

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Shelley F. Stroleny

SAC Chair: Ingrid Robledo

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

|  |
|--|
| <a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>   |
| <a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a> |
| <a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>  |
| <a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>                               |

### 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)/<br>Certification(s) | # of<br>Years at<br>Current<br>School | # of Years as<br>an<br>Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include<br>prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide<br>Assessment Achievement Levels,<br>Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and<br>AMO Progress along with the<br>associated school year)  |
|----------|------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
|          |      |                                |                                       |                                      | Principal of G. W. Carver Middle School since 2012-2012;<br>Assistant Principal of G. W. Carver Middle School since 2003-2004.<br>2011-2012 Grade "A". Reading Mastery: 93%, Math Mastery 96%, Writing: 98%, Science Mastery: 95%. AMO in Reading: No. AMO in Math: No. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 81%; Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 91%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Reading: |

|                 |                     |   |    |   |   |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|----|---|---|
| Principal       | Shelley F. Stroleny | <p>Bachelor of Arts - English / German, University of Miami;</p> <p>Master of Science -TESOL, University of Miami;</p> <p>Educational Specialist- Ed. Leadership, Nova Southeastern University.</p> <p>Certification(s): Educational Leadership (all levels), English (grades 6-12), Foreign Language – German (grades k-12)</p>  | 13 | 9 | <p>84%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 97%.</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade "A". Reading Mastery: 96%, Math Mastery 97%, Writing: 100%, Science Mastery: 88%. Made AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 75%; Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 79%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Reading: 90%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 92%.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade "A". Reading Mastery: 97%, Math Mastery 98%, Writing: 99%, Science Mastery: 90%. Made AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 78%; Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 82%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Reading: 91%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 95%.</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade "A". Reading Mastery: 98%, Math Mastery 98%, Writing: 100%, Science Mastery: 91%. Made AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 76%; Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 81%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Reading: 91%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 94%.</p> <p>2007-2008 Grade "A". Reading Mastery: 97%, Math Mastery 98%, Writing: 100%, Science Mastery: 90%. Made AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 78%; Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 86%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Reading: 91%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 93%.</p>   |
| Assis Principal | Shelton L. Rivers   | <p>Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University;</p> <p>Master's Degree in Education, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University;</p> <p>Educational Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University;</p> <p>Certification(s): Educational Leadership (all levels), State of Florida Guidance and Counseling (pre K through grade 12), State of Florida</p> | 6  | 8 | <p>Assistant Principal of G. W. Carver Middle School since 2006-2007.</p> <p>2011-2012 Grade "A". Reading Mastery: 93%, Math Mastery 96%, Writing: 98%, Science Mastery: 95%. AMO in Reading: No. AMO in Math: No. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 81%; Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 91%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Reading: 84%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 97%.</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade "A". Reading Mastery: 96%, Math Mastery 97%, Writing: 100%, Science Mastery: 88%. Made AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 75%; Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 79%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Reading: 90%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 92%.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade "A". Reading Mastery: 97%, Math Mastery 98%, Writing: 99%, Science Mastery: 90%. Made AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 78%; Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 82%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Reading: 91%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 95%.</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade "A". Reading Mastery: 98%, Math Mastery 98%, Writing: 100%, Science Mastery: 91%. Made AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 76%; Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 81%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Reading: 91%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 94%.</p> <p>2007-2008 Grade "A". Reading Mastery: 97%, Math Mastery 98%, Writing: 100%, Science Mastery: 90%. Made AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 78%; Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 86%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Reading: 91%; Lowest Quartile Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 93%.</p> |
|                 |                     |   |    |   | <p>Assistant Principal of G. W. Carver Middle School 2012-2013; Activities Director at Miami Sunset Senior High School since 2005-2006.</p> <p>2011- 2012 SCHOOL GRADE PENDING. Reading Mastery 45%, Math Mastery 52%, Writing Mastery: 85% ; Science Mastery: N/A. AMO in Reading: No. AMO in Math: No. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 62%, Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 58%. Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Reading: 64%, Lowest Quartile Learning</p>   |

|           |                      |   |   |   |   |
|-----------|----------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Sylvia Coto-Gonzalez | Bachelor of Science – Hospitality Management, Florida International University<br>Master of Science- SLD, Nova Southeastern University<br>Certification(s): Educational Leadership (all levels), State of Florida<br>SLD (k-12), State of Florida | 1 | 1 | Gains in Mathematics 59%.<br>2010- 2011 Grade "C" Reading Mastery 44%, Math Mastery 75%, Writing Mastery: 75% ; Science Mastery: 30%. Did not make AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 47%, Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 72%. Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Reading: 47%, Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Mathematics 60%.<br>2009- 2010 Grade "B" Reading Mastery 46%, Math Mastery 74%: Writing Mastery: 85%; Science Mastery: 25% . Did not make AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 54%, Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 77%. Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Reading: 53%, Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Mathematics 65%.<br>2008- 2009 Grade "B" Reading Mastery 44%, Math Mastery 73%: Writing Mastery: 82%; Science Mastery: 30% . Did not make AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 55%, Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 75%. Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Reading: 62%, Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Mathematics 65%.<br>2007- 2008 Grade "D" Reading Mastery 41%, Math Mastery 72%, Writing Mastery: 84%; Science mastery: 26% . Did not make AYP. Making Learning Gains in Reading: 54%, Making Learning Gains in Mathematics: 80%. Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Reading: 60%, Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Mathematics 79%. |
|-----------|----------------------|---|---|---|---|

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|--------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| N/A          |      |                             |                              |                                      |   |

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

|   | Description of Strategy                         | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|--------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | 1. Regular meetings with new teachers.          | Principal          | May 2013                  |   |
| 2 | 2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff.  | Principal          | May 2013                  |   |
| 3 | 3. Working with mentor teacher.                 | Principal          | May 2013                  |   |
| 4 | 4. Soliciting referrals from current employees. | Principal          | May 2013                  |   |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
| 1  | Teacher is in the process of pursuing Reading endorsement.  |

### 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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 58                                  | 0.0%(0)                  | 13.8%(8)                                   | 36.2%(21)                                   | 50.0%(29)                                  | 48.3%(28)                           | 100.0%(58)                  | 10.3%(6)                    | 31.0%(18)                           | 12.1%(7)                 |

### Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| N/A         |                 |                       |                              |

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

Title I, Part A

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

#### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal  
Assistant Principals  
Guidance Counselor  
TRUST Specialist  
Language Arts Department Chairperson  
Mathematics Department Chairperson  
Science Department Chairperson  
SPED Teacher

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

The RtI Leadership Team ensures academic success for all students by providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs. Through a data based problem solving process, a multi-tiered approach for addressing academic and behavior challenges is implemented. Ongoing examination and support is provided for all aspects of the school, including identifying methods and strategies to improve student achievement, school safety, school's culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well-being, and prevention of student failure through intervention.

1. In order to create a safe, positive, and inviting school climate where all students achieve high academic performance levels, the RtI Leadership Team is composed of the following:
  - Administrator(s) build consensus and awareness of RtI implementation constructs among all school staff and assess school interventions and resources available to all tiers of instruction and intervention.
  - Teacher(s) conduct systematic examination of available school data, engage in problem solving, participate in intervention planning, monitor student progress, and evaluate overall impact of instructional programs.
  - Team members who collaborate towards the school's academic mission by examining school, grade, classroom, and student data to measure fidelity of instruction and/or intervention in a supportive environment.
2. As problem solving issues and concerns arise, the following staff members may be included since they are in key roles to guide exploration of Root Cause Analysis and implementation of prevention/intervention strategies:

- School reading, math, science, and behavior specialists
- School guidance counselor(s)
- Special education personnel
- School psychologist
- School social worker
- Member of advisory group
- Community stakeholders

3. The framework for implementation of RtI provides a tiered-approach to instructional prevention and intervention that supports the utilization of all available resources to meet student needs. As students' needs increase in academic and behavior systems, the level of support (instruction and intervention) is intensified.

- All students in the general curriculum are included in the core instructional and behavior methodologies, practices and supports.
- Targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support are provided supplemental instruction and interventions in addition to and in alignment with the core curriculum utilizing best teaching practices, research-based interventions, and behavioral strategies.
- Students requiring intensive instructional and/or behavioral intervention to increase individual student's rate of progress will be provided intensive instruction and interventions aligned with the core curriculum. Individualized supplemental instruction and intervention will be based on ongoing evaluation to promote student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data, including FAIR testing.

Additionally, the school's leadership team will:

1. Collect and analyze data to address student academic and behavioral needs. The following questions will guide the inquiry process:

- What are students expected to learn based on the New Generation Standards and the CRRP?
- How will we use District Assessments and Teacher-developed Tests to assess student progress/learning?
- How are the needs of the students not making sufficient progress addressed? How are interventions monitored to ensure student progress? (The problem-solving process will include all necessary stakeholders.)
- How will we provide enrichment for students at high achievement levels?

2. Based on data analysis, appropriate professional development for faculty will be provided based on instructional/behavioral needs and intervention with the goal of all students meeting achievement goal.

3. Scheduled team meetings will be held to discuss exemplary teaching practices, effectiveness of interventions, and progress monitoring.

4. All faculty will communicate effectively to promote feedback on the effectiveness of procedures implemented based on data collection.

5. Monitor effective academic and behavioral intervention aligned with the school's goals to continue implementation of effective core instruction and regularly scheduled interventions.

6. Examine progress based on data, assess student needs and monitor progress toward goals to determine effectiveness of program delivery with fidelity and validity.

7. Provide all subgroups with the necessary academic instruction and interventions, and behavioral interventions to ensure adequate yearly progress.

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

The Leadership Team will determine student needs according to the academic and behavioral goals utilizing ongoing data collection, analysis, and prescriptive instructional plans.

The Leadership Team will utilize ongoing progress monitoring to determine the effectiveness of instruction and intervention.

The Leadership Team will provide interventions to students, as needed and appropriate.

#### 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.

Data collection and data analysis will be utilized to design effective instructional teaching /learning practices and appropriate interventions to accelerate student achievement and determine appropriate interventions for all students. The process

utilized is as follows:

- Ensure the effective delivery of the core instructional curriculum, including behavioral aspects, to meet student needs.
- Modify instructional methodology and delivery of instruction necessary to meet the needs of all students, including behavior management system.
- Revisit school-based resources to meet the needs of all students.
- Target professional development toward goals of meeting all students' needs.
- Monitor student growth to address and pinpoint areas of needs to increase individual student achievement academically and address behavioral needs.

Available data collection and data analysis will include:

Academic:

- FAIR Assessment
- Interim Assessments
- State/Local math and science assessments
- FCAT
- Student grades
- School site specific assessments, i.e. Teacher-developed weekly tests, midterm and final exams
- Edusoft reports

Behavior:

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The professional development and support will include:

- Providing an overview of RtI principals and procedures, including the framework for RtI, federal/state requirements, examining key roles of school leadership teams, assessing academic and behavior data to determine effective instructional intervention.
- Facilitating a system for team meetings to discuss exemplary teaching practices, research-based interventions, and ongoing progress monitoring.
- Establishing a process for adjusting/modifying instruction/interventions as needed to increase the achievement of all students.
- Sharing all updates regarding student achievement, including district assessments, FCAT item specs, interventions and effective/exemplary instructional practices.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

G. W. Carver Middle School plans to support MTSS by providing the following:

- Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.
- Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.
- Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The LLT will be composed of the follow members to ensure that all students will have the benefit of data analysis, effective instructional practices, and targeted interventions:

Libia A. Gonzalez - Principal

Shelton L. Rivers - Assistant Principal  
Shelley Stroleny - Assistant Principal  
Shannon Sejeck - Social Studies Teacher  
Janell Jensen – Media Specialist  
Janas Byrd - Language Arts Department Chairperson  
Eva Moore - Science Department Chairperson  
Gabriele K. Moghani - German Department Chairperson  
Bernadette Cadi - French Department Chairperson  
Carmen Gomez - Spanish Department Chairperson  
Jenny Llewellyn-Jones - Electives Department Chairperson  
Madelyn Vinat - Social Studies Department Chairperson  
Cheli Fernandez - Mathematics Department Chairperson

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

The LLT will be composed of the principal, assistant principal(s), language arts department chairperson, and at least one representative from each department to ensure that all students will have the benefit of data analysis, effective instructional practices, and targeted interventions.

- The principal will be in a key role to promote the impetus to engage in data chats and the implementation of best teaching practices.
- The Administrative team will ensure the effective implementation of exemplary teaching practices and ongoing monitoring of student progress, including academic and behavior systems, and follow-up with individual teachers/students, as needed to achieve excellence for all students.
- Teachers will develop a system for engaging all students academically and meeting all behavioral challenges.
- Teachers will analyze data, share best teaching practices, add new strategies to their repertoire of effective teaching practices, and follow-up with implementation of these best teaching practices, including sharing student samples to demonstrate effectiveness of the implementation of "new" practices for all students.

Meetings are regularly scheduled to address current data, analyze student areas of needs according to the benchmarks and new generation standards, institute best teaching practices and share the effective implementation of such practices.

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

- Review all available data to target benchmarks where student performance demonstrates areas of weakness, while strengthening strong areas with best teaching practices for all students.
- Designing a plan to meet the needs of all students who are not making sufficient progress toward the goals of the New Generation Standards.
- Share exemplary reading and writing instructional practices to implement across the curriculum.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
No Attachment

### \*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

### \*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.

Teachers participate in professional development activities in differentiated instruction and how to interpret FCAT and Interim Assessment data. Individual student's test data are made available to the teachers. All department chairpersons are members of the school's literacy team and disseminate the information from the literacy team meetings to build reading capacity school-wide. Social Studies, foreign language and elective classes incorporate FCAT type reading activities in their instruction on an ongoing basis. In addition to student work samples, student progress is monitored using district Baseline and Interim assessments.



## \*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

## 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](#)

N/A

## 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a:  | The results of the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 21% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to maintain Level 3 student proficiency at 21%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 21% (207)  | 21% (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 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction (grade 6). Many teachers do not have the expertise related to reading analysis and reading strategies as compared to the school's language arts teachers and do not know how to target these specific needs and or skills. | Build capacity school-wide (grades 6, 7 and 8) regarding teaching reading across the curriculum through Professional Development conducted during the school's literacy team meetings and department meetings. Conduct data chats on Reading data across departments, excluding the school's Mathematics and Science departments. | The Literacy Team along with the administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of the identified strategies. | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of classroom assessments (inclusive of graphic organizers, concept maps, and essays) focusing on students' ability to make inferences, draw conclusions, and analyze author's perspective. Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |
| 2 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Informational Text/Research Process (grade 7). Many teachers do not have the expertise related to reading analysis and reading strategies as compared to the school's language arts teachers and do not know how to target these specific needs and or skills.       | Build capacity school-wide (grades 6, 7 and 8) regarding teaching reading across the curriculum through Professional Development conducted during the school's literacy team meetings and department meetings. Conduct data chats on Reading data across departments, excluding the school's Mathematics and Science departments. | The Literacy Team along with the administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of the identified strategies. | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of classroom assessments (inclusive of graphic organizers, concept maps, and essays) focusing on students' ability to make inferences, draw conclusions, and analyze author's perspective. Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |
| 3 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Vocabulary (grade 8). Many teachers do not have the expertise related to reading analysis and reading strategies as compared to the school's language  | Build capacity school-wide (grades 6, 7 and 8) regarding teaching reading across the curriculum through Professional Development conducted during the school's literacy team meetings and department meetings. Conduct data chats on Reading data   | The Literacy Team along with the administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of the identified strategies. | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of classroom assessments (inclusive of graphic organizers, concept maps, and essays) focusing on students' ability to make inferences, draw conclusions, and analyze author's perspective.  | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| arts teachers and do not know how to target these specific needs and or skills. | across departments, excluding the school's Mathematics and Science departments. | Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). |
|---|---|--|

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:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #1b: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A  | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 68% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 68% (655)   | 68% (658)   |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Vocabulary (grades 6, 7 and 8). Many students need practice deriving word meanings and word relationships from context. | Teachers will plan for and provide instruction so that students will work with sets of words that are semantically related. Students will be provided practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms and antonyms (grades 6, 7 and 8). Provide students with enrichment activities. | The Literacy Team along with the administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of the identified strategies. | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, district Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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

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

|                                    |                                     |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| reading.<br>Reading 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   |          |   |   |                 |

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.<br>Reading Goal #3a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 81% of students made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 86%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 81% (761)   | 86% (808)  |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reading Application. Many students need practice in making inferences, drawing conclusions, and identifying the main idea and author's purpose (grades 6, 7 and 8). | Teachers will plan for and provide instruction so that students practice analyzing the author's perspective, choice of words, style and technique to understand how these elements influence the meaning of text (grades 6, 7 and 8). | The Literacy Team along with the administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of the identified strategies. | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br>Reading Goal #3b: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|   |                                     |

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

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 84% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 89%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 84% (42)  | 89% (45)  |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |   |   |  |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1   | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Informational Text and Research Process (grades 6, 7 and 8). Many students have difficulty locating and verifying details, critically analyzing text, and synthesizing details to draw correct conclusions. | Teachers will plan for and provide instruction (grades 6, 7 and 8) so that students explore shades of meaning to better identify nuances, examine rubrics, evaluate information from text features, and evaluate the validity and reliability of information from multiple sources.<br>- enroll students in intensive reading course (as applicable). | The Literacy Team along with the administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of the identified strategies. | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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 #<br>Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. |           |           |           |           |
| Baseline data 2010-2011  | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013   | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|  | 95        | 96  | 96        | 97        | 97        |           |

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:

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that the following subgroups did not make satisfactory progress in Reading: |
|--|--|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5B: | White: 93% (281)<br>Black: 87% (55)<br>Hispanic: 94% (538)<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making satisfactory progress in Reading as follows:<br>White: 94% (284)<br>Black: 95% (60)<br>Hispanic: 97% (555) |
|---|--|

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| White: 93% (281)<br>Black: 87% (55)<br>Hispanic: 94% (538) | White: 94% (284)<br>Black: 95% (60)<br>Hispanic: 97% (555) |
|--|--|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Vocabulary Many students need practice deriving word meanings and word relationships from context. | Teachers will plan for and provide instruction so that students will work with sets of words that are semantically related. Students will be provided practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms and antonyms.<br><br>Provide students with enrichment activities. | The Literacy Team along with the administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of the identified strategies. | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, district Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5C: | N/A |
|---|-----|

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

|     |     |
|-----|-----|
| N/A | N/A |
|-----|-----|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5D: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that the SWD subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in Reading.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the SWD subgroup making satisfactory progress in Reading. |
|--|--|

|                                    |                                     |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 60% (6)                            | 100% (10)                           |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Vocabulary. Many students need practice deriving word meanings and word relationships from context. | Teachers will plan for and provide instruction so that students will work with sets of words that are semantically related. Students will be provided practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms and antonyms.<br><br>Provide students with enrichment activities. | The Literacy Team along with the administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of the identified strategies. | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, district Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5E: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that the students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in Reading.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup making satisfactory progress in Reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 90% (246)   | 94% (257)  |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Vocabulary. Many students need practice deriving word meanings and word relationships from context. | Teachers will plan for and provide instruction so that students will work with sets of words that are semantically related. Students will be provided practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms and antonyms.<br><br>Provide students with enrichment activities. | The Literacy Team along with the administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of the identified strategies. | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, district Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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 |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Multi-Tiered System of Supports (M-TSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI) | Grades 6-8          | Administrator                        | 6th , 7th and 8th grade Teachers                                   | During weekly department meetings (August 2012 – May 2013)                     | Evidence of academic interventions, data analysis for progress monitoring               | Principal, Assistant Principal                |
| Data Analysis and Best Practices   | Grades 6-8          | Language Arts Department Chairperson | Leadership Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)                          | September, November, January, and May before school                            | Agendas, sign-in sheets, hand-outs and follow-up student samples across all disciplines | Assistant Principal                           |
| Common Core Standards  | Grades 6-8          | Teacher                              | 6th , 7th and 8th grade Language Arts Teachers                     | Department meeting August  | Agenda, sign-in sheet   | Principal, Assistant Principal                |

### Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                     |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$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.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1:                                     | The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Test indicate that 76% of students in grades 6-8 achieved Proficiency in Listening/Speaking.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Proficiency in Listening/Speaking on the CELLA Test by 2 percentage points to 78%. |



2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

76% (22)

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 | Seven students (25%) scored High Intermediate on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Test. The students have had limited opportunities to speak English because they are enrolled in the French International Studies Program and the home language for these students is French.   | Teachers will encourage ELL students to speak in class as much as possible; structure conversations around books and subjects that build vocabulary. | Principal, Assistant Principal                | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim, and state assessment data. Administrators will conduct classroom walk-throughs and review in-house assessments to monitor student progress. Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br>Summative: 2013 CELLA Test |
| 2 | Seven students (25%) scored High Intermediate on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Test. The students have had limited exposure to listening to English because they are enrolled in the French International Studies Program and the home language for these students is French. | Teachers will provide additional opportunities for students to engage in listening activities in English; improving their level of comprehension.    | Principal, Assistant Principal                | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim, and state assessment data. Administrators will conduct classroom walk-throughs and review in-house assessments to monitor student progress. Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br>Summative: 2013 CELLA Test |

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Test indicate that 69% of students in grades 6-8 achieved Proficiency in Reading.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Proficiency in Reading on the CELLA Test by 2 percentage points to 71%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

69% (20)

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 | As indicated on the 2011-2012 administration of the CELLA Test, some students need additional support and practice to increase their reading | Language Arts teachers and ESOL teachers will plan for and implement reading tutorials such as Reading Plus and Achieve 3000 to provide students additional reading | The Literacy Team along with the ESOL teachers and administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress. Florida Continuous | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments |

|              |  |                            |                           |
|--------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| proficiency. | practice at their reading level (grades 6, 7 and 8). | the identified strategies. | Improvement Model (FCIM). |
|--------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br>CELLA Goal #3: | The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Test indicate that 66% of students in grades 6-8 achieved Proficiency in Writing.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Proficiency in Writing on the CELLA Test by 2 percentage points to 68%. |
|--|--|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

66% (19)

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 | As indicated on the 2011-2012 administration of the CELLA Test, some students need additional support and practice to increase their writing proficiency. | Teachers will use writing samples that generate a narrative, expository, persuasive, or reference paper. Using a rubric, the written documents can be scored on content or language components. | The Literacy Team along with the ESOL teachers and administrators will be responsible for the monitoring of implementation of the identified strategies. | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress. Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 CELLA Test |

CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                     |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |



## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal # 1a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 25% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring Level 3 proficiency on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 25% (242)  | 25% (242)  |

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 6 was Geometry and Measurement.   | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>- provide students with opportunities to investigate geometric properties.<br>- differentiate instruction for students.  | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Obtain teacher feedback/share best practices during weekly departmental meetings. Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |
| 2 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 7 was Statistics and Probability. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>- use manipulatives to explore outcome of an experiment and predict which events are likely or unlikely.<br>- differentiate instruction for students.            | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).   | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |
| 3 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 8 was Geometry and Measurement.   | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>- provide students with opportunities to use similar triangles to solve problems that include height and distances.<br>- differentiate instruction for students. | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).   | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |

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

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal # 1b: | N/A |
|---|-----|

|   |                     |          |   |   |                 |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:                      |                     |          | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:           |   |                 |
| N/A   |                     |          | N/A   |   |                 |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |                     |          |   |   |                 |
|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1   | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 71% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring Levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 71% (686)   | 71% (688)  |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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   | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 6 was Geometry and Measurement.   | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>-provide students with opportunities to investigate geometric properties.<br>-differentiate instruction so that it will challenge students level of critical thinking.                                | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Obtain teacher feedback/share best practices during weekly departmental meetings. Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |
| 2   | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 7 was Statistics and Probability. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>-use manipulatives to explore outcome of an experiment and predict which events are likely or unlikely.<br>- differentiate instruction so that it will challenge students level of critical thinking. | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, district Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).   | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |
| 3   | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 8 was Geometry and Measurement.   | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>-provide students with opportunities to use similar triangles to solve problems that include  | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | District assessments (Baseline and Interim) to track students' progress and data analysis of interventions.<br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model   | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013                                 |

|  |   |         |                                 |
|--|---|---------|---------------------------------|
|  | height and distances.<br>- differentiate instruction so that it will challenge students level of critical thinking. | (FCIM). | FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |
|--|---|---------|---------------------------------|

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

|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics 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 |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 91% of students made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 4 percentage points to 95%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 91% (855)   | 95% (893)  |

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 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 6 was Geometry and Measurement. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>-provide students with opportunities to investigate geometric properties.<br>-differentiate instruction so that it will challenge students level of critical thinking. | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Obtain teacher feedback/share best practices during weekly departmental meetings. Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |
|   | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment,   | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:   | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, district  | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim   |

|   |   |  |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| 2 | the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 7 was Statistics and Probability.   | -use manipulatives to explore outcome of an experiment and predict which events are likely or unlikely.<br>-differentiate instruction for students.  |  | Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).  | Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment   |
| 3 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 8 was Geometry and Measurement. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>-provide students with opportunities to use similar triangles to solve problems that include height and distances.<br>-differentiate instruction for students. | Administrators, Department Chairperson | District assessments (Baseline and Interim) to track students' progress and data analysis of interventions.<br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |

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

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal # 3b: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A   | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 97% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 97% (55)  | 97% (55)  |

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                               |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
|  | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, | The following instructional strategies will be utilized: | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Obtain teacher feedback/share best practices during weekly | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim |

|   |   |  |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 6 was Geometry and Measurement.   | -provide students with opportunities to investigate geometric properties.<br>-differentiate instruction so that it will challenge students level of critical thinking.<br>- enroll students in intensive mathematics course (as applicable).   |  | departmental meetings. Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment   |
| 2 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 7 was Statistics and Probability. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>-use manipulatives to explore outcome of an experiment and predict which events are likely or unlikely.<br>-differentiate instruction for students.<br>- enroll students in intensive mathematics course (as applicable).            | Administrators, Department Chairperson | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, district Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).                        | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |
| 3 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grade 8 was Geometry and Measurement.   | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>-provide students with opportunities to use similar triangles to solve problems that include height and distances.<br>-differentiate instruction for students.<br>- enroll students in intensive mathematics course (as applicable). | Administrators, Department Chairperson | District assessments (Baseline and Interim) to track students' progress and data analysis of interventions.<br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).  | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |

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

|  |           |   |           |           |           |           |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. |           | Middle School Mathematics Goal #<br>Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.<br>5A : |           |           |           |           |
| Baseline data 2010-2011  | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013   | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|  | 96        | 97  | 97        | 97        | 98        |           |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | Mathematics Goal #5B:<br><br>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that the Black subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in Mathematics.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Black subgroup making satisfactory progress in Mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| Black: 89% (56)   | Black: 97% (61)   |



|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in was Geometry and Measurement. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>- provide students with opportunities to investigate geometric properties.<br>- differentiate instruction for students. | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Obtain teacher feedback/share best practices during weekly departmental meetings. Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |

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

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A   | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that the SWD subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in Mathematics.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of SWD subgroup making satisfactory progress in Mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 90% (9)  | 93% (9)  |

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                               |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
|  | According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, | The following instructional strategies will be utilized: | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Obtain teacher feedback/share best practices during weekly | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim |

|   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | the area of greatest difficulty for students in was Geometry and Measurement. | -provide students with opportunities to investigate geometric properties.<br>-differentiate instruction for students. | departmental meetings. Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, District Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment |
|---|---|---|--|---|

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

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5E: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A   | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

## Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #1: | The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicate that 29% (91) of students Level 3 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is maintain the percentage of students scoring Level 3 proficiency. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 29% (91)   | 29% (92)   |

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 | According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC, the area of concern was Polynomials. | The following instructional strategy will be utilized:<br>- provide students with more opportunities to | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | District assessments (Baseline and Interim) to track students' progress and data analysis of interventions. | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments |

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | investigate algebraic expressions to solve real-world problems. | Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Summative: Results from 2013 Algebra EOC assessment |
|--|---|--|---|

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #2: | The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicate that 69% (218) of students Levels 4 and 5 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 69% (218)  | 69% (218)  |

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 | According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC, the area of concern was Polynomials. | Increase the number of students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 by providing students with opportunities to (1) complete more rigorous mathematical problems and (2) challenge their level of critical thinking. | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | District assessments (Baseline and Interim) to track students' progress and data analysis of interventions.<br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 Algebra EOC assessment |

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

|  |                |           |           |           |           |           |
|--|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Algebra Goal # |           |           |           |           |           |
|  | N/A            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Baseline data 2010-2011  | 2011-2012      | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|  | N/A            | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       |           |

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

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3B: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A   | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A                                 | N/A                                 | N/A             |

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

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br>Algebra Goal #3C: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A   | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br>Algebra Goal #3D: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A  | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br>Algebra Goal #3E: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A   | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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.<br>Geometry 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 |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.<br>Geometry Goal #2: | The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment indicate that 100% (61) scored in the upper third.<br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring in the upper third. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 100% (61)  | 100% (61)  |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | According to the results of the 2012 Geometry EOC assessment, the area(s) of greatest difficulty for students | Develop strong achievement patterns in the area(s) of Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | District assessments (Baseline and Interim) to track students' progress and data analysis of | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| was Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics. | providing students with opportunities to complete more rigorous mathematical problems. | interventions. Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Summative: Results from 2013 Geometry EOC assessment |
|--|--|---|--|

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

|  |                 |           |           |           |           |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Geometry Goal # |           |           |           |           |
|  | N/A             |           |           |           |           |
| Baseline data 2011-2012  | 2012-2013       | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|  | N/A             | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       |           |

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

|  |                                     |   |   |                 |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br>Geometry Goal # 3B: | N/A                                 |   |   |                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |   |   |                 |
| N/A  | N/A                                 |   |   |                 |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  |                                     |   |   |                 |
|  |                                     |   |   |                 |
| Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy                            | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|  |                                     |   |   |                 |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br>Geometry Goal # 3C: | N/A                                 |   |   |                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |   |   |                 |
| N/A  | N/A                                 |   |   |                 |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  |                                     |   |   |                 |
|  |                                     |   |   |                 |
| Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy                            | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br>Geometry Goal #3D: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A  | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br>Geometry Goal #3E: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A   | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

*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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Data Analysis and Best Practices   | Grades 6-8          | Mathematics Department Chairperson | 6th, 7th and 8th grade Teachers                                   | During weekly department meetings, specifically after District Interim Assessments (August 2012 – May 2013) | Agendas, sign-in sheets, hand-outs and follow-up student samples across all disciplines | Assistant Principal                           |
| Multi-Tiered                       |                     |                                    |   |   |   |   |

|   |            |                                    |                                  |  |   |                                |
|---|------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| System of Supports (M-TSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI) | Grades 6-8 | Administrator                      | 6th , 7th and 8th grade Teachers | During weekly department meetings (August 2012 – May 2013) | Evidence of academic interventions, data analysis for progress monitoring               | Principal, Assistant Principal |
| Common Core Standards                                       | Grades 6-8 | Mathematics Department Chairperson | 6th , 7th and 8th grade Teachers | Department meeting in August 2012                          | Agendas, sign-in sheets, hand-outs and follow-up student samples across all disciplines | Principal, Assistant Principal |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)                                    |                                     |                |                         |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy   | Description of Resources            | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00                  |
|  |                                     |                | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
| Technology   |                                     |                |                         |
| Strategy   | Description of Resources            | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| Increase student stations to enhance /support differentiated instruction | Purchase computer hardware/software | EESAC          | \$4,845.00              |
|  |                                     |                | Subtotal: \$4,845.00    |
| Professional Development   |                                     |                |                         |
| Strategy   | Description of Resources            | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00                  |
|  |                                     |                | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
| Other  |                                     |                |                         |
| Strategy   | Description of Resources            | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00                  |
|  |                                     |                | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
|  |                                     |                | Grand Total: \$4,845.00 |

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.   |                     | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 42% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency.       |   |   |                 |
| Science Goal # 1a:   |                     | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving Level 3 proficiency. |   |   |                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |                     | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |   |   |                 |
| 42% (143)  |                     | 42% (144)   |   |   |                 |
| 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 | Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicate that students had difficulty with Earth and Space Science. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>-provide opportunities for students to explore their surroundings for evidence of cause and effect relationships that exist in Earth and Space Science by incorporating lab investigations and field studies.<br>-ensure instruction in Comprehensive Science 1 and Comprehensive Science 2 adheres to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides. | Administrators, Department Chairperson | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, district Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress. Evidence of lab reports and science based projects. Participation in environmental challenges/competitions.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|

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

|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.<br><br>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 |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 53% of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 53% (180)   | 53% (181)  |

| 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   | Results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicate that students had difficulty with Earth and Space Science. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized:<br>-provide opportunities for students to explore their surroundings for evidence of cause and effect relationships that exist in Earth and Space Science by incorporating lab investigations and field studies.<br>-ensure instruction in Comprehensive Science 1 and Comprehensive Science 2 adheres to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides.<br>-Continue to challenge students by asking higher order questions. | Administrators, Department Chairperson        | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, district Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress. Evidence of lab reports and science based projects. Participation in environmental challenges/competitions. Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment |

|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |                                     |
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.<br><br>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 |
| 1   | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Multi-Tiered System of Supports (M-TSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI) | Grades 6-8          | Science Department Chairperson   | 6th , 7th and 8th grade Science Teachers                           | During weekly department meetings (August 2012 – May 2013)  | Evidence of academic interventions, data analysis for progress monitoring | Principal, Assistant Principal                |
| Data Analysis and Best Practices   | Grades 6-8          | Science Department Chairperson   | 6th , 7th and 8th grade Science Teachers                           | During weekly department meetings, specifically after District Interim Assessments (August 2012 – May 2013) | Agendas, sign-in sheets, hand-outs and follow-up student work samples     | Assistant Principal                           |
| Common Core Standards  | Grades 6-8          | Science Department Chairperson   | 6th , 7th and 8th grade Science Teachers                           | Department meeting (August)   | Agenda, sign-in sheet, hand-outs and follow-up student work samples       | Principal, Assistant Principal                |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                            |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Other                                 |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
|                                       |                          |                | <b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b> |

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.   | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 97% of students achieved Level 3 or higher.<br><br>*The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 61% of students achieved Level 4 or higher. |

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Writing Goal #1a:                  | Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving at or above proficiency. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 97% (331)<br>*61% (208)            | 97% (331)<br>*61% (208)   |

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' essays lacked sensory details and descriptive language with 0% of students scoring level 6. | Teachers will plan for and provide continuous instruction on the use of literary devices, figurative and descriptive language to convey style, tone and sensory details. | Leadership Team                               | Students' scored writing prompts to monitor students' progress and adjust focus as needed. Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Formative: Students' scores on writing assessments.<br>Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test |

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

|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.<br>Writing Goal #1b: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A  | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
|                                    |                     |                                  |   |  |                                   |   |

|  |            |                                      |  |   |   |                                |
|--|------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Data Analysis and Best Practices   | Grades 6-8 | Language Arts Department Chairperson | Leadership Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)      | September, October, November, January, and April, before school | Agendas, sign-in sheets, hand-outs              | Assistant Principal            |
| Multi-Tiered System of Supports (M-TSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI) | Grades 6-8 | Administrator                        | 6th , 7th and 8th grade Language Arts Teachers | During weekly department meetings (August 2012 – May 2013)      | Student work samples, evidence of interventions | Principal, Assistant Principal |
| Common Core Standards  | Grades 6-8 | Teacher                              | 6th , 7th and 8th grade Language Arts Teachers | Department meeting (August)                                     | Agenda, sign-in sheets, hand-outs               | Principal, Assistant Principal |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                            |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Other                                 |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
|                                       |                          |                | <b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b> |

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.  | The results of the 2012-2013 Civics Baseline (Pretest) indicate that average performance was 40%.                               |
| Civics Goal #1:  | Our goal is to show a 5 percentage point increase (45%) in the average performance as indicated on the Civics Post-examination. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 40% avg. performance   | 45% avg. performance  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  |   |
|  | Person or Process Used to   |

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Position Responsible for Monitoring                    | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  | Evaluation Tool  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | The area(s) of greatest deficiency as noted on the 2012-2013 Civics Baseline (Pretest) was Organization and Function of Government. | Teachers will utilize District-published pacing guides to align lessons and assessments to the tested End Of Course Exam benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to discuss the values, complexities, and dilemmas involved in social, political, and economic issues; assist students in developing well-reasoned positions on issues. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Chairperson | Ongoing classroom assessments (inclusive of vocabulary related concept maps) focusing on student comprehension of Civics related vocabulary terms and phrases. | Formative: Mini-assessments, District baseline assessment, school developed quarterly examinations<br><br>Summative: District developed 2013 Civics Post-Examination |

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.<br><br>Civics Goal #2: | N/A                                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A  | N/A                                 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Data Analysis                      | 7/Civics            | Natalie Bonifazio                | 7th grade Civics teachers  | September 2012, November 2012, January 2013, and May 2013                      | Agendas, sign-in sheets, hand-outs and follow-up activities, student samples for Civics | Natalie Bonifazio, Assistant Principal        |

|                |          |                   |                         |                |   |  |
|----------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| Best Practices | 7/Civics | Natalie Bonifazio | Social Studies teachers | September 2012 | Agendas, sign-in sheets, hand-outs and follow-up activities, student samples for Civics | Natalie Bonifazio, Assistant Principal |
|----------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|--|

Civics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                            |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Other                                 |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
|                                       |                          |                | <b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b> |

*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<br>Attendance Goal # 1:   | Our average daily attendance rate for the 2011-2012 school year was 98.40%. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the average daily attendance rate.<br><br>Our goal for 2012-2013 is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences and excessive tardies (10 or more) by 1 student. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate:   | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:  |
| 98.40% (960)  | 98.40% (960)  |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)   |
| 30  | 29  |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)   | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)  |
|   |   |

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 attend this school from all across Miami-Dade County; many students are outside the Transportation Service Zone and are not eligible for transportation and must rely on personal transportation. In addition, students that miss their transportation or travel a great distance, many times have difficulty arriving on time, resulting in tardies and/or absences. | Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non-attendance to the Attendance Review Committee for intervention services. Each marking period homerooms with the best attendance will be recognized and celebrated | Principal, Assistant Principal, Attendance Review Committee | Weekly updates to administrators, counselors, and the social worker by the Attendance Review Committee. | Daily Attendance Bulletin |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject      | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Attendance                         | Grades 6 - 8 /Attendance | Assistant Principal              | SCSI teacher, counselors, and social worker                       | September 2012 – June 2013   | An Attendance Review Committee Plan will be developed during the PD. An Assistant Principal will monitor the implementation of this program by SCSI teacher, social worker, and counselors. | Assistant Principal                           |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                  |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00           |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                  |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00           |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                  |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |



|              |                          |                |                            |
|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| N/A          | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|              |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| <b>Other</b> |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy     | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A          | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|              |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
|              |                          |                | <b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b> |

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   |  | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of students suspended out-of-school by 3 students. |   |   |                           |
| Suspension Goal # 1:  |  | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of students suspended in-school by 1 student.      |   |   |                           |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions  |  | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions   |   |   |                           |
| 10  |  | 9   |   |   |                           |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School   |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School  |   |   |                           |
| 10  |  | 9   |   |   |                           |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions   |   |   |                           |
| 35  |  | 32  |   |   |                           |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School   |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School  |   |   |                           |
| 33  |  | 30  |   |   |                           |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement   |  |   |   |   |                           |
|   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool           |
| 1   | The total number of students suspended Out-of-School was 33. Students are unfamiliar with the Student Code of Conduct. | The school's Guidance Counselors will provide students with an overview of the Student Code of Conduct.                   | Attendance Review Committee                   | Monitor Guidance Counselor's log for evidence that students have received an overview of the Student Code of Conduct. Monitor Monthly Suspension Report for | Monthly Suspension Report |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | evidence of decrease in number of students who have been placed on outdoor suspension. Monitor suspension 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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| The Student Code of Conduct        | Grades 6-8          | Guidance Counselors              | School-wide   | September 2012   | Review Guidance Counselor's Log to determine that students have been given an overview on the Student Code of Conduct | Assistant Principal                           |

Suspension Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                            |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| Other                                 |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
|                                       |                          |                | <b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b> |

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:   | During the 2011+2012 school year, parent participation in school wide workshops supporting FCAT activities was |

| *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. |   | 28%. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase parent participation by 3 percentage points, from 28% to 31%.   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:   |   | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:   |   |  |   |
| 28% (271)   |   | 31% (300)  |   |  |   |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement   |   |  |   |  |   |
|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | Parents have limited understanding of student data (Baseline, Mid-Year, FAIR, and FCAT) and how it affects teaching and learning. | Family members, students, and teachers are invited to participate in workshops to learn how the school uses assessment results to improve student achievement and how parents can assist their children effectively. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Lead Teacher  | Review Parent Academy sign in sheets/logs to determine the number of parents attending school or community events. | Sign in sheets indicate increased parent participation. |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject                                | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader   | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring  | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Student Assessment Data            | Grades 6, 7, and 8 Reading, Writing, Math, Science | Language Arts Department Chairperson, Mathematics Department Chairperson, Science Department Chairperson | Students, parents, and teachers                                   | September 2012, October 2012, November 2012, and April 2013                    | Review Parent Academy sign in sheets/logs to determine the number of parents attending | Principal, Assistant Principal, Language Arts Department Chairperson, Mathematics Department Chairperson, Science Department Chairperson |

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                  |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00           |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                  |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00           |

|                                 |                          |                |                            |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
|                                 |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| <b>Professional Development</b> |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                        | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                             | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                 |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
| <b>Other</b>                    |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy                        | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A                             | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|                                 |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
|                                 |                          |                | <b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b> |

*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<br>STEM Goal # 1:   |   | Increase opportunities for STEM applied learning by increasing the number of students that participate in skill competitions like Science Fair, SECME, Fairchild Challenge.   |  |   |  |
| 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 that generally participate in the SECME competitions and the Fairchild Challenge are usually from the gifted resource class. | The following instructional strategy will be utilized:<br>-provide classroom and after- school opportunities for all students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and discussion of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis explanation of variables, and experimental design<br><br>(i.e Science Fair, SECME, Fairchild Challenge). | Administrators, Department Chairperson, Science teachers | Teachers/Administrators will review the results of school-wide, district Interim and state assessment data to monitor student progress. Evidence of lab reports and science based projects. Participation in environmental challenges/competitions.<br><br>Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). | Number of entries in the school and/or District Science Fair<br><br>Number of entries in the SECME challenge.<br><br>Number of entries in the Fairchild Challenge. |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| Fairchild Challenge                | Grades 6-8          | Science Department Chairperson   | Teachers   | Department meeting (September)   | Agenda, sign-in sheet, and hand-outs | Assistant Principal                           |

STEM Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                     |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$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<br>CTE Goal #1:  |  | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Social Studies teachers' knowledge of Career and Technical Education. |   |  |  |
| 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   | Social Studies teachers have had limited experience in teaching the career component in the Career and Technical Education course. | Provide opportunities for Social Studies teachers to develop and implement integrated curriculum.                           | Principal, Assistant Principals.              | Monitor and review student schedules to ensure building pipeline for advanced level courses. | - Review teachers lesson plans<br>- Review department meeting agendas<br>- Classroom observations (informal and/or formal) |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Career and Technical Education     | Grades 6-8          | Social Studies Department Chairperson | Social Studies Teachers  | Department Meetings  | Agendas from department meetings  | Assistant Principal                           |

CTE Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                     |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of CTE Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

N/A Goal:

|  |                     |          |   |   |                 |
|--|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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. N/A Goal<br>N/A Goal #1:  |                     |          | N/A   |   |                 |
| 2012 Current level:  |                     |          | 2013 Expected level:                          |   |                 |
| N/A  |                     |          | N/A   |   |                 |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  |                     |          |   |   |                 |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1  | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A   | N/A   | N/A             |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| N/A                                | N/A                 | N/A                              | N/A   | N/A  | N/A                               | N/A   |

Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                  |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00           |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                  |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00           |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                  |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A                                   | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00           |

|              |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Other</b> |                          |                |                            |
| Strategy     | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount           |
| N/A          | N/A                      | N/A            | \$0.00                     |
|              |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00           |
|              |                          |                | <b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b> |

*End of N/A Goal(s)*



# FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |  |                                     |                |                      |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Goal                                  | Strategy   | Description of Resources            | Funding Source | Available Amount     |
| Reading                               | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| CELLA                                 | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Mathematics                           | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Science                               | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Writing                               | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Civics                                | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Attendance                            | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Suspension                            | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Parent Involvement                    | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| STEM                                  | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| CTE                                   | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| N/A                                   | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
|                                       |  |                                     |                | Subtotal: \$0.00     |
| Technology                            |  |                                     |                |                      |
| Goal                                  | Strategy   | Description of Resources            | Funding Source | Available Amount     |
| Reading                               | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| CELLA                                 | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Mathematics                           | Increase student stations to enhance /support differentiated instruction | Purchase computer hardware/software | EESAC          | \$4,845.00           |
| Science                               | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Writing                               | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Civics                                | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Attendance                            | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Suspension                            | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Parent Involvement                    | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| STEM                                  | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| CTE                                   | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| N/A                                   | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
|                                       |  |                                     |                | Subtotal: \$4,845.00 |
| Professional Development              |  |                                     |                |                      |
| Goal                                  | Strategy   | Description of Resources            | Funding Source | Available Amount     |
| Reading                               | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| CELLA                                 | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Mathematics                           | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Science                               | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Writing                               | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Civics                                | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Attendance                            | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Suspension                            | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| Parent Involvement                    | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| STEM                                  | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| CTE                                   | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
| N/A                                   | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |
|                                       |  |                                     |                | Subtotal: \$0.00     |
| Other                                 |  |                                     |                |                      |
| Goal                                  | Strategy   | Description of Resources            | Funding Source | Available Amount     |
| Reading                               | N/A  | N/A                                 | N/A            | \$0.00               |

|                    |     |     |     |                         |
|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------------------------|
| CELLA              | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
| Mathematics        | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
| Science            | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
| Writing            | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
| Civics             | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
| Attendance         | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
| Suspension         | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
| Parent Involvement | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
| STEM               | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
| CTE                | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
| N/A                | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00                  |
|                    |     |     |     | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
|                    |     |     |     | Grand Total: \$4,845.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/16/2012)

## 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     |
|--|------------|
| For the 2012-2013 school year the EESAC will use its budget to purchase technology to... • Add additional student stations; create an additional computer lab • Purchase hardware to maintain additional student stations • Add additional computers to accommodate school-wide computer-based testing | \$4,848.00 |

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

The Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) will meet regularly throughout the school year and make recommendations regarding the school's programs and outreach. The EESAC assists in the preparation and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan and the school's annual budget. Furthermore, the EESAC will be the sole body responsible for the final decision-making at the school relating to the implementation of the SIP.

# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

| Dade School District<br>GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER MIDDLE SCHOOL<br>2010-2011 |           |           |         |         |                     |   |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
|   | Reading   | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |   |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)                           | 97%       | 97%       | 96%     | 90%     | 380                 | 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   | 75%       | 79%       |         |         | 154                 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2   |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?                              | 90% (YES) | 92% (YES) |         |         | 182                 | 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  |           |           |         |         | 716                 |   |
| Percent Tested = 100%   |           |           |         |         |                     | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade*   |           |           |         |         | A                   | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |

| Dade School District<br>GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER MIDDLE SCHOOL<br>2009-2010 |           |           |         |         |                     |   |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
|   | Reading   | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |   |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)                           | 97%       | 98%       | 99%     | 90%     | 384                 | 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   | 78%       | 82%       |         |         | 160                 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2   |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?                              | 91% (YES) | 95% (YES) |         |         | 186                 | 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  |           |           |         |         | 730                 |   |
| Percent Tested = 100%   |           |           |         |         |                     | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade*   |           |           |         |         | A                   | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |