FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: JOSEPH STILWELL MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Brenda Jordan

SAC Chair: Diane Nader

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 9/16/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Kyle Powell	B.S. Secondary Teaching of Social Studies M.Ed. Secondary Administration Ed. Spec. Educational Leadership Certification: Educational Leadership, Social Science (grades 6 - 12)	2	11	Assistant Principal Joseph Stilwell Middle School 2011-2012 School Grade-D; Reading Level 3+ 37%; Math Level 3+ 35%; Writing 3.5+ 73%; Science 3+ 34%; Reading Gains 57%; Math Gains 50%; Lowest 25% Reading Gains 58%; Lowest 25% Math Gains 49% Assistant Principal Robert E. Lee High School 2010-2011 School Grade- Pending; Reading Level 3 and above: 37%, Math Level 3 and above: 69%, Writing Level 4 and above: 82%, Science Level 3 and above: 35%, Reading Gains: 48%, Math Gains: 75%, Lowest 25% Reading Gains: 49%, Lowest 25% Math Gains: 59% Of the AYP sub-groups, white students met proficiency in math. All other sub-groups did not make AYP. Principal Windsor High School, Winsor, MO, 2009-2010 Increased 15% on Missouri Assessment Program.

Assis Principal	Sheryl Dumont	M.S. Secondary Education/Certification: Middle Integrated Curriculum, ESOL and Educational Leadership	2	2	Assistant Principal Joseph Stilwell Middle School 2011-2012 School Grade-D; Reading Level 3+ 37%; Math Level 3+ 35%; Writing 3.5+ 73%; Science 3+ 34%; Reading Gains 57%; Math Gains 50%; Lowest 25% Reading Gains 58%; Lowest 25% Math Gains 49% Instructional Coach Highlands Middle School 2010-2011 School Grade-D; Reading Level 3 and above: 44%, Math Level 3 and above: 41%, Writing Level 4 and above: 73%, Science Level 3 or above: 24%, Reading Gains: 53%, Math Gains: 58%, Lowest 25% Reading Gains: 57%, Lowest 25% Math Gains: 66% All sub-groups did not make AYP in reading or math. 2009-2010 School Grade: C, (441 total points); Reading Proficiency: 44%, Math Proficiency: 45%, Writing Proficiency: 89%, Science Proficiency: 19%; LQ Reading Gains: 58%; LQ Math gains: 69%. HMS did not show adequate learning growth in reading and math.
Assis Principal	Mary Cohen	B.A. Elem Ed, M.A. Educational Leadership Certification: Pre-K – Primary Elem Ed 1-6 ESOL Endorsement Educational Leadership	3	3	Assistant Principal Joseph Stilwell Middle School 2011-2012 School Grade-D; Reading Level 3+ 37%; Math Level 3+ 35%; Writing 3.5+ 73%; Science 3+ 34%; Reading Gains 57%; Math Gains 50%; Lowest 25% Reading Gains 58%; Lowest 25% Math Gains 49% 2010-2011 School Grade-C; Reading Level 3 and above: 52%, Math Level 3 and Above: 48%, Writing Level 4 and above: 88%, Science Level 3 and above: 42%, Reading Gains: 57%, Math gains: 60%, Lowest 25% Reading Gains: 64%, Lowest 25% Math Gains: 64% All sub-groups did not make AYP in reading or math. 2009-2010 School Grade: C Reading-Three and above 55%, Learning Gains 57%, BQ Learning Gains 63% Math- Three and above 50%, Learning Gains 66%, BQ Learning Gains 68% Writing- Three and above 90% Science- Three and above 40% SWD subgroup made AYP in Math. All other subgroups did not make AYP in Math or Reading.
Principal	Brenda Jordan	B. S. Elem Ed; M.A. Ed. Leadership Elem Ed 1-6; Ed Leadership Principal All Levels	1	10	Assistant Principal Sandalwood HS 2011-2012 No grade. Reading Level 3+ 49%; Math Level 3+ 57%; Writing 3.5+ 86%; Science 3+xx%; Reading Gains 61%; Math Gains 57%; Lowest 25% Reading Gains 68%; Lowest 25% Math Gains 87% 2010-2011 School Grade “B” Reading Level 3+ 43%; Math Level 3+ 67%; Writing 3.5+ 88%; Science 3+46%; Reading Gains 51%; Math Gains 68%; Lowest 25% Reading Gains 49%; Lowest 25% Math Gains 52% 2009/2010 School Grade 'A' 08/09 Sandalwood HS ‘C’ 07/08 Andrew Jackson HS ‘F’ 06/07 Andrew Jackson HS ‘ F’ 05/06 Andrew Jackson HS ‘D’ 04/05 Andrew Jackson HS ‘D’ Did not meet AYP any year
		B.S. / M.S. Emotional Disturbance/ Learning Disabilities M.A. Educational			Assistant Principal Joseph Stilwell Middle School 2011-2012 School Grade-D; Reading Level 3+ 37%; Math Level 3+ 35%; Writing 3.5+ 73%; Science 3+ 34%; Reading Gains 57%; Math Gains 50%; Lowest 25% Reading Gains 58%; Lowest 25% Math Gains 49% 2010-2011 School Grade-C; Reading Level 3 and above: 52%, Math Level 3 and Above: 48%, Writing Level 4 and above: 88%, Science Level 3 and above: 42%,

Assis Principal	Schantel Minton	Leadership Certification: Educational Leadership, Elem. Ed. K-6, Varying Exceptionalities K-12	4	4	Reading Gains: 57%, Math gains: 60%, Lowest 25% Reading Gains: 64%, Lowest 25% Math Gains: 64% All sub-groups did not make AYP in reading or math. 2009-2010 School Grade: C Reading-Three and above 55%, Learning Gains 57%, BQ Learning Gains 63% Math- Three and above 50%, Learning Gains 66%, BQ Learning Gains 68% Writing- Three and above 90% Science- Three and above 40% SWD subgroup made AYP in Math. All other subgroups did not make AYP in Math or Reading

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)
Math	Scott Powell	Bachelor of Arts in General Studies; Mathematics 5-9; Mathematics 6-12; ESOL	1	1	Ed White High School 2010-2011: Grade TBD. Math Mastery: 55%, Learning Gains: 60%, Lowest 25% Gains: 58%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup. 2009-2010: Grade D. Math Mastery: 64%, Learning Gains: 68%, Lowest 25% Gains: 57%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup. 2008- 2009: Grade D. Math Mastery: 61%, Learning Gains: 67%, Lowest 25% Gains: 63%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup. 2007 – 2008: Grade F. Math Mastery: 60%, Learning Gains: 65%, Lowest 25% Gains: 54%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup
Standards	Robin Hogan	B.A. English Ed; Eng 6-12; National Board Certified	1	1	Samuel W. Wolfson High 2011 Grade D AYP : N 2009 Grade:D AYP:N 2007 Grade:C AYP:N 2008 Grade:C AYP:N

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.Once teachers are hired, they are placed in the Mentoring Induction for Novice Teachers (MINT) where they collaborate with highly qualified, experienced teachers in their content area.	PDF	On-going	
2	2.To increase the teacher effectiveness at the school, teachers meet in Professional Learning Communities in order to allow them to continue their professional growth.	Assistant Principals	On-going	
3	3. Recruit new teachers using two of the district's programs: Educator's of America and Teach for America	Principal	Summer recruiting fairs	

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
No data submitted	

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
64	3.1%(2)	23.4%(15)	59.4%(38)	21.9%(14)	32.8%(21)	100.0%(64)	10.9%(7)	1.6%(1)	10.9%(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
Leslie Lockwood	David Brown	Ms. Lockwood is an experienced teacher and will provide invaluable assistance to her mentee.	Planning, classroom observations
Asilia Rogers	Charlotte Joyce	Ms. Rogers is an experienced Social Studies teacher and will provide invaluable assistance to her mentee	Planning, classroom observations
Marianne Lancer Silva	Nelson McCoy	Ms. Silva is ELA and Reading Endorsed and will provide invaluable assistance to her mentee	Planning, classroom observations
Angie McNutt	Maryam Owen	Ms. McNutt is an experienced Social Studies teacher and will provide invaluable assistance to her mentee	Planning, classroom observations
Karla Parrish	Kendrick Webb	Ms. Parrish is an experienced teacher and will provide invaluable assistance to her mentee	Planning, classroom observations
Marvin Robinson	Pamela Young	Mr. Robinson is an experienced Math teacher and will provide invaluable	Planning, classroom observations

		assistance to her mentee	

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.

Brenda Jordan, Principal
Schantel Minton, Assistant Principal Curriculum
Mary Cohen, 6th Grade Learning Community Principal
Sheryl Dumont, 8th Grade Learning Community Principal
Kyle Powell, 7th Grade Learning Community Principal
Joanne Ricks, ELA Department Chair
Marvin Robinson, Math Department Chair
Kelley Williams, Social Studies Department Chair
Joseph Rawlins, Science Department Chair
Rosemary Johnson, School Counselor
Maryanne Fry, ESE Liaison, School Counselor

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?

Provide professional development training to faculty on implementing MTSS; work with school based coaches; and work with small collaborative groups of subject area (PLC)/grade level teachers (SLC)
Attend district training sessions during the school year
Facilitate the monthly, or bi-monthly (as needed) , problem solving team meetings to address students needing Tier II/III interventions
Submit documentation citing the intervention services provided to each student
Assist in the analysis of data to design/monitor appropriate interventions
Assist in the analysis/monitoring of assessment results
Collaborate with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies
Working collaboratively with the Foundations Team to support a positive school climate and address behavioral interventions
Be represented on Shared Decision Making Committee, Building Leadership Team, and the School Advisory Council to support MTSS

The MTSS team will meet two times per month; sub-groups will meet according to individual RtI/MTSS progress monitoring plans. The team will review universal screening data, current instructional practices, review progress data, identify students who are not meeting academic and or behavior expectations, design intervention plans, review plans, identify professional development needs, and facilitate the problem solving process.

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 MTSS/RtI problem solving process is used throughout the development of the school improvement plan. The School leadership team reviewed the current or universal data, FCAT and Climate data. Based on the analysis of data they identified and defined areas in need of improvement. The team developed evidence based strategies, set up a progress monitoring plan, including assessment, position responsible for monitoring, and program review timelines. This plan is then shared with the School Advisory Council, for review and recommendations. The Leadership Team finalizes and implements the plan. The process is ongoing.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data: Learning Schedule Assessments (LSAs); Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading, (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Insight/Pearson, Star reading and math, My Profile, Discipline Dashboard, Office Referrals, Individual Education Plans, Functional Behavior Assessment, CELLA, District Timed Writing Assessments, District Benchmark Assessments

Ongoing Progress Monitoring: LSA pre and post assessments; Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading, (FAIR), Insight/Pearson, Star reading and math, My Profile, Discipline Dashboard, Office Referrals, Benchmark data, In House Scrimmage Data, Behavior Contracts, Office Referrals, Check-n-Connect

Frequency of data review: The data will be reviewed as it becomes available to grade-level teams; Data is reviewed according to the progress monitoring plan developed for individual students on Tier 2 and Tier 3. The MTSS team is designed to review data monthly.

The school based RtI team will attend district module trainings throughout the school year. The RtI team will train the faculty each month during built-in professional development opportunities. (i.e. early-dismissal and faculty meetings) The school's Professional Development Plan will outline continuous learning for all educators that result in increased student achievement and include evidence of RtI professional learning that are result-driven, standards-based, school-centered, and sustained over time.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development sessions during pre-planning, teacher planning days, faculty meetings, PLC meetings and Small Learning Community (SLC) meetings

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS team will be provided with TDE's to attend district professional development
The MTSS team will be provided time during the day for MTSS meetings
The MTSS team will be provided access to the needed data to analyze student success
The MTSS team will be provided with the needed time to provide professional development to the staff

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Brenda Jordan, Principal
Schantel Minton, Assistant Principal Curriculum
Mary Cohen, 8th Grade Learning Community Principal
Sheryl Dumont, 7th Grade Learning Community Principal
Kyle Powell, 6th Grade Learning Community Principal
Joanne Ricks, ELA Department Chair
Marvin Robinson, Math Department Chair
Kelley Williams, Social Studies Department Chair
Joseph Rawlins, Science Department Chair

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team will meet and collaborate monthly both as a team and in smaller Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Our focus is improving school-wide literacy instruction across disciplines and grade levels. The team will examine how student achievement can be increased and sustained through a school-wide literacy plan based on student growth patterns examined in current data. The team will engage in the implementation of a strategic plan for literacy improvement, examining FAIR, Benchmark, and common assessment data to make instructional decisions; identifying trend patterns of student needs and provide the appropriate interventions and resources to enhance teaching and learning.

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

The major initiatives of the Literacy Leadership Team this year is to cultivate a school-wide literacy plan across all disciplines and grade levels. The key elements of the plan include: 1) Writing in a response to literature across all content areas, 2) implementing school-wide reading strategies focusing on higher level questioning, making connections, and inferring 3) vocabulary building 4) 25-book campaign 5) and progressive writing across grade levels. The LLT will examine instructional practices and provide professional development to address current and future instructional needs that targets students' needs. The LLT will also facilitate school-wide incentives for reading, math, and science in order to motivate students and promote student achievement.

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.

*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 receive professional development demonstrating the incorporation reading strategies in content areas, electives, and PE/Health. Appropriate implementation of reading strategies will be monitored by administrators and department chairs. Social Studies teachers will continue to implement CAR-PD reading strategies. Math teachers will continue to focus on reading strategies as it relates to word problems and how to read the questions carefully (CRISS strategies). The elective teachers will use reading strategies during instructional delivery, especially on Skills Block Wednesdays.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Our goal is to increase the number of students achieving FCAT Level 3 for students in grades 6-8 by 7%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (391)	44% (425)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1 Teachers current ability to provide rigorous instruction, reflect on lesson plans, and evaluate instructional delivery	1A.1 Ensure that all teachers include higher order questions in lesson plans and throughout instruction by providing support through feedback and professional development	1A.1 Instructional Coach Teachers Administrators	1A.1 Monitor instruction through classroom observations	1A.1 Common assessments, Benchmark assessments, Exit Tickets, and FAIR data
2	1A.2. Number of students demonstrating proficiency through core instruction (Tier I)	1A.2. Ensure that all teachers are reflecting on lessons and evaluating instructional delivery	1A.2. Instructional Coach Teachers Administrators	1A.2. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, data chats in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	1A.2. Common assessments, Benchmark assessments, Exit Tickets, and FAIR data
3	1A.3 Student Attendance and Tardies	1A.3 Referrals to Social Worker and Attendance Intervention Team as need. Also Structured Movement during student transitions.	1A.3 Principal AP'S Counselors Identified Staff	1A.3 Attendance and Tardy Reports	1A.3 Attendance and Tardy Reports Climate Surveys

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Increase the number of students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 for students in grades 6-8 by 7%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11%(2)	17%(3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2B.1. Current level of rigorous instruction	2B.1. Teachers will increase their level of instructional rigor and expectations of students	2B.1. Instructional Coach ESE Lead Teacher Administrators	2B.1. Analyze data from curriculum based assessments and classroom observations	2B.1. Curriculum based 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:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring at or above achievement Level 4 and 5 for students in grades 6-8 by 4%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10%(106)	14% (135))

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. Teachers current ability to provide rigorous instruction	2A.1. Ensure that all teachers include higher complexity questions in lesson plans and throughout instruction , providing support through feedback and professional development	2A.1. Instructional Coach Teachers Administrators	2A.1. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, data chats in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	2A.1. Data derived from Benchmark assessments, common assessments, and exit slips
2	2A.2. Place students at Level 4 or above in advance courses providing rigorous instruction	2A.2. Place students at Level 4 or above in advance courses providing rigorous instruction	2A.2. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, data chats in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	2A.2. Data derived from Benchmark assessments, common assessments, and exit slips	2A.2. Data derived from Benchmark assessments, common assessments, and exit slips

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring at or above achievement Level 7 for students in grades 6-8 by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83%(15)	88%(16)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2B.1. Current rigor level of instruction	2B.1. Teachers will increase their level of instructional rigor and expectations of students	2B.1. Instructional Coach ESE Lead Teacher Administrators	2B.1. Analyze data from curriculum based assessments and Classroom observations	2B.1. Curriculum based 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:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Our goal is to increase the number of students making learning gains in grades 6-8 by 4%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57%(603)of the students made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT.	61% (588) of the students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Students limited knowledge and utilization of reading strategies to enhance comprehension	3.1. Implement school-wide reading strategies to be used in all content areas Implement Skills Block Wednesdays to review and assess skills where students show deficiencies based on data	3.1. Instructional Coach Teachers Administrators	3.1. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, data chats in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	3.1. Common assessments, Benchmark assessments, Exit Tickets, and FAIR data
2	3A.2. Teachers ability to identify reading deficiencies and scaffold instruction	3A.2. Teachers ability to identify reading deficiencies and scaffold instruction	3A.2. Instructional Coach Teachers Administrators	3A.2. Analyze student work, data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, data chats in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	3A.2. Common assessments, Benchmark assessments, Exit Tickets, and FAIR data
3	3A.3. Implementing RtI with fidelity	3A.3. Develop RtI plans that describe Tiered interventions Continue to provide professional development on differentiated instruction	3A.3. Instructional Coach Teachers Administrators	3A.3. Analyze student work, data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, data chats in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	3A.3. Classroom observations, RtI plans

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	Our goal is to increase the number of students making learning gains in reading by 5%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (15)	88% (16)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3B.1. Current level of rigorous instruction	3B.1. Teachers will increase their level of instructional rigor and expectations of students	3B.1. Instructional Coach ESE Lead Teacher Administrators	3B.1. Analyze data from curriculum based assessments and Classroom observations	3B.1. Curriculum based 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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Our goal is to increase the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading by 6%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%(154)	64% (158)

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	4.1 Students ability to grasp concept or skill through Tier I instruction	4.1. Implement RtI small group pull -outs outside of core instruction (Tier II and III interventions) Intentionally identify those students who are not proficient and monitor their progress. A	4.1 Instructional Coach Teachers Administrators	4.1. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, data chats in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	4.1. Common assessments, Benchmark assessments, exit slips and FAIR data
2	4A.2. Large learning /achievement gaps in components of reading (fluency, vocabulary, comprehension)	4A.2. All Level 1 and disfluent Level II students will be placed Intensive Reading receiving an additional 90 minutes per day of reading instruction	4A.2. Instructional Coach Teachers Administrators	4A.2. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, data chats in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	4A.2. Common assessments, Benchmark assessments, exit slips and FAIR data
3	4A.3. Teachers ability to analyze data to drive instruction	4A.3. ELA teachers will attend PLC Plus training and share strategies in PLC meetings	4A.3. Instructional Coach Teachers Administrators	4A.3. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, data chats in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	4A.3. Common assessments, Benchmark assessments, exit slips and FAIR data

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 # 5A :			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Increase the percentage of students in each subgroup by the predicted level of performance by the end of the 2012/13 school year based on FCAT 2.0 results
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:44% (187) Black:28% (140) Hispanic:34% (26) Asian:46% (13) American Indian	White:48% (223) Black:35% (306 Hispanic:39% (46) Asian:52%(12 American Indian:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Students limited knowledge and utilization of reading strategies to enhance comprehension. Students ability to grasp concept or skill through Tier I instruction	5B.1. Teachers will utilize a variety of assessment data to identify Tier 2 and 3 students to place students in appropriate interventions pullout groups throughout the school year monitoring student progress regularly.	5B.1. Instructional Coach Administrators	5B.1. Instructional Coach Administrators	5B.1. The results of Common assessments, Benchmark assessments, exit slips and FAIR data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Increase the number of ELL students in grades 6-8 making satisfactory progress in reading by 9%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(20)	9% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	5B 1. The students' lack of background knowledge and vocabulary	5B.1 Implement RtI small group pull -outs outside of core instruction (Tier II intervention) Identify students who are not proficient and monitor their progress.	5B.1. Literacy Team	5B.1. Classroom Visits that focus on observing implementation of instructional strategies (3-2-1-) Data derived from SAM Reports PLC discussions	5B.1. Student Work Portfolio Items Increased results on Common formative assessments, FAIR, SRI, SPI Exit slips
2	5C.1. Inconsistent use of ESOL strategies used during instruction	5C.1 Ensure that teachers are ESOL certified or attending ESOL training Provide all teachers with ESOL strategies to use during instruction	5C.1. Instructional Coach Administrators	5C.1. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, discuss in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	5C.1. Classroom observations, Common assessments, Benchmark assessments, exit slips and FAIR data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Increase the number of SWD students in grades 6-8 making satisfactory progress in reading by 7%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (118)	83% (118)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C 1. Student processing deficiencies and development	5C.1 Ensure that ESE teachers are using appropriate accommodations and modifications	5C.1. Instructional Coach Administrators	5C.1. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, discuss in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	5C.1. IEP reports and classroom observations
2					
3	5D.2. Lack of knowledge of ESE strategies and consistency with using the strategies in each content area classroom	5D.2. Provide professional development and support on using ESE strategies throughout content areas	5D.2. Instructional Coach Administrators Teachers	5D.2. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, discuss in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	5D.2. IEP reports and classroom observations

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Increase the number of SWD students in grades 6-8 making satisfactory progress in reading by 7%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (118)	83% (118)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D 1. Student processing deficiencies and development	5D.1. Ensure that ESE teachers are using appropriate accommodations and modifications	5D.1. Instructional Coach Administrators	5D1. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, discuss in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	5D.1. IEP reports and classroom observations
2	5D.2. Lack of knowledge of ESE strategies and consistency with using the strategies in each content area classroom	5D.2. Provide professional development and support on using ESE strategies throughout content areas	5D.2. Instructional Coach Administrators Teachers	5D.2. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, discuss in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need	5D.2. IEP reports and classroom observations
3	5D.3. Inconsistency differentiating instructions and assessments for students with disabilities	5D.3. Ensure that ESE teachers are using appropriate accommodations and modifications when differentiating instructions and assessments for students	5D.3. Instructional Coach Administrators Teachers	5D.3. Analyze data from Benchmark, common assessments and exit slips, discuss in PLCs and develop next steps/ interventions as need steps/ interventions as need	5D.3. IEP reports and classroom observations

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
Higher Level Question	All Subjects Grades 6-8	District PD Facilitator Instructional Coach	All PLCs Grades 6-8	Early Release September 2012	Classroom observations	Instructional Coach Administrators
Response to Intervention	All Subjects Grades 6-8	District PD Facilitator Instructional Coach	All PLCs Grades 6-8	Early Release October 2012	Classroom observations	Instructional Coach Administrators
Response to Intervention Differentiation Small Group	All Subjects Grades 6-8	District PD Facilitator Instructional Coach	All PLCs Grades 6-8	Early Release November 2012	Classroom observations	Administrators Instructional Coach

Reading Budget:

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	24% (5) of our ELL students will score proficient in the listening/speaking area of the CELLA assessment.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
21%(4)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	11.1. Teachers lacking appropriate strategies to infuse strategies to aid in language acquisition for ELL learning	.1. Provide professional development on ESOL/ELL language acquisition strategies for teacher in embed in daily instruction.	1.1.. Principal, Professional Development Facilitator, Standards Coach	1.1. Implementation of ESOL/ELL strategies in lesson plans and lesson delivery.	1.1. Classroom Observation

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	CELLA Goal #2: 43% (9) of our ELL students will score proficient in the reading area of the CELLA assessment.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

33% (7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Teachers may think they have to use a different set of strategies to encourage ELL students in reading	2.1. Teachers can utilize the same key strategies used to engage non-ELL students in reading	2.1. Standards Coach, Assistant principal(s)	.1. .PLC meetings where teachers share effective reading strategies, classroom visits that focus on the reading workshop model	2.1. Classroom observation, FAIR, fluency reading probes
2	2.2. Students may lack background knowledge and vocabulary.	2.2. Implement tier 2 and 3 interventions specific to ELL learners using identified ELL and reading strategies.	2.2. ELA teachers, reading teachers, Standards Coach (monitoring)	2.2. Classroom observations, PLC discussion groups	2.2. FAIR, SRI, Benchmark test

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	24% (5) of our ELL students will score proficient in the writing area of the CELLA assessment.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

14% (3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of language acquisition	2.1. Provide ELL students with language appropriate dictionary, teach writing strategies	2.1. ELA PLC lead teacher, ELA teachers	2.1. Informal writing samples, teacher/student commentary and revisions	2.1. District Writing prompts, response to literature writing

CELLA Budget:

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

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Increase the number of students achieving proficiency (FCAT 2.0 level 3) in Mathematics by 6%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24%(254)	30%(296)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Greater than 50% of all students scored lower than level 2 on FCAT.	1A.1. All level 1 and 2 students are enrolled in Intensive Math.	1A.1. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	1A.1. Discussions of content and strategies during weekly PLC and Leadership meetings. Administration observations.	1 1A.1. Benchmark assessment, Baseline and Post LSA(s), District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT and Teacher-generated snapshot assessments
2	1A.2. Student dependence on Instructor-driven learning	1A.2. Employ FCIM instruction supported by data with fidelity throughout the class period.	1A.2. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	1A.2. Informal observation. Formal Administration-based observation.	1A.2. Benchmark assessment, Baseline and Post LSA(s), District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT and Teacher-generated snapshot assessments.
3					1
4	1A.3. Poor attendance history with block scheduling contributes to greater instructional deficits	1A.3. Poor attendance history with block scheduling contributes to greater instructional deficits	1A.3. Teacher Attendance clerk	1A.3. Constant monitoring of class attendance by the classroom teacher. Follow up where necessary.	1A.3. Call logs and emails will serve as artifacts that attempts are being made.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	Increase the number of students scoring at the achieving level in Mathematics by 6%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (4)	28% (5)

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	1B.1. Student dependence on teacher-led instruction.	1B.1. Ensure the Number Worlds curriculum is being implemented with fidelity in the SLA classroom	1B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Lead Teacher	1B.1. Classroom observations, Lesson planning checks	1B.1. Curriculum-based assessments, ESE CAST assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Increase the number of students achieving proficiency (FCAT 2.0 levels 4 and 5) in Mathematics by 6%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11%(110)	17%(151)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2	2A.1. Greater than 50% of all students scored lower than level 2 on FCAT.	2A.1. Schedule all level 3 students in either Intensive Math or, for Algebra 1, Intensified Algebra/Agile Minds for all low-level 3 and AVID students.	2A.1. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	2A.1. Informal observation. Formal Administration-based observation.	2A.1. Benchmark assessment, Baseline and Post LSA(s), District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT and Teacher-generated snapshot assessments.
3	2A.2. All level 3-5 students in 8th grade are scheduled for Algebra 1 which takes EOC in addition to FCAT 2.0.	2A.2. FCAT 2.0 will be Pre-Algebra oriented so pre-algebra concepts will be stressed in content and Instructional Focus periods	2A.2 Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	2A.2. Informal observation. Formal Administration-based observation	2A.2. Benchmark assessment, Baseline and Post LSA(s), District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT and Teacher-generated snapshot assessments.
4	2A.3. Insufficient rigor built into curriculum.	2A.3. Increase rigor through HOT questioning and investigation. Increase Explore period problem complexity.	2A.3. Content-area AP Grade-level AP Math Coach	2A.3. Informal observation. Formal Administration-based observation.	2A.3. Informal observation. Formal Administration-based observation

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Increase the number of students scoring at the commended level in Mathematics by 11%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (13)	72% (13) 83% (15)

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	2B.1. Lack of rigor built into the curriculum.	2B.1. Increase rigor through utilizing Webb's Depth of knowledge level of questioning	2B.1. Content area AP, ESE Lead Teacher, Math coach (as necessary)	2B.1. Informal classroom observations	2B.1. Curriculum-based assessments, ESE CAST assessments

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	60% of students will make learning gains in FCAT 2.0 Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (542)	60%(578)

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	Greater than 50% of all students scored lower than level 2 on FCAT.	3A.1. All students receive Math intervention either through Intensive Math, Intensified Algebra or Instructional Focus within the class period.	3A.1. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	3A.1. Data comparison between baseline and post assessments. Data comparison between Interim Benchmark Assessments.	3A.1. Benchmark assessment, Baseline and Post LSA(s), District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT and Teacher-generated snapshot assessments.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	78% of students will make learning gains in Mathematics on the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (13)	78% (14)

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	3B.1. Students receiving support-level academics are not scheduled into intensive math classes	3B.1. Students in SLA will receive small-group remedial instruction in noted areas of weakness in Mathematics.	3B.1. Content-Area AP, ESE lead teacher, Math Coach (as necessary)	3B.1. Informal and formal classroom observations	3B.1. Curriculum-based assessments, teacher-made assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Increase the number of lower quartile students achieving learning gains (FCAT 2.0 Math level 1-2) by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% (133)	59% (142)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4A.1 Greater than 50% of all students scored lower than level 2 on FCAT.	4A.1 All level 1 and 2 students are enrolled in Intensive Math.	4A.1 Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	4A.1 Informal observation. Formal Administration-based observation	4A.1 Benchmark assessment, Baseline and Post LSA(s), District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT and Teacher-generated snapshot assessments.
2	4A.2. Student dependence on Instructor-driven learning	4A.2. Employ FCIM instruction supported by data with fidelity throughout the class period.	4A.2. . Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	4A.2. Informal observation. Formal Administration-based observation.	4A.2. Benchmark assessment, Baseline and Post LSA(s), District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT and Teacher-generated snapshot assessments
3	4A.3. Low academic support within away from school	4A.3. Recruit students for Team Up and other RtI-based programs. Use Pull Out/Push In opportunities to remediation.	4A.3. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	4A.3. Team Up enrollment logs. RtI evidence artifacts from Instructional Focus period. Informal observation. Formal Administration-based observation.	4A.3. Student dependence on Instructor-driven learning

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A :			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The percentage of subgroup members making learning gains will increase to the predicted levels of performance by the end of 2012-13year based on FCAT 2.0 results
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:50% Black:30% Hispanic:32% Asian:52% American Indian	White:55% Black:37% Hispanic:39% Asian:56% American Indian

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Greater than 50% of all students scored lower than Level 2 on FCAT	5B.1. All Level 1 and low Level 2 students are enrolled in Intensive Math	5B.1. Principal Content area Asst Principal Grade level Asst Principal PLC Lead Teacher Math coach	5B.1. Formal and informal observations, classroom walk-thrus	5B.1. Benchmark assessments, baseline and post Learning Schedule Assessments (LSA) District 5 Q/A quizzes CBT and teacher generated snapshots
2	5B.2. Low academic support away from school	5B.2. Recruit students for Team Up and other RtI based programs. Use push-in/pull-out opportunities to remediate	5B.2. Principal Content area Asst Principal Grade level Asst Principal PLC Lead Teacher Math coach	5B.2. Team up enrollment logs. RtI evidence artifacts from Instructional focus period. Formal and informal observations, classroom walk-thrus	5B.2. Benchmark assessments, baseline and post Learning Schedule Assessments (LSA) District 5 Q/A quizzes CBT and teacher generated snapshots

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	21% of ELL students will make Learning Gains in Mathematics per FCAT 2.0 test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (3)	21% (4)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5C.1. Attendance rate is lower in this subgroup.	5C.1. Active attendance monitoring by classroom	5C.1. Leadership Team: Principal	1A.3. Constant monitoring of class attendance by the	1A.3. Call logs and emails will serve as

1		teacher along with Attendance Clerk to provide opportunities for early attendance interventions	Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach Attendance Clerk	classroom teacher. Follow up where necessary.	artifacts that attempts are being made
2	5C.2. Poor attendance leads to learning lag/make up work burden for student.	5C.2. Early enrollment into recovery/remediation programs.	5C.2. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	5C.2. Team Up enrollment logs. RtI evidence artifacts from Instructional Focus period. Informal observation. Formal Administration based observation.	5C.2. Benchmark assessment, Baseline and Post LSA(s), District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT and Teacher-generated snapshot assessments.
3	5C.3. ESOL/ELL strategies may be inconsistently used in classrooms	5C.3.All teachers will become ESOL qualified per required level. Monitor for ESOL best practices	5C.3. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	5C.3. Monitor student performance through current data with attention paid to growth toward non-ELL levels of proficiency	5C.3. Benchmark assessment, Baseline and Post LSA(s), District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT and Teacher-generated snapshot assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	18% of Students with Disabilities will make learning gains in Mathematics on FCAT 2.0 test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (23)	18% (28)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1.Attendance rate is lower in this subgroup	5D.1. Active attendance monitoring by classroom teacher along with Attendance Clerk to provide opportunities for early attendance interventions	5D.1. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach Attendance Clerk	5D.3. Constant monitoring of class attendance by the classroom teacher. Follow up where necessary.	5D.3. Call logs and emails will serve as artifacts that attempts are being made.
2	5D.2. Poor attendance leading to learning lag/make up work burden for students	5D.2. Early enrollment into recovery/remediation programs	5D.2. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach Attendance Clerk	5D.2. Team Up enrollment logs. RtI evidence artifacts from Instructional Focus period. Informal observation. Formal Administration based observation.	5D.2. Benchmark assessment, Baseline and Post LSA(s), District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT and Teacher-generated snapshot assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	37% of economically disadvantaged students will make learning gains in Mathematics per FCAT 2.0 test.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (229)	37% (255

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Attendance rate is lower in this subgroup.	5E.1. Active attendance monitoring by classroom teacher along with Attendance Clerk to provide opportunities for early attendance interventions	5E.1. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach Attendance Clerk	5E.1. Constant monitoring of class attendance by the classroom teacher. Follow up where necessary.	5E.1. Call logs and emails will serve as artifacts that attempts are being made.
2	5E.2. Students struggle to remain on task due to distractions from social concerns.	5E.2. Teacher offers encouragement through enthusiasm regarding learning as a positive life experience.	5E.2. Leadership Team: Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach Guidance Counselor	5E.2. Constant monitoring of class performance by the classroom teacher. Follow up where necessary.	5E.2. Observation artifacts by the classroom teacher. Counseling records from the Guidance Counselor. Academic performance records.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	40% of all students taking the Algebra I EOC will score sufficiently high enough to earn a passing score (level 3) and receive full credit for Algebra I
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (46)	40% (57)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lower level 3 students may not be prepared for Algebra 1, lacking necessary skills and conceptual depth of understanding for success	1.1. Lower level 3 students will be scheduled into Intensive Algebra/Algebra I and will use the Agile Minds Algebra I course to reinforce pre-Algebra skills/knowledge.	1.1. Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	1.1. Monitoring test results Formal and informal observations.	1.1. Benchmark, Learning Schedule Assessments, District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT, teacher generated assessments
	1.2. AVID Algebra I students may not be prepared for	1.2. AVID students will be scheduled into Intensive Algebra/Algebra	1.2. Principal Content-area AP	.2. Monitoring test results Formal and informal	1.2. Benchmark, Learning Schedule Assessments,

2	Algebra I, lacking necessary skills and conceptual depth of understanding for success	I and will use the Agile Minds Algebra I course to reinforce pre-Algebra skills/knowledge.	Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	observations.	District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT, teacher generated assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 4/5 in Algebra 1 will increase by 9 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
1% (2)	10% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Students may not be prepared for the rigor and/or depth of knowledge necessary for scoring above lev	2.1. Teachers will begin on day 1 to demand and accept only at or above standard work from Algebra 1 students. Students will rework to proficiency	.1. Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	2.1. Monitoring test results Formal and informal observations.	2.1. Benchmark, Learning Schedule Assessments, District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT, teacher generated assessments

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Algebra Goal # 3A :			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	The percentage of student subgroups by ethnicity making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 will increase to the predicted levels of performance by the end of the 2012-13 year based on FCAT 2.0 results
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:33% Black:31% Hispanic:33% Asian:33% American Indian:N/A	White:35% Black:37% Hispanic:50% Asian:43% American Indian: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	3B.1. Students may not be prepared for Algebra 1, lacking necessary skills and conceptual depth of understanding for success	3B.1. Teachers will begin on day 1 to demand and accept only at or above standard work from Algebra 1 students. Students will rework to proficiency	3B.1. Principal Content-area AP Grade-level AP(s) PLC Lead Teacher Math Coach	3B.1. Monitoring test results Formal and informal observations.	3B.1. Benchmark, Learning Schedule Assessments, District 5 Q/A quizzes, CBT, teacher generated assessments

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	Less than 15 students
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Less than 15 students	Less than 15 students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	35% of Economically Disadvantaged students will perform at

Algebra Goal #3E:	= Level 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (24)	35% (25)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3E.1. Lack of supplies Technology outside of school Different set of responsibilities Education is not primary focus	3E.1. Identify students Offer snacks during after-school tutoring Provide supplies Differentiate Instruction Contact Parents	3E.1. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Algebra 1 Administrator Parents	3E.1. Looking at student protocols	3E.1. Teacher observation
2	3E.2. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	3E.2. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	3E.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Algebra 1 Administrator	3E.2. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	3E.2. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
3	3E.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students	3E.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers	3E.3. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Algebra 1 Administrator	3E.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols	3E.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 # 3A :			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Acquisition and Use through Inform	6-8	Math Coach, District DAT Coach	6-8 Mathematics Teachers, all core content teachers	Early Dismissal Wednesdays in September plus ongoing refresher trainings.	Monitor Data Binders for data refreshes as new data becomes available through Inform	Leadership Team, Content AP, Grade Level AP, Math Coach, PLC Lead Teacher
Higher Order Questioning techniques and use	6-8	Math Coach, PLC Lead Teacher, District Math Coach, Content AP	6-8 Mathematics Teachers, all core content teachers	Early Dismissal Wednesdays in September plus ongoing refresher trainings.	Monitor Lesson Plans for HOT scripted questions. Observe classroom instruction for evidence of HOT question use.	Leadership Team, Content AP, Grade Level AP, Math Coach, PLC Lead Teacher
Comparing Common Assessments	6-8	Math Coach, PLC Lead Teacher, District Math Coach, Content AP	-8 Mathematics Teachers, all core content teachers	-8 Mathematics Teachers, all core content teachers	Monitor PLC meetings paying close attention to time usage, discussion strands and compliance with PLC norms and model	Leadership Team, Content AP, Grade Level AP, Math Coach, PLC Lead Teacher

Mathematics Budget:

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

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Science Goal #1A: 39% of grade 8 students will score Level 3 or higher on the Science FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (112)	39% (123)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Students lack background knowledge	1A.1. Utilize RtI to identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment.	1A.1. Science Department Head and LCPs	1A.1. Review student groupings frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on latest data.	1A.1. Assessments along with essential questioning used in lesson and as exit tickets at the end of the class period.
2	1A.2. Low reading/writing skills	1A.2. Supplementary reading material that corresponds with student reading ability and reading level based on data on FCAT test.	1A.2. Science Department Head and LCPs	1A.2. Ensure groupings are designed to taqrget the need of students based on latest data.	1A.2. Assessments along with essential questioning used in lesson and as exit tickets at the end of the class period.
3	1A.3. Lack of Research and hands on knowledge	1A.3. Scaffold Inquiry based activities.	1A.3. Science Department Head and LCPs	1A.3. Review student groupings frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on latest data.	1A.3. Assessments along with essential questioning used in lesson and as exit tickets at the end of the class period.
4	1A.4. Seeing students every other day with modified block scheduling	Common board configuration including objectives, essential questions, bell ringers (warm-ups), and Focus Lesson on Strands (Nature of Matter, Energy, 1A.4. Force and motion, Processes	1A.4. Instructional Coach, Science Lead, and AP's	1A.4. Focus walks/classroom visits will be conducted by the administrative team and Coaches to ensure all Science teachers are using common board configurations	1A.4. Administrative team and Coaches will utilize Weekly Focus Element forms to conduct daily classrooms visits.

		That shape the Earth, Earth and Space, Processes of Life, How Living Things Interact with Their Environment, and Nature of Science).			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	Fewer than 15 students
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Fewer than 15 students	Fewer than 15 students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	10% of grade 8 students will score above proficiency (level 4 or higher) on the Science FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6% (21)	10% (32)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1 Seeing students every other day with A/B scheduling	2.1. Teachers will utilize differentiated Instruction with evidenced based instruction and interventions with Science classes.	2.1. Science lead teacher, AP's and Instructional coach	2.1. Focus walks/classroom visits will be conducted daily by the administrative team and coaches to review lesson plans and view evidence of differentiated instruction.	2.1 Grade level teacher observations and discussions during PLCs. Improvement on district assessments.
	2.2. Ensuring that all science teachers follow the 5E lesson	2.2. Developing a lesson study that focuses on the 5 E's and	2.2. Department Chair Instructional	2.2. Discussing the district's learning schedule and student	2.2. Grade level teacher observations and

2	plan format that focuses on the scientific method	enrichment activities that will immerse students in rigor.	Coach Principal	needs based on data to write meaningful lesson plans and focus calendars.	discussions during PLCs. Improvement on district and Write Score assessments.
3	2.3 All science teachers must implement reading and test taking strategies	2.3 Teachers will expose students to FCAT formatted questions to establish familiarity and reading strategies that will aid them in selecting the correct response.	2.3 Department Chair Instructional Coach PLC (teachers)	2.3 PLC and Department meetings	2.3 Increased student performance on district and Write Score assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	Less than 15 students tested (4 students tested)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Less than 15	Less than 15

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Implementing MTSS(RtI) effectively	6-8	Science Lead teacher	6-8 Science teachers	Early release days 2 times per month	Classroom observations. Tier 2 instruction.	Administrators, Science lead teacher

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Increase the number of students scoring 3 or higher by 12%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (182)	63% (199)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students lack of knowledge and or practice using the writing process	1.1. Explicitly teach all steps of the writing process, utilizing Steps Up to Writing and model the use of rubric scoring with students to increase the quality of student writing Implement school wide writing plan	1.1. Department Chair, LearningCommunity Principal	1.1. Instructional Coach Administrators Teachers	1.1. Rubrics, Data Chats, classroom observations, and lesson plans
2	1.2. Students lack of knowledge in grammar usage and writing conventions and mechanics	1.2. Students are scheduled into academic electives focusing on grammar and writing conventions and mechanics	1.2. Instructional Coach Administrators Teachers	1.2. Analyze data from district writing prompts and student work, data chats in PLCs	1.2. Rubrics, Data Chats, classroom observations, and lesson plans
3	1.3 Lack of teacher knowledge and training on new scoring/ rubric	1.3 Provide professional development on new scoring rubric for FCAT	1.3 Instructional Coach Administrators	1.3 Analyze data from district writing prompts and student work, data	1.3 Rubrics, Data Chats, classroom observations, and

	for FCAT writing	writing	Teachers	chats in PLCs	lesson plans

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	Increase the number of students scoring 4 or higher by 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%	39%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT 2.0 Writing Scoring to the Rubric	ELA Grade 8	District PD Facilitator Instructional Coach	All PLCs Grades 6-8	Early Release September 2012	Classroom observations	Instructional Coach Administrators
Step Up to Writing Writing process	ELA Grade 8	District PD Facilitator Instructional Coach	All PLCs Grades 6-8	Early Release November 2012	Classroom observations	Instructional Coach Administrators

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Increase attendance of students by 1%. while reducing the numbers of excessive absences by 10% (25) and tardies by 50% (35)
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96%	97%

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
250	225
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
70	35

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Middle schools' start of the day. (9:45)	1.1. Communicate with parents attendance and tardy issues	1.1. Assistant Principals and Attendance Clerk	1.1. Monitor attendances reports from Genesis and Oncourse	1.1. Attendances reports generated from Genesis and OnCourse
2	1.2. Students interest in socializing in hallways between classes.	1.2. Instituted structured movement for all grade levels.	1.2. Principal and Assistant Principals	1.2. Monitor tardy reports from Genesis. Classroom Observations	1.2. Tardy reports from Genesis

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
Keeping Proper Attendance	6-8	House Administrator	Grade Levels	Once a Semester	Analyzing Data	House Administrators

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Suspension Goal #1: Reduce the number of In school suspensions, Out of school suspensions and the number of students violations by 10%
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
922	830
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
351	316
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
842	758
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
17	15

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Parental involvement/ support.	1.1. Contacting/ conference with parents on every referral, behavior contracts, mentoring program.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principals	1.1. Discipline report will be pull at the end of each quarter to compare with previous year	1.1. Discipline Report generated from Genesis
2	1.2. Student motivation	1.2. Implementation of a mentor program Structured movement between classes	1.2 Principal, Assistant Principals Kyle Powell Assistant Principal	1.2. Discipline report will be pulled at the end of each quarter to compare with previous year.	1.2. Discipline reports generated from Genesis
	1.3. Students' lack of	1.3. Offer counseling	1.3. Principal	1.3 Discipline report will	1.3 Discipline

3	problem solving skills.	sessions instead of suspension and provide students character education lesson from Second Steps during In-school suspension	Assistant Principals	be pulled at the end of each quarter to compare with previous year Monitoring	reports generated from Genesis

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1:	Parent Involvement Goal #1:

Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.	Increase the number of parents who participate in Open House, PTSA, SAC, and volunteer opportunities, beyond athletics.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
137 (based on 11% of student population)	3500-4000 (duplicated) parents are present for activities (primarily athletics)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Communication with parents	1.1Use a variety of resources (Messenger, Parent Portal, school website, teacher websites, letters, flyers) to increase parent awareness	1.1 Principal, Assistant Principals, teachers.	1.1. Monitor connections made through Messenger (auto-dialer) and distribution of parent log-in for OnCourse	1.1 Review volunteer contact logs, attendance sheets, parent surveys, and verbal feedback
2	1.2Parent access to technology	1.2.Provide computer stations in parent resource center	1.2.School technology contact	1.2. Volunteer contact logs, attendance sheets, parent surveys, and verbal feedback	1.2. Volunteer contact logs, attendance sheets, parent surveys, and verbal feedback

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Safety Goal 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. Safety Goal Goal Safety Goal Goal #1:	Additional Goal #1: 1.1 The school will increase by 50% the number of staff members who believe the school provides a safe environment for teaching and learning. 1.2 The school will decrease by 30% the number of violent incidences at School
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
1.1 In the 2011-2012 Staff School Climate Survey, 37.6% (33) of staff members felt the school was a safe environment for teaching and learning. 1.2 There were 122 incidences of violence against students in 2011-2012	1.1 74% (66) of staff members will believe the school is not a safe environment for teaching and learning. 1.2 There will be less than 85 incidences of violence against students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Historically high discipline rates	1.1. Increased emphasis on discipline. Structured movement in halls.	1.1 Principal House Administrators	1.1. Analyze Discipline data	1.1 Genesis Discipline Data.
2	1.2. Historically high discipline rates	1.2. Increased emphasis on discipline. Structured movement in halls.	1.2. Principal House Administrators	1.2. Analyze Discipline data	1.2. Genesis Discipline Data.

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Safety Goal Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

( ) Priority (•) Focus ( ) Prevent ( ) NA

Are you a reward school: ( ) Yes (•) No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/14/2012)

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
Funds will be utilized to support instruction, specifically in the lowest quartile Reading and Math through purchase of supplemental resources.	$0.00
Student incentives and awards	$0.00

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

SAC will meet monthly to review student data and SIP. Meeting agendas and activities will be in response to emerging student

needs.

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

Duval School District
JOSEPH STILWELL MIDDLE SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	52%	48%	88%	42%	230	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	57%	60%			117	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	64% (YES)	64% (YES)			128	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					475	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
JOSEPH STILWELL MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	55%	50%	90%	40%	235	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	57%	66%			123	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	63% (YES)	68% (YES)			131	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					489	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested