

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: WALTER C. YOUNG MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Harold E. Osborn

SAC Chair: James McNally

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/12

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Harold "Chip" Osborn	Master of Education degree Psychology 6-12 Guidance K-12 School Principal	1	14	2012 School Grade "A" % Meeting High Standards: Reading 67% Mathematics 67% Writing 82% Science 57% Percent Making Learning Gains: Reading 69% Mathematics 72% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading 61% Mathematics 52% Acceleration Participation and Performance Points: Mathematics 66
					2012 School Grade "A" % Meeting High Standards: Reading 67% Mathematics 67%

Assis Principal	Lorry B. Greenberg	Middle Grades Math ESOL Ed. Leadership School Principal	5	13	Writing 82% Science 57% Percent Making Learning Gains: Reading 69% Mathematics 72% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading 61% Mathematics 52% Acceleration Participation and Performance Points: Mathematics 66
Assis Principal	Marcela Mansur	Middle Grade Math 6-9 Elementary Ed. ESOL Ed. Leadership	7	4	2012 School Grade "A" % Meeting High Standards: Reading 67% Mathematics 67% Writing 82% Science 57% Percent Making Learning Gains: Reading 69% Mathematics 72% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading 61% Mathematics 52% Acceleration Participation and Performance Points: Mathematics 66
Assis Principal	Susan G. Kincaid	General Science 5-9 PE 6-12 PE K-8 Ed. Leadership School Principal	2	11	2012 School Grade "A" % Meeting High Standards: Reading 67% Mathematics 67% Writing 82% Science 57% Percent Making Learning Gains: Reading 69% Mathematics 72% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading 61% Mathematics 52% Acceleration Participation and Performance Points: Mathematics 66

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Gloria Sekowski	MS. Reading K-12: LA Middle Grades: Elem. Ed	22	15	2012 School Grade "A" % Meeting High Standards: Reading 67% Mathematics 67% Writing 82% Science 57% Percent Making Learning Gains: Reading 69% Mathematics 72% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading 61% Mathematics 52% Acceleration Participation and Performance Poi

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	Interview for potential candidates conducted by a panel of faculty members.	Administration, Dept. Heads, and teachers within the department	Conclusion of advertising for position	
2	Induction orientation for newly hired staff.	Administration, NESS Liaison, selected faculty members	Prior to the pre-planning week in August.	No New Hires
3	Assignment of a "buddy" teacher within a department.	Administration, Dept. Heads and designated faculty members.	Prior to pre-planning week in August	

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
All instructional staff are highly qualified	

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
65	0.0%(0)	4.6%(3)	27.7%(18)	67.7%(44)	43.1%(28)	100.0%(65)	13.8%(9)	13.8%(9)	100.0%(65)

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
At the present time, no instructional staff are being mentored due to the fact we have no new teachers. However, we do have a plan in place if we receive new additional staff.			

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)

Intensive Reading Programs

Violence Prevention Programs

Safe Schools
Anti-Bullying
Conflict Mediation
Peer Court

Nutrition Programs

Wellness Program through Memorial Healthcare System.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

Community School houses approximately 2,000 students per term.

Career and Technical Education

EPEP
Career Planning

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.

Harold "Chip" Osborn, Principal
Lorry Bruce Greenberg, 8th Grade Administrator

Susan Kincaid, 7th Grade Administrator
Marcela Mansur, 6th Grade Administrator
Sandrus Griffin-Mahoney, 8th Grade Guidance Counselor
Joy Williams, 7th Grade Guidance Counselor
Marilyn White, Guidance Director and 6th Grade Guidance Counselor
Laura Dunbar, ESE Specialist
Gloria Sekowski, Reading Coach
Daisy Pardo, School Psychologist
Lilia Francois, Social Worker
Janice Patrick, Family Counselor
Teachers, based on grade level

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?

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

The MTSS/RtI team at Walter C. Young meets the second and fourth Wednesday of every month. Guidance counselors coordinate the meetings. The Guidance Secretary notifies the team members of upcoming meeting times and students' issues to be discussed. Grade level counselors chair the respective meetings. Student history, current information, teacher/parent concerns, and tier 1 progress data are reviewed at the meeting. A plan of action is developed. The grade level guidance representative keeps record of the team proceedings.

As students move to Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, a case manager is assigned to assist the staff in implementing interventions. The case manager is usually the guidance counselor assigned to the student's grade level but can be another member of the team, depending on the nature of the problem. The case manager assists the teachers throughout the process. The team identifies and defines the problems and determines the data source for collection of baseline data. Upon inspection of baseline data, team members develop and implement targeted interventions. Goals are set, progress is monitored, and the team meets again to continue interventions, revise the interventions, intensify the interventions, or fade out the interventions. The Intervention Record Forms for Academic and Behavior and process monitoring graphs are used to track the information generated for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. These records are stored in the guidance counselors's/case manager's office.

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 RtI Leadership Team informs the SAC team of issues which impact core curriculum and students' needs for more intensive interventions. The SAC Team, with assistance from administration, department heads and teachers, work closely to create and monitor the School Improvement Plan. During monthly SAC meetings, updates from the RtI Leadership Team are provided to the SAC Team for evaluation.

The RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP through inspection of Tier 1 data in the areas of reading, math, writing, science, and behavior. This data is used to improve the core curriculum and school-wide behavior plan. Data chats are held between students, teachers, and administrators. This data is also used to help identify students who are struggling with either academics or behavior and who may be in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. The school based MTSS Leadership Team works closely with other school teams such as the grade level teams and department heads to organize/coordinate efforts by keeping them informed on issues which impact core curriculum and students' need for more intensive interventions.

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.

Reading:

Tier 1 data sources: BAT 1, BAT 2, FCAT, FAIR and class grades

Tier 2 & 3 data sources: Diagnostic Assessment of reading, FAIR, San Diego Test, Fluency Test, Intervention Record Forms and progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students.

Data Management Systems: Virtual Counselor, TERMS, or Pinnacle

Mathematics:

Tier 1 data sources: BAT 1, BAT 2, FCAT, FAIR and classroom assessments

Tier 2 & 3 data sources: Tests, quizzes, class grades, Intervention Record Forms and progress monitoring graphs generated

for individual students. Teachers will diagnose and prescribe for each student based on the results of assessments.
Data Management Systems: Virtual Counselor, TERMS, or Pinnacle

Writing:

Tier 1 data sources: FCAT Writes, September/November Writing Prompts

Tier 2 & 3 data sources: Intervention Record Forms and progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students.

Science:

Tier 1 data sources: BAT 1, BAT 2, FCAT, and classroom assessments

Tier 2 & 3 data sources: Tests, quizzes, class grades, Intervention Record Forms and progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students. Teachers will diagnose and prescribe for each student based on the results of assessments.

Behavior:

Tier 1 data source: Administrative referrals, teacher observations, referrals to guidance and external suspensions.

Tier 2 & 3 data source: Intervention Record Forms and progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students.

Data Management Systems: TERMS, Discipline Management System

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff will continue to be trained through workshops an early release days, and on-going as needed

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Gloria Sekowski -Reading Coach
Gloria Sekowski - Literacy Department Head
Fiesta Mitchell - Social Studies Teacher
Judy Zelinski - Media Specialist
Hope Fisher - Reading Teacher
Lili DiStefano - Reading Teacher
Susan Kincaid - Administrator over Reading Department
Teresa Andriella - ESOL Coordinator
Julia Ludovici - ESE Department

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

To promote reading beyond the classroom while infusing reading through all curriculum.

We promote guided sustained reading(GSR) through content area by encouraging teachers to maintain classroom library with titles pertinent to their content area. Thirty minutes of GSR will be implemented through the content areas, with the exception of mathematics, on a weekly basis. A follow-up activity emphasizing one benchmark will be part of the session.

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

This year, the focus will be on the creation of book clubs.
In addition, content area teachers will take an active role in the daily infusion of reading Sunshine State Standards.
Core Curriculum
All teachers in the classroom will be provided the ESOL Matrix and addendum to use with the current ELL population. All Social Studies, Science and Reading teachers will incorporate reading strategies in the classroom.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Administrators and LLT will monitor during walkthroughs to ensure that reading benchmarks are being addressed in the instructional delivery.

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In May 2012, 30% of students scored level 3 on the FCAT SSS. By May 2013, 33% of students will score level 3 on FCAT SSS
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (398/1265)	33% (417/1265)

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. Lack of knowledge in the effective use of reading strategies employed by content area teachers with fidelity	1. CRISS training 2. Training of effective comprehension strategies using complex text	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach and Content Dept. Chairs	1. Informal Marzano observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs will determine the actuality of the utilization of reading strategies.	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BATS
2	1. Lack of knowledge of effective reading strategies in the content areas	1. Sharing of best practices through monthly staff development, department meetings and morning trainings. 2. CRISS and McRel Training	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach and Content Dept. Chairs	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs will determine the actuality of the utilization of reading strategies 2. Teachers will fill out an evaluation form and submit it to the appropriate dept. head to evaluate the effectiveness of the monthly trainings.	1. FCAT 2. BAT 1 and 2 3. Mini BATS 4. FAIR Tests
3	1. The lack of SSS support in the Content Areas	1. Each content area teacher will be responsible to coordinate with the Reading Dept. in following the Instructional Focus Calendar with fidelity.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach and Dept. Chairs	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs	1. FCAT 2. BAT 1 and 2 3. Mini Bats 4. FAIR Tests
4	1. Lack of rigor within content instruction	1. Differentiated instruction workshops 2. CRISS and McRel Training	1. Reading Coach / Dept Chair 2. Administration	1. Data analysis based on initial assessment tests 2. Classroom Walk-throughs 3. Bi-weekly data analysis	1. FCAT 2. SRI 3. Mini BATS 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests
5	1. Lack of teachers knowledge in motivating reluctant students	1. Teachers will attend weekly on-site morning trainings 2. Teachers will share Best Practices in	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs	1. FCAT 2. BAT 1 and 2 3. Mini Bats

	motivating reluctant students at monthly dept. meetings		4. FAIR Tests
--	---	--	---------------

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:	In May 2012, 45% of students scored a Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading on the Florida Alternative Assessment. By May 2013, 48% of students will score a Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading on the Florida Alternative Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (5/11)	48 (7/11)

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	1. Lack of rigor within content instruction	1. PLCs focusing on improving comprehension using complex text.	1. Reading Coach and Dept. Chairs	1. Classroom Walkthroughs 2. Planbook Check	1. FAIR 2. BAT II 3. Mini BATS

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:	In May 2012, 37% of students scored level 4 or 5 on the FCAT SSS. By May 2013, 40% of students will score level 4 or 5 on FCAT SSS
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (494/1265)	40% (506/1265)

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. Lack of teacher knowledge in motivating higher functioning students to read outside of school	1. Teachers will collaborate during monthly dept. meetings on ways to keep students reading beyond the school day.	1. Administration Reading Coach	1. Informal observations and Classroom Walkthroughs	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BATS
2	1. Not enough rigor within the curriculum to engage the higher functioning students	1. Attending District training on topics relevant to the development of higher functioning students; such as Socratic Seminar and strategies for teaching gifted/high achieving students. Grade level collaboration of lesson development	1. Administration Reading Coach	1. Informal observations and Classroom Walkthroughs Reflective conversations with teachers regarding lesson development	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
	1. Teachers Lack of	1. CRISS TRAINING	1. Reading Coach	1. Bi-Weekly Classroom	1. FCAT

3	knowledge of reading strategies	2. MCREL TRAINING 3. CAR-PD TRAINING		Walk Throughs focusing on strategies 2. Reflective conversations with teachers on effective use of reading strategies 3. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers	2. Computer lab reports from READ ON, Success Maker and FCAT Explorer 3. Mini Bats 4. FAIR 5. BAT 1 and 2
4	1.Lack of teacher knowledge in motivating students to read outside of school	1. Teachers will share Best Practices at monthly dept. meetings 2. Teachers will attend on site weekly workshops	1.Administration 2. Reading Coach	1.Classroom Walk-Throughs 2. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers	1.FCAT 2.Mini Bats 3. BAT 1 and 2
5	1. Rigor in the instructional process is not maintained for levels 4 and 5	1. Grade Level Collaboration of Lesson Development. 2. Sharing of Best Practices 3. Increase use of BEEP 4. Attending District Training on topics relevant to development of the higher functioning students; such as Socratic Seminar and Strategies for teaching gifted/high achieving students	1.Administration 2.Reading Coach	1. Data analysis based on initial assessment test 2. Bi-Weekly Classroom walk- throughs focusing on lesson development 3. Reflective conversations with teachers regarding lesson development	1.FCAT 2.FAIR 1.BAT 1 and 2

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:	In May 2012, 18% of students scored level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment. By May 2013, 20% of students will score level 7 on Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (2/11) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in Reading	20% (2/10)of students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in Reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Cognitive ability can be in the intellectual disability level therefore it limits their ability and process to learn.	1. The student will accurately and consistently identify pictures or symbols paired with words and stories or daily activities. 2. The student will used new vocabulary that is introduced and taught directly. 3. The student will elate new vocabulary to	1. Classroom Teachers 2. ESE Specialist	1. Classroom walk throughs 2. Mastery of individual education plann goals	1. Florida alternative assessment.

		familiar words			
2	1. Cognitive ability can be in the intellectual disability level therefore it limits their ability and process to learn.	1. The student will accurately and consistently identify pictures or symbols paired with words and stories or daily activities. 2. The student will use new vocabulary that is introduced and taught directly. 3. The student will relate new vocabulary to familiar words.	1. Classroom Teachers 2. ESE Specialist	1. Classroom walk throughs 2. Mastery of individual education plan goals	1. Florida alternative 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:	By May 2012, 71% of students made learning gains in reading. By May 2013, 74% of students will make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (909/1289)	74% (936/1265)

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. Lack of teacher knowledge in motivating reluctant students	1. Teachers will share Best Practices in motivating reluctant students at monthly dept. meetings	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach 3. Dept. Chairs	1. Informal observations and Classroom Walkthroughs 2. Data Analysis of weekly tests and quizzes	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
2	1. Lack of knowledge by content area teachers in the infusion of research based reading strategies	1. CRISS training 2. Peer Observations 3. Grade level collaboration	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach 3. Dept. Chairs	1. Informal observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
3	1. Lack of teacher experience with teaching using complex text	1. PLCs will be established so that teachers can collaborate on techniques utilizing the skills needed to comprehend complex text	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach 3. Dept. Chairs	1. Informal observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
4	1. Lack of teacher knowledge on motivating reluctant students	1. Teachers will attend on site weekly workshops 2. Teachers will share Best Practices on motivating students at monthly dept. meeting	1. Administrators 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs	1. FCAT 2. Mini bats 3. Bat 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests
5	1. Embedding of Reading SSS into another content area with fidelity.	1. The Social Studies Department will work in conjunction with the Reading Department in following the instructional focus calendar.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs	1. FCAT 2. Mini bats 3. BAT 1 and 2

					4. FAIR Tests
6	1. Lack of knowledge by content area teachers in the infusion of research based reading strategies.	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs will be used to determine the frequency of reading strategy infusion within content area curriculum. 2. Monthly strategy infusion staff development through department meetings and morning trainings. 3. Teachers will attend CRISS and MCRel trainings.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs	1. FCAT 2. Mini bats 3. Bat 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests

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:	By May 2012, 42% of students made learning gains in reading. By May 2013, 45% of students will make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (4.2/10) of students made learning gains in reading using the Florida Alternative Assessment.	45% (4.5/10) of students will make learning gains in reading using the Florida Alternative Assessment.

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. Cognitive ability can be in the intellectual disability level therefore it limits their ability and process to learn	1. The student will accurately and consistently identify pictures or symbols paired with words and stories or daily activities. 2. The student will use new vocabulary that is introduced and taught directly. 3. The student will relate new vocabulary to familiar words	1. Classroom Teachers 2. ESE Specialist	1. Classroom walk throughs 2. Mastery of individual education plan goals	1. Florida Alternative 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:	By May 2012, 64% of our students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. By May 2013, 67% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (210.9/328)	75% (237 /316)

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. Lack of knowledge by teachers in meeting the needs of the lowest 25%	1. Workshops on differentiated instruction	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach 3. Dept. Chairs	1. Informal observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
2	1. Teacher inexperience with coordinating data with instruction	1. Teachers will attend workshops on the effective use of data to drive instruction	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach 3. Dept. Chairs	1. Informal observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
3	1. Students need additional instructional time in reading	1. Students will be given the opportunity to attend before school classes throughout the school year	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach 3. Dept. Chairs	1. Informal observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
4	1. Lack of knowledge by teachers in meeting the needs of lowest 25%	1. Workshops on differentiated instruction 2. Sharing of Best Practices at monthly department meetings. 3. CRISS and McRel training	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs	1. FCAT 2. Mini bats 3. BAT 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests
5	1. Teacher inexperience with coordinating data with instruction	1. Teachers will attend workshops on the effective use of data 2. Teachers will share Best Practices at monthly dept. meetings.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs 2. Data chats with administrator	1. FCAT 2. mini-bats 3. BAT 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests
6	1. Additional Instructional Time	1. Students will participate in a reading pull out program.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Through.	1. FCAT 2. mini bats 3. BAT 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67%	75%	78%	80%	83%	

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Reading Goal #

5A : By the end of 2016-17 school year, we will decrease 50% of our non proficient students school wide.

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:	By May 2013, each subgroup will decrease the amount of students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Percentage of students not making satisfactory progress per subgroup White 25% (78/316), Black 39% (130/333), Hispanic 38% (213/565), Asian 13% (10/78), American Indian 67% (2/3)	White 23% (68/297), Black 36% (120/333), Hispanic 35% (197/562), Asian 10% (7/74), American Indian 63% (0/0)

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. Teachers lack of knowledge in effective use of data to drive instruction	1. Teachers will attend workshops on differentiated instruction. 2. Peer observations	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach 3. Dept. Chairs	1. Informal observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
2	1. Teachers lack of knowledge in efficient use of data to drive instruction	1. Teachers will attend on site weekly morning trainings on the efficient use of data. 2. Teachers will share Best Practices pertaining to successful use of data to drive instruction. 3. Workshop on Differentiation.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Bi-Weekly Classroom Walk-Throughs 2. Reflective conversation with teachers	1. FCAT 2. Mini-bats 3. BAT 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests
3	1. Additional Instructional Time	1. Students will participate in a reading pull out program.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs	1. FCAT 2. Mini bats 3. BAT 1 and 2
4	1. Teachers lack of knowledge of infusion of ESL strategies into reading curriculum	1. Teachers will take a refresher course in ESL Strategies 2. Teachers will observe model teachers teaching ESL students 3. Reading Coach will observe teachers to assist with the infusion of ESL strategies	1. Reading Coach 2. Administration	1. Bi-Weekly Classroom Walk-Throughs 2. Reflective Conversations with teachers on the successful use of ESL strategies.	1. FCAT 2. Mini Bats 3. FAIR

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	By May 2013, students in the English Language Learners (ELL) Subgroup not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79% (41/52) of the ELL subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in reading	76% (47/62) of the ELL subgroup will not make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Teachers unfamiliar with proper infusion of ESE accommodations	1. Teachers will be trained by either district personnel or the school's ESE specialist on the proper infusion of accommodations. 2. Peer Observations	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Informal Marzano observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
2	1. Teachers lack of knowledge in the proper utilization of data to drive instruction	1. Teachers will attend workshops on the effective use of data to drive instruction. 2. Teachers will attend workshops on the proper use of differentiated instruction.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Informal Marzano observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
3	1. Lack of teacher knowledge on the infusion of ELL strategies.	1. Teachers will attend workshops on infusing ELL strategies instructed by either a county trainer or the school's ELL teacher. 2. Teachers will share Best Practices on instructional techniques for ELL students at monthly dept. meeting and/or weekly team meetings.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs 2. Implementation of reading instructional focus into daily lesson	1. FCAT 2. Mini bats 3. BAT 1 and 2 4. CELLA
4	1. Teachers adhering to ELL strategies with fidelity	1. Reading teachers will be trained monthly by the Reading Coach on research based differentiated strategies to include setting up learning centers, classroom libraries, cooperative groups, oral and silent reading drills. 2. CRISS and Mcrel, and individual and group testing procedures.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs 2. Lesson Plan Review	1. FCAT 2. Mini-bats 3. BAT 1 and 2 4. CELLA

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:	By May 2013, students in Students with Disabilities (SWD) Subgroup will decrease students proficient by 3%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (107/147) did not make satisfactory progress in the SWD subgroup	70% (102/145) will not make satisfactory progress in the SWD subgroup

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1. Teachers lack of	1. Teachers attend	1. Administration	1. Informal Marzano	1. FCAT

1	knowledge in understanding the ramifications of poverty in the classroom	workshop on understanding poverty	2. Reading Coach	observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs	2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
2	1. Lack of teacher knowledge in the proper inclusion of complex text	1. Through PLCs, teachers will develop lessons that increase comprehension using complex text	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Informal Marzano observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs 3. Lesson plan check	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
3	1. Teachers unfamiliarity with proper infusion of ESE accommodations	1. Teacher training at weekly staff development. 2. Lowest 25% students with disabilities will be pulled out by the reading coach.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach 3. ESE Specialist 4. Support Facilitators	1. Follow-up Classroom Walk-Throughs 2. Disaggregated FCAT Data	1. FCAT 2. Mini Bats 3. BAT 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests
4	1. Teachers lack of fidelity with ESE accommodations compliance	1. Lesson Plan check 2. Sharing of Best Practices at monthly dept. meetings and/or weekly team meetings	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach 3. Support Facilitators	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs 2. Lesson plan check	1. FCAT 2. Mini Bats 3. BAT 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests
5	1. Teachers lack of knowledge in the proper utilization of data to drive instruction	1. Teachers will attend workshops on Differentiated Instruction. 2. Teachers will attend on site weekly workshops on the efficient use of data in the classroom.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walkthroughs 2. Lesson plan check	1. FCAT 2. BAT 1 and 2 3. FAIR Tests

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:	By May 2013, students in Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup will increase students proficient by 4%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (266/594) of economically disadvantaged students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	41% (239/584) of economically disadvantaged students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Lack of teacher collaboration in formulating an ongoing plan	1. Teachers will collaborate with grade level and administrators to discuss student progress based on student progress monitoring data	1. Grade Level Administrators 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walkthroughs 2. Data Conversations with administrators	1. FAIR 2. FCAT 3. Mini-Bats
	1. Teachers lack of knowledge in motivating reluctant students	1. Teachers will share Best Practices in student motivation at monthly dept. meetings.	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs	1. FCAT 2. Mini bats

2		2. Teachers will attend trainings on motivating reluctant students at weekly morning workshops.			3. Bat 1 and 2 4. SRI 5. FAIR Tests
3	1. Embedding of Reading SSS into another content area with fidelity	1.The Social Studies Department will work in conjunction with the Reading Department in following the instructional focus calendar	1.Administration 2. Reading Coach	1.Classroom Walk-Throughs	1.FCAT 2.Mini bats 3.BAT 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests
4	1. Lack of teacher knowledge in the use of Research Based Instructional strategies in content areas	1.CRISS and McRel Trainings 2.Shared Best Practices at staff development through monthly department meetings and weekly morning trainings.	1.Administration 2. Reading Coach	1.Classroom Walk-Throughs	1.FCAT 2.Mini bats 3.Bat 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests
5	1. Additional Instructional Time	1.Students will be invited to attend Saturday Camp.	1.Administration 2. Reading Coach	1.Classroom Walk-Throughs	1.FCAT 2.Mini bats 3. BAT 1 and 2 4. FAIR Tests

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
Working With Text Complexity	All Content Areas 6-8	Reading Coach	Reading Coach	10/18/2012	Classroom Walkthroughs	Reading Coach, Gloria Sekowski
Working with ESE Students	All Content Areas 6-8	District Personnel or ESE Specialist	School-wide	10/26/2012	Classroom Walkthroughs	Reading Coach, Gloria Sekowski
Working with ELL Students	All Content Areas 6-8	District Personnel or School's ELL Coordinator	School-wide	10/26/2012	Classroom Walkthroughs	Reading Coach, Gloria Sekowski

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To instruct teachers on the proper use of the IMPACT Curriculum	District Training	Accountability	\$400.00
			Subtotal: \$400.00
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
Content Area teachers to be instructed on infusing reading strategies into their curriculum	CRISS Training	Accountability	\$400.00
			Subtotal: \$400.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To improve classroom instruction	Ancillary and Novels to complete class sets	Accountability	\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
			Grand Total: \$1,400.00

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:		By May 2013, each grade level will increase proficiency in listening /speaking by 5%.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
The following percentage represents grade level proficiency of students in listening/speaking: Sixth Grade 35% (8/23) Seventh Grade 55% (6/11) Eighth Grade 55% (16/29)					
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. Language Barrier. 2. Native language spoken at home. 3. Lack of parental knowledge of the English language.	1. N/A	1. State of Florida.	1. N/A	1. CELLA is a 3 part test. One of the components is the Listening/ Speaking portion of the test which must be passed with a Proficient level along with the 2 other components of the test for a student to be exited.

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:	By May 2013, each grade level will increase proficiency in reading by 5%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
The following percentage represents grade level proficiency of students in reading: Sixth Grade 21% (5/24) Seventh Grade 27% (3/11) Eighth Grade 59% (17/29)	

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. Language Barrier. 2. Native language spoken at home. 3. Lack of parental knowledge of the English language.	N/A	1. State of Florida	N/A	1. CELLA is a 3 part test. One of the components is the Reading portion of the test which must be passed with a Proficient level along with the 2 other components of the test for a student to be exited.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	By May 2013, each grade level will increase proficiency in writing by 5%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
The following percentage represents grade level proficiency of students in writing: Sixth Grade 29% (7/24) Seventh Grade 36% (4/11) Eighth Grade 45% (13/29)	

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. Language Barrier. 2. Native language spoken at home. 3. Lack of parental knowledge of the English language.	1. N/A	1. State of Florida	1.N/A	1. CELLA is a 3 part test. One of the components is writing portion of the test which must be passed with a Proficient level along with the 2 other components of the test for a student to be exited.

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Cella testing is to determine placement	\$800. will be needed to cover the cost of a substitute teacher.	Accountability	\$800.00
			Subtotal: \$800.00
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: \$800.00

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:	In May 2012, 25% of students scored level 3 on the FCAT SSS. By May 2013, 28% of students will score level 3 on FCAT SSS
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (338/1333) scored at the Achievement Level 3	28% (354/1265) will score at Achievement Level 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	1. Lack of student experience in math manipulative tools and exposure to various math strategies.	1. Math teachers may participate in professional development in utilization of manipulatives. 2. Math teachers will integrate manipulatives through math lessons as appropriate.	1. Administration 2. Department Head	1. Data Analysis	1. Classroom assessments 2. September/ November BAT Testing 3. FCAT
2	1. Next Generation Sunshine State Standards at each grade level have concepts which should have been covered in prior grades.	1. Math teachers will form PLC's to review IFC's to continue to identify and discuss concepts not covered in prior grades. Plan lessons to address these skills.	1. Administration 2. Department Head	1. Data Analysis 2. Review mini BAT assessments throughout the year.	1. Classroom assessments 2. BAT Testing 3. FCAT 4. Mini BAT 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	In May 2012, 36% of students scored a Levels 4, 5, and 6 in math on the Florida Alternative Assessment. By May 2013, 39% of students will score a Levels 4, 5, and 6 in math on the Florida Alternative Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (4/11) of students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics on the Florida Alternative Assessment	39% (4/10) of students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics on the Florida Alternative Assessment

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. Cognitive ability can	1. The students will	1. Classroom	1. Classroom	1. Florida

1	be in the intellectual disability level therefore it limits their ability and process to learn	match two different objects, symbols or pictures presented at the same time to identical objects, symbols or pictures using the concept of one to one correspondence.	teachers 2. ESE specialist	walkthroughs	Alternative Assessment
2	1. Cognitive ability can be in the intellectual disability level therefore it limits their ability and process to learn	1. The student will identify values of individual coins and bills	1. Classroom Teacher 2. ESE Specialist	1. Classroom walkthroughs	1. Florida Assessment Test

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By May 2013, students achieving proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5) will increase by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (560/1333) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics	44% (556/1265) of students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics

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. Teachers lack of familiarity with Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and item specifications.	1. Continued trainings on new standards. 2. Teachers will use formative and summative assessments to check student progress and guide instruction accordingly.	1. Administration 2. Department Head	1. Data Analysis	1. Classroom assessments
2	1. Students coming into Algebra may have a weak pre algebra skills. However, currently all students are above grade level.	1. All Algebra and Geometry teachers will review FCAT strategies during the third quarter.	1. Administration 2. Department Head	1. Data Analysis	1. Classroom assessments 2. FCAT 3. Mini BAT Assessments
3	1. Teachers lack detailed knowledge of Marzano's observation tool.	1. Trainings on design questions. 2. Sharing best practices used in classroom	1. Administration 2. Reading Coach 3. Department Head	1.1 – Observations done by Administration	1.1 - Observation Tool

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:	In May 2012, 18% of students scored level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment. By May 2013, 20% of students will score level 7 on Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (2/11) of students scored at or above Achievement	20% (2/10) of students will score at or above Achievement

Level 7 in mathematics.			Level 7 in mathematics.		
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. Cognitive ability can be in the intellectual disability level therefore it limits their ability and process to learn	1. The student will initiate counting objects or actions to 2 or more in daily activities. 2. The students will use counting, grouping and place value to identify the value of whole numbers to 100. 3. The student will identify time to the minute using a clock.	1. Classroom teacher. 2. Monitoring by the ESE Specialist.	1. Classroom walk throughs. 2. Mastery of goals and objectives on the Individual Education Plan.	1. Florida Alternative 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By May 2012, 73% of students made learning gains in math. By May 2013, 76% of students will make learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (936/1286) of students made learning gains in mathematics	76% (961/1265) of students will make learning gains in mathematics

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. Both Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and Common Core Standards require higher order questioning through application	1. Professional Development to learn and understand the eight mathematical Practices. 2. Chapter Tests will be constructed to include FCAT style questions	1. Administration 2. Department Heads 3. Teachers by grade level will create chapter tests.	1. Administration 2. Department Heads 3. Teachers by grade level will create chapter tests.	1. Administration 2. Department Heads 3. Teachers by grade level will create chapter tests.

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:	By May 2012, 62% of students made learning gains in mathematics. By May 2013, 70% of students will make learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (6.2/10) of students made learning gains in mathematics using the Florida Alternative Assessment.	70% (7/10) of students made learning gains in mathematics using the Florida Alternative Assessment.

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. Cognitive ability can be in the intellectual disability level therefore it limits their ability and process to learn	1. The student will identify a specified part of a whole. 2. The student will follow three or more directional instructions in daily activities. 3. The student will match two different objects, symbols or pictures presented at the same time to identical objects, symbols or pictures using the concept of one to one correspondence.	1. Classroom teacher. 2. Monitored by the ESE Specialist.	1. Classroom walk throughs. 2. Masery of the Individual Education Plan Goals and Objectives.	1. Florida Alternative 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By May 2012, 54% of our students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics. By May 2013, 57% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (183/339)	57% (180/316)

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.Level one and two students inability to answer higher level questions.	1.Professional Development to learn and understand the eight Mathematical Practices. 2.Teachers will share "Best Practices" on how to connect concepts to real life examples. Continued training to ensure teachers understanding of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards	1. Administration 2.Department Head	1. Data Analysis 2.Data Chats	1. Classroom assessments 2.BAT Testing 3.FCAT
2	1. Students' participation and supplemental academic assistance	1.Encourage student participation in FCAT Camp. 2. Encourage student participation using Florida Achieves.	1. Administration 2. Department Head	1. Data Analysis 2. Data Chats	1.Classroom assessments 2. BAT Testing 3. FCAT 4. Mini BAT Assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # By the end of 2016-17 school year, we will decrease 50% of our non proficient students school wide.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67%	75%	78%	80%	83%	

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:	By May 2013, each subgroup will decrease the amount of students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 20% (64/316), Black 42% (138/329), Hispanic 38% (214/567), Asian 10% (8/78), American Indian 33% (1/3)	White 17% (50/297), Black 39% (130/333), Hispanic 35% (197/562), Asian 7% (5/78), American Indian 30% (0/0)

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. Teachers lack of knowledge in effective use of data to drive instruction	1. Teachers will attend workshops on differentiated instruction. 2. Teachers will use Differentiated Instruction strategies to motivate these students 3. Teachers will share Best Practices pertaining to motivating reluctant students	1. Department Head 2. Administration	1. Data Analysis 2. Data Chats	1. Classroom Assessments 2. September/November BAT Testing 3. FCAT 4. Mini BAT Assessment

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	By May 2013, students in English Language Learners (ELL) Subgroup will increase students proficient by 5%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (28/52) of the ELL subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in math.	59% (37/62) of the ELL subgroup will not make satisfactory progress in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	1. Lack of language acquisition by A1 and A2 ELL students	<p>1. Teachers will incorporate ELL strategies throughout the content area making modifications through modified assessments, extra time and peer buddy.</p> <p>2. Formative and cumulative assessments identified by the math department will be used consistently in every grade level to assess specific benchmark objective mastery.</p> <p>3. Students will use word walls to help with vocabulary acquisition</p> <p>4. Teachers will incorporate, but not limited to, ELL strategies i.e. visuals, demonstrations, graphs, webbing, T charts, demonstrations, peer buddy, small group activities, 1-1 instruction, etc.</p>	<p>1. Department Heads</p> <p>2. Administration</p>	<p>1. Monitoring and adapting lessons based on daily student progress.</p> <p>2. Small group instruction</p> <p>3. Tutorials</p> <p>4. Classroom Walkthroughs</p> <p>5. Increase achievement between assessments</p>	<p>1. Weekly Lesson Plan</p> <p>2. September/November BAT</p> <p>3. FCAT</p> <p>4. FAIR</p>
2	1. A1 and A2 students are not proficient enough in English to be mainstreamed into content area classes.	<p>1. Teachers will receive training on the use of ESOL strategies as stated in the Multicultural Matrix L and Addendum to assist in better meeting the ELL student's needs.</p> <p>2. New adopted Math series provides assistance on-line with translating in multiple languages.</p>	<p>1. Department Heads</p> <p>2. Administration</p>	<p>1. Instruction will include reteaching of deficient skills using differentiated instruction and alternative assessments.</p> <p>2. Students will be continuously monitored through mini assessments.</p> <p>3. Tutorials</p> <p>4. Classroom Walkthroughs</p>	<p>1. September/November BAT</p> <p>2. FCAT</p>
3	1. ELL students have varying levels of language ability and can be a barrier to learning in mainstream classrooms	<p>1. Students will be paired with bilingual students for additional support.</p> <p>2. Teacher will model and use simple and direct language to explain concepts.</p> <p>3. Teachers will use visuals and graphic organizers to help students' understanding of math concepts.</p> <p>4. Teachers will use formative assessments to monitor students' progress and focus instruction on what students need.</p> <p>5. Use of math item Specs</p>	<p>1. Department Heads</p> <p>2. Administration</p>	<p>1. Monitoring and adapting lessons based on daily student progress.</p> <p>2. Small group instruction</p> <p>3. Tutorials</p> <p>4. Classroom Walkthroughs</p>	<p>1. Weekly Lesson Plan</p> <p>2. September/November BAT</p> <p>3. FCAT</p> <p>4. Mini BAT Assessment</p>

6. FCAT Tutoring

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:	By May 2013, students in Students with Disabilities (SWD) Subgroup will increase students proficient by 6%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72.6% (106/146)of students with disabilities are not making satisfactory progress in mathematics	66% (96/145)of students with disabilities will not making satisfactory progress in mathematics

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. Insufficient support staff 2. Students with IEP's scheduled to be mainstreamed may require more individual instruction to achieve proficiency.	1. Based on assessment plan, supplemental instruction/ intervention will be available for students not responding to core instruction 2. Instruction will be determined by review of assessment data and will include explicit instruction, guided and independent practice.	1. Administration 2. ESE Facilitation	1. Mini Assessments 2. Monitoring 3. Small Group Instruction 4. Individual support	1. Classroom assessments 2. September/November BAT Testing 3. FCAT 4. MiniBAT Assessment
2	1. Students inability to adequately utilize math strategies	1. SWD will receive support through peer tutoring, exposure to Community School resources, in class assistance and support facilitator. 2. Teachers will provide tutorials and individualized instruction specific to student needs.	1. Administration	1. Mini Assessments 2. Monitoring 3. Small Group Instruction 4. Individual support	1. Classroom assessments 2. September/November BAT Testing 3. FCAT

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	By May 2013, students in Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Subgroup will increase students proficient by 4%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (258/589)of economically disadvantaged students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	40% (233/584)of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading.

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	1. Economically Disadvantaged students often lack the pre-requisite background knowledge and basic math skills.	1.As appropriate, teachers will use Differentiated Instruction strategies to meet specific learning needs.	1. Department Head 2. Administrators	1. Weekly Assessments 2. Data Analysis 3. Administrators	1. Classroom Assessments 2. September/November BAT Testing 3. FCAT 4. Mini BAT Assessment

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:	At the present time, our school does not have any Achievement Level 3 in Algebra
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0/90) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra	0% (0/90) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra

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.Lack of students' exposure to Pre-Algebra Skills 2. Students have difficulty keeping up with the expected pace of the curriculum.	1. Teacher will review Pre-Algebra skills upon identification of specific weaknesses 2. Students use on-line resources via beep to review and strengthen their skills	1. Classroom Teacher	1. Classroom walk throughs 2. Weekly chapter assessments	1. EOC 2. BAT 1 3. BAT 2 4. District Mid Terms and Finals

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:	During the 2012-2013, will strive to maintain 100% of our students to score at or above Achievement Level 4
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (90/90) of are students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Algebra.	100% (90/90) of are students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Algebra.

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	1. lack of exposure to necessary math skills prior to entering algebra 1 honors.	1. Teacher will review Pre-Algebra skills upon identification of specific weaknesses 2. Students use on-line resources via beep to review and strengthen their skills	1. Classroom Teacher	1. Classroom walk throughs 2. Weekly chapter assessments	1. BAT 1 2. BAT 2 3. County Mid Term 4. EOC

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 # During the 2010-2011 school year, 100% of our algebra students were proficient in mathematics on FCAT 2.0. We will continue to maintain 100% of our algebra students being proficient in mathematics.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	100%	Maintain	Maintain	Maintain	Maintain	

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:	We will strive to maintain 100% of students in all subgroups making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0/90) white (0/28), Black (0/18), Hispanic (0/25), Asian (0/16) students in are not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	0% (0/90) students will continue making satisfactory progress in Algebra

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. Lack of students' exposure to Pre-Algebra Skills 2. Students have difficulty keeping up with the expected pace of the curriculum.	1. Teacher will review Pre-Algebra skills upon identification of specific weaknesses 2. Students use on-line resources via beep to review and strengthen their skills	1. Classroom Teacher	1. Classroom walk throughs 2. Weekly chapter assessments	1. EOC 2. BAT 1 3. BAT 2 4. District Mid Terms and Finals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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. Algebra Goal #3E:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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:	We did not have Achievement Level 3 students participate in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of Achievement Level 3 students participated in Geometry	0% of Achievement Level 3 students are participating in Geometry

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. Lack of knowledge in the effective use of math strategies employed by content area teachers with fidelity	1. Students will use a variety of problem solving strategies, such as drawing a diagram, making a chart, guess and check, solving a simpler problem, writing an equation, and working backwards	1. Administration 2. Classroom Teachers	1. Informal Marzano observations 2. Classroom Walkthroughs will determine the actuality of the utilization of math strategies.	1. District Mid Terms and Finals 2. Bat I 3. BAT II 4. EOC
2	1. Time Frame / Pacing	1. Teacher and students will keep pace with the instructional focus calendar. 2. Fieldtrips, etc. will be kept at a minimum.	1. Classroom Teacher 2. Administration	1. End of chapter test 2. Weekly quiz 3. District Midterms and Finals	1. EOC 2. End of course Test 3. BAT 1 4. BAT 2 5. District Mid Terms and Finals

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:	For the 2012-2013 school year, we will continue to strive for 100% of students scoring at Achievement Level 4 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (34/34) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in Geometry.	100% (29/29) of students will continue to score at or above Achievement Level 4 in Geometry.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		1. The student will use	1. Classroom	1. Midchapter Quizzes	1. EOC

1	1. Lack of prior knowledge	properties of congruent and similar polygons to solve mathematical or real world problems	Teacher 2. Administrative Staff	2. End of Chapter Exams	2. End of course Test 3. BAT 1 4. BAT 2 5. District Mid Terms and Finals
2	1. Lack of prior knowledge	1. The student will classify, construct, and describe features and characteristics about polygons and solids (including area and volume).	1. Classroom Teacher 2. Administrative Staff	1. Midchapter Quizzes 2. End of Chapter Exams	1. EOC 2. End of course Test 3. BAT 1 4. BAT 2 5. District Mid Terms and Finals
3	1. Lack of prior knowledge	1. The students will apply trigonometric functions to calculate missing dimensions of triangles.	1. Classroom Teacher 2. Administrative Staff	1. Midchapter Quizzes 2. End of Chapter Exams	1. EOC 2. End of course Test 3. BAT 1 4. BAT 2 5. District Mid Terms and Finals

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 # During the 2010-2011 school year, 100% of our geometry students were proficient in mathematics on FCAT 2.0. We will continue to maintain 100% of our geometry students being proficient in mathematics.			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	100%	Maintain	Maintain	Maintain	

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:	During the 2012-2013 school year, we will strive to continue 0% of all subgroups not making satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0/34), white (0/13), Black (0/2), Hispanic (0/9), Asian (0/9) of the students are not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	0% (0/27) of students not making satisfactory progress will continue in all subgroups

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Lack of students prior knowledge	1. Additional resources are made available to the students for extra	1. Administration 2. Classroom	1. End of chapter Exams	1. EOC 2. End of course

1		assistance (Hotmath.com, Khanacademy.org)	Teacher	2. Weekly Quizes	Test 3. BAT 1 4. BAT 2 5. District Mid Terms and Finals
2	1. Lack of students prior knowledge	1. Teacher will spiral to previous lessons to reinforce prior knowledge (Algebra and Geometry)	1. Administration 2. Classroom Teacher	1. End of chapter Exams 2. Weekly Quizes	1. EOC 2. End of course Test 3. BAT 1 4. BAT 2 5. District Mid Terms and Finals

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:		NA			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
NA		NA			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
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:		During the 2012-2013 school year, we will strive to continue 0% of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0% (0/2) of students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in Geometry.		0%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	During the 2012-2013 school year, we will strive to continue 100% of our economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0/3) economically students did not make satisfactory progress in Geometry.	0%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
1. Sharing Best Practices for Math Practice for 1 and 2	1. 6-8	1. Arlene Colson 2. Math Teachers	1. Math Department	1. October 18, 2012	1. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. Differentiated Instruction for Math	1. 6-8	1. Tonys Burke	1. Math Department	1. November 8, 2012	1. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. CCSS Math Leadership Colloquium Power Point	1. 6-8	1. Arlene Colson 2. Math Teachers	1. Math Department	1. September 6, 2012	1. Classroom walk through	1. Administrators
1. STEMCAST Math Practice	1. 6-8	1. Arlene Colson 2. Math Teachers	1. Math Department	1. September 20, 2012	1. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. STEMCAST Math Practice	1. 6-8	1. Arlene Colson 2. Math Teachers	1. Math Department	1. October 4, 2012	1. Classroom Walkthrough	1. Administraton
1. Digging into the common Core Quiz	1. 6-8	1. Arlene Colson 2. Math Teachers	1. Math Department	1. October 11, 2012	1. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. ESE Math Training	1. 6-8	1. Arlene Colson 2. Math Teachers	1. Math Department	1. October 26, 2012	1. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. Administration
		1. Arlene				

1. STEMCAST Math Practices 3	1. 6-8	Colson 2. Math Teachers	1. Math Department	1. November 1, 2012	1. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. Administration
STEMCAST Math Practices 4	1. 6-8	1. Arlens Colson 2. Math Teachers	1. Math Department	1. November 29, 2012	1. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. Best Practices Math Practice 4 Defining the core shifts	1. 6-8	1. Arlene Colson 2. Math Teachers	1. Math Department	1. December 13, 2012	1. Classroom Walkthroughs	1. Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teach teachers with new common core state standards	Common Core State Standards Flipbooks	Accountability	\$165.00
			Subtotal: \$165.00
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: \$165.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	By May 2013, 43% of all students will achieve a proficiency level three on the 2012-2013 science FCAT assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (188/473) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Science.	43% (209/488) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Science.
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	1. Difficulty for 6th grade teachers to effectively cover all Earth and Space benchmarks during the school year.	1. Content collaboration will be utilized to allow teachers to unwrap the benchmarks together, lesson plan, and establish common assessments, and activities that efficiently cover the benchmarks 2. Modified IFC	1. Department Chair 2. Administration	1. Content collaboration opportunities 2. Unwrapping the standards 3. Common assessments 4. Common inquiry activities 5. Observation during classroom walkthroughs	1. Teacher generated weekly assessments 2. District developed science mini-benchmark assessment tests 3. Tool used to collect data during classroom walkthroughs 4. Feedback from teachers during content collaboration
2	1. Students struggle with the ability to read and comprehend abstract science concepts.	1. Teachers will incorporate reading strategies through science. Professional development in implementing common core reading in science Use of Science World magazines to increase student exposure to scientific articles	1. Administration 2. Department Chair	1. Teachers will use assessments to evaluate the student learning gains and adjust instruction as needed	1. District developed science mini-benchmark assessment tests Teacher generated weekly assessments
3	1. Student retention of concepts through 6-8 grades	1. Comprehensive tests that include material covered from previous topics 2. Use of selected instructional and review materials to be used to reinforce previous concepts throughout 6-8 grades 3. Modified IFC 4. FCAT camp	1. Department Chair 2. Administration	1. Teachers will use assessments to evaluate student retention and comprehension of benchmarks and adjust review materials as needed	1. Teacher generated weekly assessments
4	1. Student deficiency in problem-solving skills	1. Science inquiry training to science teachers 2. Hands-on as well as computed simulated inquiry labs	1. Department Chair 2. Administration	1. Review of lesson plans 2. Teachers will use Assessments to evaluate student gains in problem solving skills and	1. Activities documentation 2. Teacher generated weekly assessments
5	1. Reading and comprehension skills need to be elevated.	1. More effective use of cooperative learning groups 2. Increased use of real-world connections to science concepts 3. Professional development in implementing common core standards in science	1. Administration 2. Department Chair	1. Classroom walkthroughs	1. More effective use of cooperative learning groups 2. Increased use of real-world connections to science concepts 3. Professional development in

					implementing common core standards in science
6	1a.5. Teachers lack of detailed knowledge of Marzano's observation tool	1a.5. Trainings on design questions Sharing best practices used in the classroom	1a.5. Department Chair Administration	1a.5. iObservation	1a.5. iObservation feedback
7	1. Teacher's deficiency in increasing STEM practices in the classroom	1. Professional development 2. Sharing best practices	1. Department chair	1. Informal observations, walkthroughs	1. Mini BAT assessments 2. FCAT 3. End of Chapter Review

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:	During the 2012-2013 school year, we will strive to maintain all Level 4,5,& 6 students in science at their current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1/1) of students scored at Level 4,5, & 6 in Science.	We will strive to maintain 100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Lack of rigor within content instruction	1.PLCs focusing on improving comprehension using complex text.	1. Reading Coach and Dept. Chairs	1.Classroom Walkthroughs 2.Planbook Check	1. FAIR 2. BAT II 3. Mini BATS

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By May 2013, 25% of the students tested at a level 4/5 on the 2012-2013 science FCAT assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (82/473)students scored at Achievement Level 4 in science	25% (122/448)students will score at Achievement Level 4 in science

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. Lack of teacher knowledge in motivating higher functioning students to read outside of school	1.Teachers will collaborate during monthly dept. meetings on ways to keep students reading beyond the school	1.Administration Reading Coach	1. Informal observations and Classroom Walkthroughs	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BATS

		day.			
2	1. Not enough rigor within the curriculum to engage the higher functioning students	1. Attending District training on topics relevant to the development of higher functioning students; such as Socratic Seminar and strategies for teaching gifted/high achieving students. Grade level collaboration of lesson development	1. Administration Reading Coach	1. Informal observations and Classroom Walkthroughs Reflective conversations with teachers regarding lesson development	1. FCAT 2. FAIR 3. BAT II 4. Mini BAT
3	2a.1. Higher performing students need opportunities to improve abstract thinking and application of concepts.	2a.1. Increase in opportunities for student created science investigations Professional development and integration of STEM into higher performing science classrooms	2a.1. Department Chair Administration	2a.1. Lab investigation data and analysis Teachers will use Assessments to evaluate student gains in abstract thinking and adjust instruction as needed	2a.1. Lab reports, journals, presentations Teacher generated assessments
4	2a.2. Differentiated instructional strategies need to be further implemented to enrich level 4 or 5 students on a regular basis	2a.2. Training on using differentiated instruction strategies	2a.2. Department Chair Administration	2a.2. Classroom walkthroughs Review of lesson plans Review of science journals, reports	2a.2. Tool used to collect data during classroom walkthroughs Lesson plans Science journals, reports

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:		1		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
0% (0/1) students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 on the Florida Alternative Assessment		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				

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
Marzano Model Plan	Grade 6-8	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair	Science Teachers	October 4, 2012	Administration, Classroom walkthroughs	Administration
Content Training	Grade 6-8	Cindy Knoff, District Trainer	Science Teachers	As offered by the district throughout the 2012-2013 school year	Classroom walkthroughs	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair
Curriculum help/ Resources for all grades	Grade 6-8	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair	Science Teachers	October 11, 2012	Classroom walkthroughs	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair
Differentiated instruction training	Grade 6-8	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair	Science Teachers	October 18, 2012	Classroom walkthroughs	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair
Implementing Common Core Standards	Grade 6-8	Gloria Sekowski, Reading Coach and Tracy Schiller, Department Chair, and/or district trainer	Science Teachers	September 6, 2012	Classroom walkthroughs	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair
Effective STEM practices	Grade 6-8	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair Professional development workshop trainer	Science Teachers	October 25, 2012	Classroom walkthroughs	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT Camp	Providing tutoring for low achieving students as well as level 4's and 5's. Updated review materials for FCAT	Accountability	\$1,000.00
Science World magazine subscription	1 year subscription to Science world magazines		\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$1,300.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
GIZMO	GIZMO inquiry based, interactive software		\$7,200.00
Brainpop.com	interactive videos		\$1,495.00
			Subtotal: \$8,695.00
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: \$9,995.00

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	90% of the students taking the 2012/2013 FCAT writing assessment will score at a level 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89% (414/464)	92% (425/464)

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. Barriers would include, but not be limited to intergration of writing across the curriculum.	1. All 6th grade students will develop their writing skills through the Spring Board Curriculum with an emphasis on Conventions and Organization, as well as expository writing. 2. All 7th grade students will develop their writing skills through the Spring Board with an emphasis on Word Choice, Ideas, and Sentence Fluency, as well as persuasive writing. 3. All 8th grade students will develop their writing skills through the Spring Board with an emphasis on Voice and Word Choice as well as expository and persuasive writing	1. Administrator	1. Students will respond to a variety of activities based on the individual trait prompts every other month. 2. Teachers will provide corrective feedback and monitor writing progression.	1. September and December writing prompts
2	2. A change in the method by which the FCAT Writes is scored will lead to a greater needed emphasis for instruction in grammar and conventions.	1. An emphasis will be placed on developing student understanding of conventions and grammar in writing through continued utilization of the Six Trait Writing method.	1. Administrator	1. Tracking of student progress through the use of student writing portfolios.	1. Bi-monthly writing prompts.

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:	
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
1	1. Because students are group homogenously, the level 4 students may not get the individualized instruction they need.	1. Teachers will be trained on the effective use of Differentiated Instruction.	1. Administration 2. LA Dept. Head	1. Marzano informal observations	1. Monthly writing prompts 2. FCAT Writes
2					

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
1. Common Core State Standards	1. 6-8	1. Sekowski	1. Teachers	1. October 4, 2012	1. Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. New Materials	1. 6-8	1. Sekowski	1. Teachers	1. October 11, 2012	1. Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. Common Core State Standards	1. 6-8	1. Sekowski	1. Teachers	1. October 18, 2012	1. Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. Best Practice Grammer	1. 6-8	1. Sekowski	1. Teachers	1. November 1, 2012	1. Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. Common Core Standards	1. 6-8	1. Sekowski	1. Teachers	1. November 8, 2012	1. Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. Best Practices Elaborations	1. 6-8	1. Sekowski	1. Teachers	1. November 15, 2012	1. Walkthroughs	1. Sekowski
1. Best Practices Conventions	1. 6-8	1. Sekowski	1. Teachers	1. November 29, 2012	1. Walkthroughs	1. Administration
1. Best Practice Core Literature	1. 6-9	1. Sekowski	1. Teachers	1. December 13, 2012	1. Walkthroughs	1. Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To instruct teachers on the proper use of the new Spring Board Curriculum	District Training	Accountability	\$400.00
			Subtotal: \$400.00

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: \$400.00

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:	By May 2013, 50% of the seventh grade students will score a 75% or higher on the county EOC final exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	50% (237/474 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					
2	1. Lack of knowledge of expected state test EOC questions.	1. S.S. Civics teachers will train in conjunction with county offered workshops. 2. Teachers will share best practices with document based questions.	1. Department Head(s) 2. Teachers	1. Classroom walk throughs 2. Content collaboration.	1. County Civics Mid Term 2. State Civics EOC field test 3. County EOC final exam

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:	By May 2013, 60% of seventh grade students will score a 75% or higher on county EOC Final Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A		60% (285/474 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. Lack of knowledge of EOC Test questions.	Ongoing school and county training.	Department Heads	1. Classroom walk through 2. Data analysis based on mid term.	1. County Civics Mid Term 2. State civics EOC field test
2	2. Rigor appropriate for levels four and above is maintained for student progress.	1. Teachers share best practices. 2. Teachers attend county meetings.	Department Heads	classroom walk through	1. Classroom DBQs 2. County civics mid term.

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
1. Kids voting/Election Curriculum 2. Common Core 3. Best/Worst practices 4. Instructional goals/objectives	1. Textbook technology 2. Common Core 3. Best/worst practices 4. Instructional goals/objectives 5. Projects/Tests/Rubrics	Department Heads	Social Studies Teachers grades 6-8	Weekly PD meetings. Bi-monthly content collaboration	classroom walk through	Department Heads (Sande Hartman, Stephanie Suraci)

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Improve classroom instruction	Ancillary materials	Accountability	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
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
County training for Civics teachers.	County Civics trainings	Accountability	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:		To decrease the amount of students with excessive absences and tardies by 10%.			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
95.561%		97%			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
63		57			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
9		8			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Lack of student/Parent compliance	1. Utilize RTI Process 2. Inform Social Worker 3. BTIP 4. Parentlink to inform parents of absentism 5. After school detention	1. Attendance Clerk 2. Guidance 3. Administration	1. Data Warehouse reports to monitor both tardiness and absences. 2. Pinnacle to monitor attendance. Referrals/Detentions for tardiness	1. TERMS 2. Discipline Management System

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
1. RTI Training	1. All Middle school grades	1. Lili Francois	1. School wide	1. 1/17/2013	A folder will be created for each RTI Meeting with specific goals for a student. A timeline will be created to ensure intervention are being used and working. Adjustments will be made if necessary.	1. Administration
2. School wide attendance and tardy policy	2.All Middle school grades	2. Guidance/Administration	2. School wide	2. Pre-Planning Week	2. Teacher feedback and data chats	Administration

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:	By May 2013, reduce the amount of students that serve internal suspension and external suspension/AES by 10%
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
854	782

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
301	271
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
69	62
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
52	46

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. Non-compliance from students	1.Revise the Pro Active Discipline Plan 2.CHAMPS and Understanding Poverty training for the staff 3. Utilize Peer Court Mentoring identified students	1.Administration	1.Monitor the referrals issued. 2. Classroom Observations	1.Discipline Management System 2. Champs Rubric and The Basic 5

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
Ruby Payne's Understanding Poverty	Grades 6-8 in all subjects	Administrators Zone Behavior Specialist	All staff	Staff Development Days	Reviewing the discipline data	Administrators
CHAMPS	Grades 6-8 in all subjects	Administrators Zone Behavior Specialist	All staff	Staff Development Days	Reviewing the discipline data	Administrators
Discipline Plan/District Behavior Matrix	Grades 6-8 in all subjects	Administrators	All staff	Pre-planning Days and on going	Monitor referrals and conversations with staff	Administration

Suspension Budget:

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Based on 2012/2013 data of parent completed surveys, school will increase the return percentage by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
4.7% of parents responded to the Annual Customer Survey.	20% of parents will respond to the Annual Customer Survey.

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.Varied Languages of parents.	1.During the window of the survey, inform staff, students and parents of the importance of the information 2.Utilize the parentlink, newsletter and website to inform parents of the customer survey.	1.Administration 2. PTSA 3.Leadership Team	1.The percentage of returned customer surveys.	1.The Seventeen Annual Customer Survey

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
Communication/Conferencing Skills	All grades	Guidance Counselors, Administration	All grades and subjects	October 26, 2012 Teacher Planning day	Guidance Counselors to observe parent/teacher conferences	Administration

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
	1. Teacher's deficiency in increasing STEM	1. Professional development	1. Department Chair	1. Informal observations	1. Mini Benchmarks

1	practices in the classroom	2. Sharing best practices 3. Training on GIZMO	2. Walkthroughs	2. FCAT 3. End of chapter test
---	----------------------------	---	-----------------	-----------------------------------

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Effective STEM practices	Grade 6-8	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair Professional development trainer	Science teacher	November 2, 2012	classroom walkthroughs	Tracy Schiller, Department Chair
GIZMO training	Grade 6-8	Professional development trainer	Science and math teachers	November 2, 2012	Classroom walkthroughs	Tracy Schiller, Science Department Chair Arlene Colson, Math Department Chair

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	To instruct teachers on the proper use of the IMPACT Curriculum	District Training	Accountability	\$400.00
CELLA	Cella testing is to determine placement	\$800. will be needed to cover the cost of a substitute teacher.	Accountability	\$800.00
Mathematics	Teach teachers with new common core state standards	Common Core State Standards Flipbooks	Accountability	\$165.00
Science	FCAT Camp	Providing tutoring for low achieving students as well as level 4's and 5's. Updated review materials for FCAT	Accountability	\$1,000.00
Science	Science World magazine subscription	1 year subscription to Science world magazines		\$300.00
Writing	To instruct teachers on the proper use of the new Spring Board Curriculum	District Training	Accountability	\$400.00
Civics	Improve classroom instruction	Ancillary materials	Accountability	\$1,000.00
				Subtotal: \$4,065.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	GIZMO	GIZMO inquiry based, interactive software		\$7,200.00
Science	Brainpop.com	interactive videos		\$1,495.00
				Subtotal: \$8,695.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Content Area teachers to be instructed on infusing reading strategies into their curriculum	CRISS Training	Accountability	\$400.00
Civics	County training for Civics teachers.	County Civics trainings	Accountability	\$1,000.00
				Subtotal: \$1,400.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	To improve classroom instruction	Ancillary and Novels to complete class sets	Accountability	\$600.00
				Subtotal: \$600.00
				Grand Total: \$14,760.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The SAC Team will continue to meet with Departments Heads throughout the school year to ensure that the strategies established during the previous school are being implemented. Department Heads will attend SAC meeting once the BAT 1 & 2 are administered in September and December to communicate results to make revisions if needed. Parents, teachers, and administrators will continue to monitor the SIP to determine effectiveness, and make any necessary changes.

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

Broward School District WALTER C. YOUNG MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	81%	81%	89%	62%	313	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	68%	76%			144	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?	72% (YES)	67% (YES)			139	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					596	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District WALTER C. YOUNG MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	79%	91%	54%	301	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	68%	78%			146	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?	66% (YES)	74% (YES)			140	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					587	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested