifest themselves during regular RtI Leadership team meetings. Further information and training are expected from the county.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Decisions to implement RtI strategies manifest themselves in a multitude of ways. Follow-up student services meetings, Educational Planning Team meetings, Individualized Education Plan meetings (where Behavior Improvement Plans may be implemented), team meetings, guidance meetings, or individual meetings with students and parents all serve to ensure that support for students is meted on an individual basis.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) includes Jim TenBieg (principal), Lisa Peterson (assistant principal for curriculum), Bruce Johnson (assistant principal for administration), Peggy Beland (Reading Department Chair), Tim McShane (Language Arts Department Chair), Jill Kanji (guidance counselor), Jennifer MacEwan (guidance counselor), Debbie Roberts (media specialist), Melissa Pratto (reading teacher).

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team will serve as the hub for data and data analysis as well as the chief conduit for the flow of information and training with regard to reading. The team will meet regularly to analyze data, discuss and implement intervention strategies, monitor progress, evaluate effectiveness, and identify areas of need with regard to professional development in the reading content area.

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

The main focus of the LLT for this school year is to provide reading strategies within content area courses.

Another initiative of the LLT this year will be to work with science and social studies teachers to develop content-specific FCAT-style questions as "bell-ringers." Although the focus would be on reading instruction, the lessons themselves will touch upon all subject areas, both academic and exploratory classes. Westwood has combined homeroom and first period to facilitate the implementation of the focus lessons.

Regularly scheduled progress monitoring will occur through use of the F.A.I.R. assessment. Response-to-Intervention (RtI) will aide in identifying and remediating students in need of additional resources. Advanced technology will be used to increase student motivation.

Public School Choice

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

relevance to their future?

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The number of students scoring a (3 or above) in FCAT 2.0 reading will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (233/948)	35% (332/948)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's	Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
3	Low-interest materials	Increase use of high-interest technology Greater familairarity with last year's adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist County	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
4	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities

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:	The percentage of Westwood students scoring a level 4 or above on the FAA will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (1/3)	43%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's	Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
3	Low-interest materials	Increase use of high-interest technology Greater familairarity with last year's adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist County	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
4	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities

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:	Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (291/948)	41% (389/948)

	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	Low-interest materials	Increase use of high-interest technology Greater familararity with last year's adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist County	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair,	Classroom walk-through's	Lesson plan monitoring,

				administration		"Essential Question" monitoring
4	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities

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:	Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading on the FAA will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (1/3)	43%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's	Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
3	Low-interest materials	Increase use of high-interest technology Greater familairarity with last year's adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist County	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
4	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities

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:	Percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	64% (575/897)		74% (664/897)		

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's	Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments
3	Low-interest materials	Increase use of high-interest technology Greater famaliarity with last year's adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist County	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
4	Limited resources with regard to effective research-based programs.	READ 180 lab created. Three teachers in room during computer instruction	Teachers	Formal and informal assessments	FAIR testing, FCAT, READ 180 assessments
5	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities

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:	Percentage of students making gains in reading on the FAA will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (1/2)	60%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's	Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments

					Classroom walk-through's
3	Low-interest materials	Increase use of high-interest technology Greater familairarity with last year's adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist County	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
4	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities

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:	Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (137/228)	70% (158/228)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's	Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
3	Low-interest materials	Increase use of high-interest technology Adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist County	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
4	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities
5	Limited resources with regard to effective research-based programs.	READ 180 lab created. Three teachers in room during computer instruction	Teachers	Formal and informal assessments	FAIR testing, FCAT, READ 180 assessments

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 #
	In six years, Westwood Middle School will decrease the achievment gap by 50%.
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	57	64	68	71	75	

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:	Student subgroups by ethnicity not making satisfactory progress in reading will all decrease by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Asian - 41% (12/29), Black - 68% (248/363), Hispanic - 43% (40/92), Indian - 33% (1/3), White - 25% (102/401)	Asian - 31% (9/29), Black - 58% (211/363), Hispanic - 33% (30/92), Indian - 23% (1/3), White - 15% (60/401)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's	Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team Formal and informal assessments	Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
3	Low-interest materials	Increase use of high-interest technology Greater familiarity with last year's adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist County	Feedback in professional learning communities Formal and informal assessments	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
4	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities
5	Limited resources with regard to effective research-based programs.	READ 180 lab created. Three teachers in room during computer instruction	Teachers	Formal and informal assessments	FAIR testing, FCAT, READ 180 assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	
	English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory

	Reading Goal #5C:		progress in reading will decrease by 10%.		

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (34/41)	73% (30/41)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's

Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring | Classroom walk-through's

Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring |
| 2 | Infrequent progress monitoring | Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring | Leadership Team | Formal and informal assessments

Feedback in professional learning communities | Classroom walk-through's

Various computer and teacher-generated assessments |
| 3 | Low-interest materials | Increase use of high-interest technology

Greater familiarity of last year's adoption of new textbook series | Debbie Roberts, technology specialist, Administration, learning communities, County | Formal and informal assessments

Feedback in professional learning communities | Various computer and teacher-generated assessments

Classroom walk-through's |
| 4 | Language barrier | Working in concert with ESOL teacher and aide. | Teachers, Stacie Oyenarte | Formal and informal assessments | Formal and informal assessments |
| 5 | Limited assistance outside of class | Tutoring | Tutors | Formal and informal assessments

Feedback in professional learning communities | Formal and informal assessments

Feedback in professional learning |

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: | Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 10%. |

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (144/191)	65% (124/191)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair, administration	Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring	Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential

					Question" monitoring Classroom walk-through's
1				Classroom walk-through's	
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Classroom walk-through's Various computer and teacher-generated assessments
3	Low-interest materials Increase use of high-interest technology	Greater familiarity of last year's adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology, specialist, Administration, learning communities, County	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
4	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning

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:	Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (300/490)	51% (250/490)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Reading teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring, "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Classroom walk-through's Various computer and teacher-generated assessments
3	Low-interest materials Increase use of high-interest technology	Greater familiarity of last year's adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist, Administration, learning communities, County	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments	Formal and informal assessments

				Feedback in professional learning communities	Feedback in professional learning
4					

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
Read 180 Training	6-8/Reading	Lisa Peterson	Read 180 teachers	August of 2011	FAIR Testing and SRI Testing	Peggy Beland & Lisa Peterson

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:	Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

57% (24/42)

	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	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
2	Low-interest materials	Increase use of high-interest technology Greater familiarity with last year's adoption of new textbook series	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist County	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
3	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities
4	Language barrier	Working in concert with ESOL teacher and aide.	Teachers, Stacie Oyenarte	Formal and informal assessments	Formal and informal assessments

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:	Cella students scoring proficient in reading will increase 10%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
57% (24/42)	

	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	Language barrier	Working in concert with ESOL teacher and aide.	Teachers, Stacie Oyenarte	Formal and informal assessments	Formal and informal assessments
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
3	Low-interest materials	Increase use of high-interest technology Greater familairaity	Debbie Roberts, technology specialist	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments

		with last year's adoption of new textbook series	County	professional learning communities	Classroom walk-through's
4	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Students scoring proficient in writing will increase by 10%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:
57% (24/42)

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	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
2	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities
3	Language barrier	Working in concert with ESOL teacher and aide.	Teachers, Stacie Oyenarte	Formal and informal assessments	Formal and informal assessments

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 percentage of students scoring at (or above) a level 3 in mathematics will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (300/969) level 3 61% (591/969) of levels 3, 4, 5	71% (688/969 projected students)

<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>Lack of uniform curriculum structure</td><td>Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"</td><td>Math teachers, department chair, administration</td><td>Classroom walk-through's

Lesson plan monitoring

"Essential Question" monitoring</td><td>Classroom walk-through's

Lesson plan monitoring

"Essential Question" monitoring</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Limited assistance outside of class</td><td>Tutoring through EDEP program</td><td>Tutors</td><td>Formal and informal assessments

Feedback in professional learning communities</td><td>Formal and informal assessments

Feedback in professional learning</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Infrequent progress monitoring</td><td>Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring</td><td>RtI Leadership Team</td><td>Formal and informal assessments

Feedback in professional learning communities</td><td>Various computer and teacher-generated assessments

Classroom walk-through's</td></tr>
</table>

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (2/3)	77% (2/3)

<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>
</table>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
2	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through afterschool program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning
3	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Math teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring

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:	Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 & 5) will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (282/948)	40% (379/948 projected students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through EDEP program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
3	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Math teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring

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:	The percentage of students scoring at or above a level 7 in mathematics (for FAA) will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (1/3)	43%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Westwood students who make adequate yearly progress in math will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (621/895)	79% (707/895 projected students)

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	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
2	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through EDEP program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning
3	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Math teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring

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:	Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (621/895)	79% (707/895 projected students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Math teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through afterschool program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities
3	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's

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:	Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (139/225)	69% (155/225)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through EDEP program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning

#	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
					communities
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
3	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Math teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring

---

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 # In six years, Westwood Middle School will reduce its achievment gap by 50%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	55	58	63	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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Student subgroups by ethnicity not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will all decrease 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White - 23% (92/401), Black - 64% (234/363), Hispanic - 40% (37/92), Asian - 21% (6/29), Indian 67% (2/3)	White - 13% (52/401), Black - 54% (196/363), Hispanic - 30% (28/92), Asian - 11% (3/29), Indian 57% (2/3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
#	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Math teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
	Limited assistance	Tutoring through EDEP	Tutors	Formal and informal	Formal and informal

					assessments	assessments
3	outside of class	program			Feedback in professional learning communities	Feedback in professional learning communities

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:	English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (29/41)	61% (25/41)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td align="center">Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td align="center">Strategy</td>
<td align="center">Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td align="center">Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td align="center">Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Infrequent progress monitoring</td>
<td>Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring</td>
<td>RtI Leadership Team</td>
<td>Formal and informal assessments

Feedback in professional learning communities</td>
<td>Various computer and teacher-generated assessments

Classroom walk-through's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Language barrier</td>
<td>Working in concert with ESOL teacher and aide.</td>
<td>Teachers, Stacie Oyenarte</td>
<td>Formal and informal assessments</td>
<td>Formal and informal assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of uniform curriculum structure</td>
<td>Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"</td>
<td>Math teachers, department chair, administration</td>
<td>Classroom walk-through's

Lesson plan monitoring

"Essential Question" monitoring</td>
<td>Classroom walk-through's

Lesson plan monitoring

"Essential Question" monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Limited assistance outside of class</td>
<td>Tutoring through EDEP program</td>
<td>Tutors</td>
<td>Formal and informal assessments

Feedback in professional learning</td>
<td>Formal and informal assessments

Feedback in professional learning</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (138/191)	62% (118/191)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through EDEP program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities
2	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Math teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring
3	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (277/490)	47% (230/490)

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	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
2	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through EDEP program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities
3	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Math teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring

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:	Students scoring a level 3 (or above) in Algebra EOC will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (25/90)	38% (34/90 projected students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Math teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring
2	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through afterschool program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities
3	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's

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:	Students scoring at or above a level 4 in Algebra EOC will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (63/90)	80% (72/90 projected students)

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	Infrequent progress monitoring	Implement RTI with regular progress monitoring	RtI Leadership Team	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Various computer and teacher-generated assessments Classroom walk-through's
2	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through EDEP program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning
3	Lack of uniform curriculum structure	Instructional calendar, "Essential Questions"	Math teachers, department chair, administration	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring	Classroom walk-through's Lesson plan monitoring "Essential Question" monitoring

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

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

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
Remediation & tutoring	A teacher worked after school hours fro both CROP remediation as well as tutoring.	Adv & lot	$840.00
			Subtotal: $840.00
			Grand Total: $840.00

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:	Westwood students scoring a level 3 (or above) will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (98/308) level 3	42%

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	Time constraints; current pacing guide does not include review of previous year's science content and teachers may not readily buy into adding additional aspects within instructional calendar.	Have students use technology programs where they can review materials from previous courses on-line. Our physical science teachers will incorporate spiral reviews of earth/space and life science curriculum to ensure students comprehend and can recall all aspects of the 6-8 science course materials. In addition, all science teachers will collaborate to develop test bank questions for transitional grades.	Science Department Chairperson	Utilization of progress monitoring tools in the classroom with students each 2-3 weeks and warm-ups/tickets out the door to review science concepts.	Mini-assessments and On-Track tests
2	Weaknesses in critical thinking skills.	Enrichment activities and collaborating with language arts teachers to share cross-curricular research based strategies. Increase the number hands-on laboratories used with students, higher order Bloom's Taxonomy questions on mini assessments that include analysis and interpretation of science concepts, participate in science experiences that require students to improve note-taking skills and writing of laboratory reports that involve real work experiences.	Science teachers, department chair	Teacher assessment	Teacher 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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Students achieving above proficiency in FCAT science levsl 4 & 5 will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11% (33/308)	21% (65/308 projected students)

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	Time constraints; current pacing guide does not include review of previous year's science content and teachers may not readily buy into adding additional aspects within instructional calendar.	Have students use technology programs where they can review materials from previous courses on-line. Our physical science teachers will incorporate spiral reviews of earth/space and life science curriculum to ensure students comprehend and can recall all aspects of the 6-8 science course materials. In addition, all science teachers will collaborate to develop test bank questions for transitional grades.	Science Department Chairperson	Utilization of progress monitoring tools in the classroom with students each 2-3 weeks and warm-ups/tickets out the door to review science concepts.	Mini-assessments and On-Track testing
	Weaknesses in critical thinking skills.	Enrichment activities and collaborating with	Science teachers,	Teacher assessment	Teacher assessment

| 2 | language arts teachers to share cross-curricular research based strategies.

Increase the number hands-on laboratories used with students, higher order Bloom's Taxonomy questions on mini assessments that include analysis and interpretation of science concepts, participate in science experiences that require students to improve note-taking skills and writing of laboratory reports that involve real work experiences. | department chair | | | |

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:	n/a

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Students achieving proficiency (FACT level 3) will increase 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (254/325)	89% (289/325 projected students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not proficient in revising own work.	The revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and assessed using student writing pieces.	Language arts teachers and department chair	Progress monitoring	Teacher assessment and 8th grade FCAT
2	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through the afterschool program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities
3	Student lack of knowledge in use of grammar, usage, and mechanics.	Teachers will use mini lessons on grammar, usage, and mechanics of writing.	Language Arts teachers, department chair, and administration	Students will be given practice essays scored on a rubric to check for accuracy of grammar usage.	Students will practice writing using a district created writing prompt (6th and 7th grades).

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:	Westwood students scoring a 4.0 or higher on the writing assessment will increase 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11% (38/325) scored a 4.0 or higher on the writing assessment.	16% (54/projected 325)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not proficient in revising own work.	The revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and assessed using student writing pieces.	Language arts teachers and department chair	Progress monitoring	Teacher assessment and 8th grade FCAT
2	Limited assistance outside of class	Tutoring through the afterschool program	Tutors	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities
3	Limited feedback with regard to writing	Peer feedback on writing	Peers	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities	Formal and informal assessments Feedback in professional learning communities

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						

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Attendance rate will increase 1%. Students with excessive absences (10 or more) will decrease by 10%. Students with escessive tardies (10 or more) will decrease by 10%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94.14%	95.14%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
157	141
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
209	188

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with excessive absences are disenfranchised from school, both socially and academically.	Parent contact Counseling Involvement with county truancy liaison and court system	Jill Kanji & county truancy officer	Ongoing tracking of absences	Documented absences from school as determined by Infinite Campus.
2	Tardies break academic momentum.	Better record-keeping. Tardy lock-outs.	All staff	Data from Infinite Campus (database software)	Data from Infinite Campus (database software)

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Youth Combine	Afterschool atheletic organization designed to motivatate as well as teach leadership skills.	Adv & Lot	$7,650.00
			Subtotal: $7,650.00
			Grand Total: $7,650.00

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:	Total number of students suspended both in-school and out-of-school shall decrease by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

847	424
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
277	211
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
1,151	1,036
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
230	207

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are repeatedly being suspended from instructional contact.	Alternatives to in-school detention and out-of-school suspensions will be further explored.	Deans	I.S.S. and O.S.S. reports through database	I.S.S. and O.S.S. reports through database
2	Limited behavioral interventions (in some cases) before referral process is initiated	Intervention (PRIM) manuals have been made available to all teachers

An intervention web site has been made available to all staff members.

A password-protected, shared database was created for accurate parental contact information. | All staff | Data as compiled through county database | Infinite Campus |
| 3 | Students are unmotivated to "do the right thing" | Postive Behavior Support (P.B.S.) will be continued | P.B.S. committee | Data as compiled through county database | Infinite Campus |

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
					Discipline data	

| Positive Behavior Support Inservice | All | Jill Kanji & Karen Bethel | School-wide | 8/16/12 | through Infinite Campus.

Requests for P.B.S. "Whirl-One" coupons | Jill Kanji & Karen Bethel |

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
Positive Behavior Support supplies	Items for "Whirl-Mart" store. Printing for "Whirl-One" coupons.	Lotto funds	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

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.*	Parent involvement will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
7,471 Volunteer Hours	8,218 Volunteer Hours

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of opportunity to positively interact with the school beyond	Family literacy night FCAT night	Adminsration & guidance department	Number of parents/families attending	Sign-in sheets

	parent conferences and open house				
2	Disconnect between what parents perceives as happening at school vs. what is truly happening.	"Bring a parent to school" day	Administration	Number of parents attending over course of five days	Parent attendance log
3	Lack of communication between home and school	Increased use of PhoneHome system Email list	Administration PTA as well as Infinite Campus	ParentLink phone home system log	ParentLink phone home system log

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

Subtotal: $0.00

Grand Total: $0.00

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Remediation & tutoring	A teacher worked after school hours fro both CROP remediation as well as tutoring.	Adv & lot	$840.00
Attendance	Youth Combine	Afterschool atheletic organization designed to motivatate as well as teach leadership skills.	Adv & Lot	$7,650.00
Suspension	Positive Behavior Support supplies	Items for "Whirl-Mart" store. Printing for "Whirl-One" coupons.	Lotto funds	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $9,490.00
				Grand Total: $9,490.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ꞁn Priority	ꞁn Focus	ꞁn Prevent	ꞁn NA

Are you a reward school: ꞁn Yes ꞁn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/10/2012)

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

Positive Behavior Support - $2,500 Four $250 teacher grants - $1,000 Math Tutoring - 2 teachers/4 hours per week - $8,000 Read 180 Books - $5,500 Reading program coordinator - 2 teachers/8 hours per week - $6,240	$23,240.00

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

In addition to looking at ways to increase student achievement, Westwood's school advisory council will continue to explore a variety of ways to increase parent involvement. Progress monitoring will occur throughout the year and will be shared with the school advisory council in order to re-examine school improvement goals. The SAC will also determine the most appropriate need for the expenditure of Lotto and Advanced Placement monies, including mini-grants (worth up to $250 for those applying).

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Alachua School District WESTWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	75%	91%	52%	289	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	65%	77%			142	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	65% (YES)	73% (YES)			138	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					569	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Alachua School District WESTWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	69%	70%	88%	52%	279	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	60%	73%			133	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	58% (YES)	70% (YES)			128	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					540	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested