# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: HERITAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Volusia

Principal: Carolyn Carbonell

SAC Chair: Judy Sterrett-Pegg

Superintendent: Dr. Margaret A. Smith

Date of School Board Approval: Pending School Board Action on December 11, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

## 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 | Carolyn Carbonell | BA Education MA Education Certifications School Principal Mathematics (6-12) Elementary Education Early Childhood Education Middle Grades Endorsement ESOL endorsement | 3 | 16 | 2011-B School, (54% R/52% M; 64% R/65%M; 58% R/60% M)* 2010-A School, AYP 74% (74% R/57% M; 65% R/67% M; 67% R/68% M)* 2009-Deltona High-C School, AYP 67% (47% R/71% M; 52% R/ 70% M; 45% R/58% M)* 2008-Deltona High-C School, AYP 67% (42% R/71% M; 50% R/74% M; 53% R/64% M)* 2007-Deltona High-C School, AYP 72% (39% R/69% M; 54% R/77% M; 54% R/73% M)* *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M) Based on the district evaluation system, Mrs. Carbonell has met all district competencies in the area of administration (highly qualified). |
| | | | | | 2011-B School, (54% R/52% M; 64% |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assis Principal | Maite Porter | BS Exceptional Student Education M.Ed Educational Leadership Certifications Exceptional Student Education Educational Leadership | 5 | 5 | R/65%M; 58% R/60% M) 2010-A School, AYP 74% (74% R/57% M; 65% R/67% M; 67% R/68% M)* 2009-A School, AYP 72% (73% R/69% M; 65% R/70% M; 69% R/69% M) * 2008-A School, AYP 92% (72% R/69% M; 68% R/70% M; 70% R/67% M) *  *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M)  Based on the district evaluation system, Mrs. Porter has met all district competencies in the area of administration (highly qualified). |
| Assis Principal | Elizabeth Johnson | BA Elementary Education M.Ed Educational Leadership Certifications Elementary Education (1-6) Gifted Endorsement Educational Leadership | 5 | 5 | 2011-B School, (54% R/52% M; 64% R/65%M; 58% R/60% M) 2010-A School, AYP 74% (74% R/57% M; 65% R/67% M; 67% R/68% M)* 2009-A School, AYP 72% (73% R/69% M; 65% R/70% M; 69% R/69% M) * 2008-A School, AYP 92% (72% R/69% M; 68% R/70% M; 70% R/67% M) *  *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M)  Based on the district evaluation system, Mrs. Johnson has met all district competencies in the area of administration (highly qualified). |
| Assis Principal | Joshua Wycuff | BS Communication M.Ed Educational Leadership Certifications Middle Grades English (5-9) Elementary Education (K-6) Educational Leadership ESOL Endorsement | 1 | 5 | 2011-Campbell Middle-C School, (37% R/33% M; 52% R/49% M; 50% R/50% M)* 2010-Campbell Middle-B School, AYP 74% (57% R/53% M; 62% R/65% M; 66% R/74% M)* 2009-Campbell Middle-B School, AYP 74% (58% R/57% M; 57% R/70% M; 55% R/76% M)* 2008-Campbell Middle-B School, AYP 82% (59% R/56% M; 63% R/64% M; 75% R/69% M)*  Based on the district evaluation system, Mr. Wycuff has met all district competencies in the area of administration (highly qualified). |

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESE Consultation/ Academic Coach | Jami Atkinson | BA Education MA Special Education Certifications Mentally Handicapped K-12 Physically Impaired K-12 Middle Schools Integrated | 14 | 4 | 2011-B School, (54% R/52% M; 64% R/65%M; 58% R/60% M) 2010-A School, AYP 74% (74% R/57% M; 65% R/67% M; 67% R/68% M)* 2009–A School, AYP 72% (73% R/69% M; 65% R/70% M; 69% R/69% M) * *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M) |
| ESE Consultation/ Academic Coach | Kristen Kuches | BA Elementary Education BA Business Administration Certifications Elementary 1-6 Math 5-9 ESOL Endorsement | 6 | 3 | 2011-B School, (54% R/52% M; 64% R/65%M; 58% R/60% M) 2010-A School, AYP 74% (74% R/57% M; 65% R/67% M; 67% R/68% M)* 2009–A School, AYP 72% (73% R/69% M; 65% R/70% M; 69% R/69% M) * *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M) |

| | | BS Elementary Education Certifications Elementary K-6 RESOL Endorsement Gifted Endorsement | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Coach | Judy Sterrett-Pegg | | 3 | 3 | 2011-B School, (54% R/52% M; 64% R/65%M; 58% R/60% M)*<br>2010-A School, AYP 74% (74% R/57% M; 65% R/67% M; 67% R/68% M)*<br>2009-Deltona High-C School, AYP 67% (47% R/71% M; 52% R/70% M; 45% R/58% M)*<br>*(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M) |

## 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 | New Teacher Programs (E3: Empowering Educators for Excellence, Individualized PD, ALT leader mentors, PAR teachers, peer classroom visits, other site visits) | Administration | 6/8/13 | |
| 2 | Leadership Opportunities | Administration | 6/8/13 | |
| 3 | Professional Development | Carolyn Carbonell | 6/8/13 | |
| 4 | PLC Activities | Administration | 6/8/13 | |
| 5 | Celebrations/Teacher Recognitions | Administration | 6/8/13 | |
| 6 | Network with Community and Business Partners | Carolyn Carbonell | 6/8/13 | |
| 7 | Promotion of School (Advertisement) | Carolyn Carbonell | 6/8/13 | |
| 8 | Student Showcase/Acknowledgement | Administration | 6/8/13 | |
| 9 | VSET Training | Administration | 6/8/13 | |

## 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 |
|---|---|
| None | N/A |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 72 | 4.2%(3) | 22.2%(16) | 41.7%(30) | 31.9%(23) | 36.1%(26) | 100.0%(72) | 19.4%(14) | 4.2%(3) | 27.8%(20) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Kristy Kuches | Math and Science Teachers | Professional Development | Professional Development, Class vistations, conferencing, and support |
| Judy Sterrett-Pegg | Reading and Language Arts Teachers | Professional Development | Professional Development, Class vistations, conferencing, and support |
| Jami Atkinson | Social Studies, ESE, and Elective Teachers | Professional Development | Professional Development, Class vistations, conferencing, and support |
| PAR teacher Vicki Banks | Elizabeth Coldiron | New Teacher | E3 Requirement |
| PAR teacher Vicki Banks | Altamont Coley | New Teacher | E3 Requirement |
| PAR teacher Vicki Banks | Courtney Kohler | New Teacher | E3 Requirement |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

# ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

<span style="color:red">Note: For Title I schools only</span>

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

Under Title I Part A our school works with outside agencies that provide specific services to targeted children and their families. These organizations team with our school to provide specific services to students, parents, and staff, including all special needs groups. It is the expectation of those involved in these partnerships that the activities and services will benefit the students by providing the children served with the support, tools, and materials they need to be ready to learn as they move down the appropriate path to graduation.

Programs supported by Title I at Heritage Middle School include:

--Family Center Para-professional who facilitates our extensive parent involvement program
--Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)

### Title I, Part C- Migrant

The District Migrant Education Program Coordinator, Migrant Advocates and Migrant Recruiters work together to provide services and support to the migrant students and their parents. The MEP Coordinator works with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met. The Migrant Education Program provides the following:

• Academic Assistance through credit accrual/recovery, tutoring, and summer school
• Translation services for parent/teacher conferences
• Parental support through parent/child activity nights and workshops on school success
• Migrant Parent Advisory Council (MPAC)
• Medical Assistance through referrals to outside community agencies
• Food Assistance through referrals to food assistance programs

### Title I, Part D

The district receives funds to support the N & D programs to accelerate the rate of student achievement and close the achievement gaps for students in these programs. Services are coordinated with district DJJ and Neglected programs.

Students are transitioned from DJJ centers back into the district schools with a transition plan to ensure academic and social success.

Title II

The district provides ongoing Professional Development in the core subject areas to ensure quality instruction and student success.

Title III

The District ESOL Coordinator and staff provide ongoing support and Professional Development to teachers to ensure instructional best practices are utilized. Teachers consistently progress monitor the ELL students to identify specific needs, target interventions/enrichments to ensure the appropriate pathway toward graduation.

Title X- Homeless

The school works closely with Pam Woods, Title X Coordinator, to ensure that homeless students have the materials and resources they need to be successful.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers the following non-violence and anti-drug programs:
• Student mentoring program
• Peer Mediation program
• Crisis training program (staff only)
• Suicide prevention program
• Anti-Bullying program for students and parents (Parent training 11/10/12, 11/14/12, 11/15/12, 10/05/12, 10/23/12, and 01/2013)
• Teens against violence by Domestic Abuse Counsel
• Drug Demand Reduction
• "Night Vision" through 7th grade Science
• Male Respnosibility Group/Female Respnsibility Group for at-risk students

Nutrition Programs

Heritage Middle School offers a variety of nutrition programs including:
• Free and Reduced Meal Plan
• Wellness Policy school plan
• Nutrition and wellness instruction
• Health instruction
• Personal fitness instruction

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Heritage Middle School offers Agriscience, Business, and Technology classes to all students.

Job Training

Heritage Middle School offers students' career awareness opportunities through guest speakers from business and industry and field trips to business and industry locations.

Our school offers students career awareness opportunities through Career and Technical Education in the Agriculture, Business, and Technology classes. Students are also offered the opportunity to develop leadership skills through Career and Technical Student Organizations such as FFA.

Other

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making by promoting the Multi-Tiered System of Supports. Ensures that educators are implementing the district's Progress Monitoring Plan (PMP) accessible through the K-12 curriculum link of the webpage and the VCS Problem Solving/RtI model (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) for those students who do not respond effectively to core instruction. For those students who do not respond positively to interventions beyond core, ensure that the school's Problem Solving Team (PST) is accessed as needed. Ensure adequate professional development is scheduled for faculty. School Psychologists will provide/facilitate training on skill building and understanding of the components of PS/RtI. Support the school's team in the completion of resource mapping (academic and behavioral) with focus on standard protocol interventions in order to enhance implementation of PS/RtI. Communicates with parents through school newsletters, relevant meetings, and the sharing of the parent link of the VCS Problem Solving/RtI website (under Psychological Services) in order to address the purpose of PS/RtI in meeting student needs and to address frequently asked parental questions. In addition, parents are provided information about PS/RtI at PST meetings.

School Psychologist: Assists schools in interpreting individual, class-wide, grade-level and school-wide data in order to develop appropriate targeted interventions linked to the academic or emotional/behavioral problem. Ensure that on-going progress monitoring is in place in the area of intervention to most appropriately determine the student's response to intervention. Provides professional development to staff on PS/RtI.

Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, support facilitation, and consultation. Encompasses Problem Solving/RtI practices when addressing the needs of ESE students with a focus on potential reintegration into General Education based on data.

Academic Coaches: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

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 school's RtI Leadership Team functions as a natural extension of the school's Problem Solving Team (PST). The school's PST includes RtI as an explicit step of problem solving and addresses individual as well as class, grade-level and school-wide issues. The PST is embedded in the infrastructure of the school. Core members of the PST are the principal, assistant principals, curriculum specialists, academic coaches, school psychologist, speech/language clinician, school counselors, school social worker, and ad hoc teachers. In addition, since parent collaboration is essential for the success of PS/RtI implementation, parent input will be actively sought to enhance student outcomes. The school's leadership team will focus PS/RtI meetings around two PLC essential questions: 1) "How will we respond when they don't learn?" and 2) "How will we respond when they already know it?" The team meets regularly to engage in the following activities: Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and the classroom level to identify student who are either meeting/exceeding expectations or those who are at risk for not meeting benchmarks. For those students who are at risk, tiered level supports are in place to address the deficits and to ensure grade-level proficiency as appropriate. For those students who are exceeding expectations, enrichment activities are in place to ensure acceleration of learning.

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 Problem Solving/RtI Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic, behavioral and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending,

Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures. Additionally, the MTSS Leadership team supports the implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

## MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network: FAIR, Differentiated Accountabilitiy (DA), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Progress Monitoring: FAIR, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation
Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA), Differentiated Accountabilitiy (DA)

End of year: FAIR, FCAT, End of Course Exams (EOC)

Frequency of Data Days: monthly for data analysis or as determined by principal

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided to staff through faculty meetings, grade level meetings, and individual teacher and parent consultations in order to provide greater understanding of PS/RtI. Training modules for each step of the Problem Solving/RtI process as well as an overview of PS/RtI is accessible through the PS/RtI link on the Psychological Services link of the district website. Specific training is provided on intervention design, data collection, and development of hypotheses and goal statements. School staff has access to web-based state training on PS/RtI. Job-embedded learning through academic and behavioral data analysis and progress monitoring will enhance the acquisition and application of PS/RtI.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal/Administrators: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making by promoting the Heritage Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). Encourages educators to implement extended core instruction (ECI) for those students who do not respond effectively to core instruction during the regular class time. Administrators ensure adequate professional development is scheduled for faculty to use ECI strategies for students to receive extended core instruction.

The Academic Coaches have placed bulletin boards in each of the grade-level hallways that give visual images of the morphemes and extension words. The Language Arts classrooms, led by the language arts contact, read and write about various topics that are relevant in the core curriculum classrooms. An example being that the 8th grade Language Arts classes read and write about the Holocaust which is a topic covered in the 8th grade Social Studies curriculum. The Language Arts classes also teach analytical writing, using textual evidence, a skill that is required in Science and Social Studies research papers, as well as in the Common Core Curriculum.

Heritage's media center specialist supports the school's literacy objectives by sponsoring several promotional reading programs including The World Tour, in which students are encouraged to read books and take RC quizzes or complete written reports to travel around the world and earn prizes, and "It's Your Lucky Day" in which students participate in a comprehensive oral reports on selected books to earn prizes. The center is also using Scholastic Book Fairs to offer inexpensively priced books to students and staff and the community. Students volunteering as aides in the center and participating in the book fair crew are responsible for completing job applications and interviews. The center supports the school's SIP goals by promoting technology support for students and staff by offering training and working with teachers and students to integrate multimedia productions such as Photo Story and Power Point into assessments and instructing students in responsible research, plagiarism and copyright laws.

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

The LLT works with staff members at faculty meetings, house meetings, department meetings, grade level meetings, and Academic Leadership Team (ALT) meetings. The LLT instructs and coaches the staff on implementation of the Multi-Tiered System of Support. The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) in conjunction with district personnel identifies literacy needs of the school by evaluating school core standards/ programs. LLT programs that are initiated through the School-wide Literacy Plan include Reading, Writing, and Conversing Across the Curriculum to support Common Core Standards that have been adopted by the state of Florida. One of these is the school-wide "Morpheme of the Week". Morpheme of the Week is a vocabulary program that the reading department initiated through instruction of Greek and Latin morphemes and words construction using these morphemes. The Media Specialist reviews a word per day on the school's morning news show using a power point. The classroom teachers then review the words as they needed within their subject areas.

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

PLC continued implementation
Reading across the curriculum
Writing across the curriculum
Conversing and Listening across the curriculum
School-wide Literacy Plan
School-wide Morpheme of the Week
School-wide Word of the Day
FEA/PTSA sponsored Book Exchange

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/18/2012)

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

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

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.

Every secondary school has the support of a Reading Coach to ensure that all teachers receive professional development related to current reading research and instructional pedagogy. All classroom teachers utilize effective reading strategies in order to meet the instructional needs of the students.

## *High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

## Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading will increase by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 27% | 32% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Teachers who are not familiar enough with literary strategies necessary to accomplish the rigor required by Common Core Standards | Train teachers to use High Impact Literacy Strategies that support achieving the Anchor Literacy Standards | Administrative Staff<br>Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches | Ongoing monitoring through VSET observations<br><br>Teacher records of reflections on literary strategy use | FAIR data, FCAT results, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 2 | Teachers who do not clearly understand terms or acronyms being used, and teachers using different terminology with students causes confusion. | Provide a common language that all teachers can use in collaboration and teaching. | Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches<br>PLC<br>Administrators | PLC meetings and minutes<br><br>Faculty meetings<br><br>Word walls | Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET), FCAT results |
| 3 | Teachers are unfamiliar with the Common Core curriculum. | All teachers working on students reading, writing, and conversing about what they are reading to support Common Core standards | Administrators<br>Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches<br>Teachers | VSET observations<br><br>lesson plans | FCAT results, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 4 | Challenges in working with students who exhibit behaviors which impede their learning. | Increase level 3's in reading. | Administrators<br>Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches | VSET observations<br><br>lesson plans | FCAT results, FAIR data, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 5 | Challenges of working with students who come from low SES backgrounds. | Ensure that all teachers receive professional development related to effective instructional strategies in reading | Reading Coach<br>Administrators<br>SES Tutoring Contact | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessment and teacher observation by administration | School-based Assessments, FCAT results, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 6 | Time for teacher collaboration as a follow up to professional development | Provide for uninterrupted teacher collaboration during PLC time | Administration and Reading Coach | Data collected from PLC meetings | Student outcomes |

| 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: | Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading will increase by 14%. |
|---|---|---|
| | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | 0% | 14% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Difficulty of finding high-quality lessons for students with cognitive disabilities that also address varying complexity levels | District training for teachers on the implementation of Unique Learning System for Access courses<br><br>Follow-up coaching provided by program specialists | Administration ESE Team | Check usage and implementation, as well as student progress data using Unique Reports<br><br>Administrative observation tools | Unique Reports FAA Scores |
| 2 | There is a need for more collaboration time amongst teachers of students with cognitive disabilities | Participation of Access course teachers in District's monthly Virtual PLC using webinar platform<br><br>Evaluation of the student's need to access more rigorous courses and change placement if necessary<br><br>Discussion of application of skills and knowledge at a higher level and in various settings | Administration ESE Team | District follow-up survey<br><br>Check student progress data using Unique Reports | Unique Reports Survey |
| 3 | Not all instruction has been consistently aligned to the NGSSS access points | Implement Access courses in all core academic areas, as well as Standards-Referenced Grading | Administration ESE Team | Check usage and implementation, as well as student progress data using Unique Reports<br><br>Administrative observations | Check usage and implementation, as well as student progress data using Unique Reports<br><br>Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5) in reading will increase by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 27% | 30% |

| 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 | Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated instruction, and deliver the instruction within the school day. | Teams (with the support of the coaching staff) will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to work collaboratively in collecting and analyzing data in order to plan effective differentiated instruction and enrichment. | Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data<br><br>Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Math assessment data, Science assessment data, FCAT results |
| 2 | More rigorous instruction is needed, with more opportunities for higher-level thinking skills. | Professional development on Charlotte Danielson's Framework 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques | Curriculum Team | Ratio of higher-level questions to lower-level questions will be assessed during walk-throughs and coaching provided to those with a low percentage of higher-level questions. | Walk-throughs |
| 3 | Availability of advanced reading materials | Acquire higher level reading materials for advanced students | Reading Coach, Media Specialist, and Administrator | Data collected from Media Center showing frequency of use of higher level reading materials | District Assessments and FCAT results |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2b: | Students scoring Achievement Level 7 in reading will increase by 1%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 70% | 71% |

| 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 | Difficulty of finding high-quality lessons for students with cognitive disabilities that also address varying complexity levels | District training for teachers on the implementation of Unique Learning System for Access courses<br><br>Follow-up coaching provided by program specialists | Administration ESE Team | Check usage and implementation, as well as student progress data using Unique Reports<br><br>Administrative observation tools | Unique Reports FAA Scores |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3a: | Students making Learning Gains in reading will increase by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | | | | 64% | | 69% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students with large gaps in reading achievement. | Intensive assistance in Reading will be provided by Intensive Reading teachers, assisted by the evaluation and monitoring of the administrative team. | Reading Coach, ESE Lead Team, Administrators | FAIR assessments will be analyzed three times each year.<br><br>FCAT Explorer and District Interim Assessments will be monitored monthly to note student | FAIR assessments<br><br>FCAT Explorer<br><br>District Interim Assessments |
| 2 | Teachers using data from available resources and progress monitoring assessments to target instruction in classroom. | Provide school based training on Pinnacle (Volusia Informational Management System) Gradebook and Insight reports | Department Chairs Reading Coach Administrators | Monitor District Interim Assessments | FCAT 2.0<br><br>FAIR assessments<br><br>End of course exams |
| 3 | Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated instruction, and deliver the instruction within the school day. | Teams (with the support of the coaching staff) will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to work collaboratively in collecting and analyzing data in order to plan effective differentiated instruction and enrichment. | Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data<br><br>Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Science assessment data, FCAT results |
| 4 | Lack of motivation for students to attend tutoring | Utilize the Multi-tiered System of Support to identify student needs, Extended Core Instruction | Reading Coach, Teachers, and Administrators | Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students using formative data. | School-Based Assessments and FCAT Results |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3b: | Students making learning gains in reading will increase by 4%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 67% | 71% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Not all instruction has been consistently aligned to the NGSSS access points | Implement Access courses in all core academic areas, as well as Standards-Referenced Grading | Administration ESE Team | Check usage and implementation, as well as student progress data using Unique Reports | Unique Reports FAA Scores |

| | | | Administrative observation tools | |
|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | Students in the lowest 25% making Learning Gains will increase by 5%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 58% | 63% |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anticipated Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated instruction, and deliver the instruction within the school day.</td>
<td>Teams (with the support of the coaching staff) will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to work collaboratively in collecting and analyzing data in order to plan effective differentiated instruction and enrichment.</td>
<td>Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data<br><br>Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students</td>
<td>Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Science assessment data, FCAT results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students in the lowest 25% are often students with disabilities, low SES and/or ELL. Many are affected by these multiple barriers</td>
<td>Provide in school tutoring in the areas of vocabulary, fluency, phonics, and comprehension instruction using scientifically based reading materials.</td>
<td>Instructional coaches, tutors, administration</td>
<td>Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students using formative data.</td>
<td>Reading assessment data, FAIR data, FCAT results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Challenges of working with students who come from low SES backgrounds.</td>
<td>Provide tutoring after school and during lunch.</td>
<td>Intervention Specialist and Administators</td>
<td>Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students using formative data.</td>
<td>District Assessments, Alternate Assessments, and FCAT Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students have an inadequate vocabulary.</td>
<td>The use of word walls in all classrooms<br><br>Implementation of Morpheme of the Week</td>
<td>Academic Coaches and Administrators</td>
<td>Increased formative and summative test scores</td>
<td>District Assessments, Alternative Assessments, and FCAT Results</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Reading Goal #<br><br>In 2012-2013, we will reduce the achievement gap in reading by meeting the Safe Harbor target (59% scoring proficient).<br><br>5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 54% | 59% | 69% | 73% | 76% | |

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: | In 2012-2013, each subgroup will reduce the achievement gap by meeting the Safe Harbor target listed below. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 61% proficient Black: 33% proficient Hispanic: 49% proficient Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A | White: 65% proficient Black: 40% proficent Hispanic: 54% proficient Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | We have a number of Hispanic students, some of which receive services in our ESOL program. | Ensure that all teachers receive professional development related to effective instructional strategies in reading for ELL Students. Follow up and coaching will be provided. | Reading Coach ESOL Teacher Administrators | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observation by administration. | District Assessments and FCAT results |
| 2 | Teachers and staff may not understand cultural differences related to students of varying backgrounds. | Continue VSET training, particularly in the components related to meeting individual student needs (Knowledge of Students, Assessing Student Learning, Respect and Rapport, etc.) | Administrators Peer Assistance & Review (PAR) Teachers | Ongoing classroom and teacher observations | Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 3 | Teachers and staff may not understand cultural differences related to students of varying backgrounds | Continue VSET training, particularly in components related to individual student needs (Knowledge of Students, Assessing Student Learning, Respect and Rapport, etc.) | Administrators and Instructional Coaches | Ongoing classroom and teacher observations/conferences | Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |

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: | In 2012-2013, the achievement gap for ELL students will be reduced by meeting the Safe Harbor target listed below. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 19% proficient | 27% proficient |

| | 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 | Challenges working with students who come ELL backgrounds with significant gaps in vocabulary | Provide high-quality vocabulary instruction throughout the day.<br><br>Teach essential content words in depth.<br><br>Use instructional time to address the meanings of common words, phrases, and expressions not yet learned | Instructional Coaches<br><br>Administration | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observation by administration. | District Assessements and FCAT results<br><br>Progress monitoring of weekly data using graphs/trend lines. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5D: | In 2012-2013, the achievement gap for Students With Disabilities will be reduced by meeting the Safe Harbor target listed below. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 20% proficient | 28% proficient |

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The individual needs of some students in the Exceptional Student Education program are not being met. | Provide intensive, systematic instruction on 3 foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the proficient level. Typically, these groups meet between three and five times a week, for 20 to 40 minutes | ESE Assistant Principal, ESE Lead Team | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments | FAIR<br><br>FCAT |
| 2 | The majority of our Students with Disabilities are below grade level. | Ensure that all teachers receive professional development related to effective instructional strategies in reading for SWD's. | Reading Coach and Administrators | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observation by Principal or designee | District Assessments and FCAT results |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5E: | In 2012-2013, the achievement gap for Economically Disadvantaged students will be reduced by meeting the Safe Harbor target listed below. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 47% proficient | 52% proficient |

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Challenges of working with students who do not have exposure to high-level academic vocabulary in their homes | Implementation of a school-wide literacy system that emphasizes a unified, systematic approach to the teaching of vocabulary using research-based strategies | Administration<br><br>Reading Coach<br><br>Literacy Leadership Team | Classroom Walkthrough<br><br>Literacy Leadership Team Meetings | VSET Observations Domain 3 |
| 2 | Challenges of working with students who come from low SES backgrounds. | Ensure that all teachers receive professional development related to effective instructional strategies in reading.<br><br>Implement MTSS | Reading Coach and Administrators | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessment and teacher observation by principal | District Assessments and FCAT results |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core | 6-8, all subjects | Administrators, CCSS Team | HMS Faculty | August 29<br>September 26<br>October 10<br>October 24<br>November 14<br>December 5<br>January 23<br>February 6 | VSET observations | VSET Administrator |
| Common Core State Standards Team Trainings | N/A | Volusia County Schools Professional Development Department | CCSS Team | September 7<br>September 14<br>September 28<br>October 12<br>November 2<br>November 16<br>January 11<br>January 25 | Common Core Trainings | Administrators |
| Specific Common Core Topics and Strategies | 6-8, all subjects | ALT Leaders, CCSS Team | PLC groups | bi-weekly | Meeting minutes | Administrators |
| State Common Core Conference | 6-8, all subjects | State Common Core Team | CCSS Team | June 18-21 | Common Core Trainings | Administrators |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Parent Liasion (part-tme) for Parent Center | 1 hour daily for 180 days | Title 1 Parenting | $3,648.60 |
| Supplies for Parent Programs | Materials and supplies | Title 1 Parenting | $3,083.40 |

|  |  |  | Subtotal: $6,732.00 |
|---|---|---|---|

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hire 1 AVID teacher | Teacher Unit | Title 1 AVID | $49,908.19 |
| Training | AVID Summer Institute | Title 1 AVID | $1,838.00 |
| Program activities | Tutors and field trips | Title 1 AVID | $3,763.81 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal: $55,510.00 |
|  |  |  | Grand Total: $62,242.00 |

*End of Reading Goals*

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. <br><br> CELLA Goal #1: | The percentage of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking on CELLA will increase by 3%. |

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Listening 85%

| 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 | Providing comprehensible instruction to English Language Learners | Data on ELL students language proficiency and achievement levels should be used for differentiated instruction | Administrators Reading Coach ESOL Teacher | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observations by principal | CELLA, IPT, FCAT, District Assessments |
| 2 | Providing comprehensible instruction to English Language Learners | Ensure that teachers use English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners | Administrators Reading Coach ESOL Teacher | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observations by principal | CELLA, IPT, FCAT, District Assessments |
| 3 | Providing comprehensible instruction to English Language Learners | Ensure that teachers receive professional development related to effective instructional practices for teaching ELLs. | Administrators Reading Coach ESOL Teacher | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observations by principal | CELLA, IPT, FCAT, District Assessments |

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

| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.<br><br>CELLA Goal #2: | The percentage of students scoring proficient in Reading on CELLA will increase by 3%. |
|---|---|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

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 | Providing comprehensible instruction to English Language Learners | Data on ELL students language proficiency and achievement levels should be used for differentiated instruction | Administrator Reading Coach ESOL Teacher | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observations by administrators | CELLA, IPT, FCAT, District Assessments |
| 2 | Providing comprehensible instruction to English Language Learners | Ensure that teachers use English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners | Administrator Reading Coach ESOL Teacher | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observations by principal | CELLA, IPT, FCAT, District Assessments |

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

| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br><br>CELLA Goal #3: | The percentage of students scoring proficient in writing on CELLA will increase by 3%. |
|---|---|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

15%

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Providing comprehensible instruction to English Language Learners | Data on ELL students language proficiency and achievement levels should be used for differentiated instruction | Administrators Reading Coach ESOL Teacher | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observations by administrators | CELLA, IPT, FCAT, District Assessments |
| 2 | Providing comprehensible instruction to English Language Learners | Ensure that teachers use English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners | Administrators Reading Coach ESOL Teacher | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observations by administrators | CELLA, IPT, FCAT, District Assessments |
| 3 | Providing comprehensible instruction to English Language Learners | Ensure that teachers receive professional development related to effective instructional practices for teaching ELLs. | Administrators Reading Coach ESOL Teacher | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observations by administrators | CELLA, IPT, FCAT, District Assessments |

CELLA Budget:

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

*End of CELLA Goals*

# Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| --- | --- |
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics will increase by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 29% | 34% |

| 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 who are not familiar enough with literary strategies necessary to accomplish the rigor required by Common Core Standards | Train teachers to use High Impact Literacy Strategies that support achieving the Anchor Literacy Standards | Administrative Staff<br>Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches | Ongoing monitoring through VSET observations<br><br>Teacher records of reflections on literary strategy use | FAIR data, FCAT results, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 2 | Teachers who do not clearly understand terms or acronyms being used, and teachers using different terminology with students causes confusion. | Provide a common language that all teachers can use in collaboration and teaching. | Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches<br>PLC<br>Administrators | PLC meetings and minutes<br><br>Faculty meetings<br><br>Word walls | Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET), FCAT results |
| 3 | Teachers are unfamiliar with the Common Core curriculum. | All teachers working on students reading, writing, and conversing about what they are reading to support Common Core standards | Administrators<br>Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches<br>Teachers | VSET observations<br><br>lesson plans | FCAT results, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 4 | Challenges in working with students who exhibit behaviors which impede their learning. | Increase level 3's in math. | Administrator<br>Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches | VSET observations<br><br>lesson plans | FCAT results |
| 5 | Challenges of working with low SES students | Offer after school and lunch tutoring to all students. | Academic Coach and Administrators | Classroom assessments | FCAT Scores |
| 6 | Time for teacher collaboration as a follow up to professional development | Monthly department meetings and provide uninterrupted time for teachers to create common formative assessments. | Academic Coach and Administrators | Data collected at department meetings | Student Outcomes |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| --- | --- |
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1b: | Students achieving a Level 4,5, and 6 in mathematics will increase by 6%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| 80% | 86% |
|-----|-----|

| | 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 | Difficulty of finding high-quality lessons for students with cognitive disabilities that also address varying complexity levels | District training for teachers on the implementation of Unique Learning System for Access courses<br><br>Follow-up coaching provided by program specialists | Administration ESE Team | Check usage and implementation, as well as student progress data using Unique Reports<br><br>Administrative observation tools | Unique Reports FAA Scores |
| 2 | There is a need for more collaboration time amongst teachers of students with cognitive disabilities | Participation of Access course teachers in District's monthly Virtual PLC using webinar platform<br><br>Evaluation of the student's need to access more rigorous courses and change placement if necessary<br><br>Discussion of application of skills and knowledge at a higher level and in various settings | Administration ESE Team | District follow-up survey<br><br>Check student progress data using Unique Reports | Unique Reports Survey |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | Students achieving above proficience (FCAT Level 4 and 5) will increase FCAT scores by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 23% | 26% |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated instruction, and deliver the instruction within the school day. | Teams (with the support of the coaching staff) will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to work collaboratively in collecting and analyzing data in order to plan effective differentiated instruction and enrichment. | Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data<br><br>Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Math assessment data, Science assessment data, FCAT results |
| | More rigorous instruction is needed, with more opportunities for higher- | Professional development on Charlotte Danielson's Framework 3b: Using | Curriculum Team | Ratio of higher-level questions to lower-level questions will be | Walk-throughs |

| 2 | level thinking skills. | Questioning and Discussion Techniques | | assessed during walk-throughs and coaching provided to those with a low percentage of higher-level questions. | |
| 3 | Limited participation in the Math Counts program | Publicize the Math Counts program more in advanced courses | Academic Coach, Department Chair, Math Counts Coordinator, and Administrators | Enrollment in Math Counts | FCAT Scores |

| 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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b: | Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics will increase by 4%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 10% | 14% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Difficulty of finding high-quality lessons for students with cognitive disabilities that also address varying complexity levels | District training for teachers on the implementation of Unique Learning System for Access courses<br><br>Follow-up coaching provided by program specialists | Administration ESE Team | Check usage and implementation, as well as student progress data using Unique Reports<br><br>Administrative observation tools | Unique Reports FAA Scores |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | Students making learning gains in mathematics will increase by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 65% | 70% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students with large gaps in reading achievement. | Intensive assistance in Reading will be provided by Intensive Reading teachers, assisted by the evaluation and monitoring of the administrative | Reading Coach, ESE Lead Team, Administrators | FAIR assessments will be analyzed three times each year.<br><br>FCAT Explorer and District Interim | FAIR assessments<br><br>FCAT Explorer<br><br>District Interim Assessments |

| | | | | Assessments will be monitored monthly to note student |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Teachers using data from available resources and progress monitoring assessments to target instruction in classroom. | Provide school based training on Pinnacle (Volusia Informational Management System) Gradebook and Insight reports | Department Chairs Reading Coach Administrators | Monitor District Interim Assessments | FCAT 2.0<br><br>FAIR assessments<br><br>End of course exams |
| 3 | Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated instruction, and deliver the instruction within the school day. | Teams (with the support of the coaching staff) will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to work collaboratively in collecting and analyzing data in order to plan effective differentiated instruction and enrichment. | Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data<br><br>Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Science assessment data, FCAT results |
| 4 | Lack of opportunity for students to attend tutoring | Provide ECI during lunch | Academic Coach, Teachers, and Administrators | Attendance records of those attending tutoring and monitoring their progress | FCAT Scores |

| 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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3b: | Students making learning gains in mathematics will increase by 6%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 44% | 50% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Not all instruction has been consistently aligned to the NGSSS access points | Implement Access courses in all core academic areas, as well as Standards-Referenced Grading | Administration ESE Team | Check usage and implementation, as well as student progress data using Unique Reports<br><br>Administrative observation tools | Unique Reports FAA Scores |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | Students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will increase by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 60% | 65% |

## 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 | Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated instruction, and deliver the instruction within the school day. | Teams (with the support of the coaching staff) will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to work collaboratively in collecting and analyzing data in order to plan effective differentiated instruction and enrichment. | Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data

Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Science assessment data, FCAT results |
| 2 | Students in the lowest 25% are often students with disabilities, low SES and/or ELL. Many are affected by these multiple barriers | Provide in school tutoring in the areas of vocabulary, fluency, phonics, and comprehension instruction using scientifically based reading materials. | Instructional coaches, tutors, administration | Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students using formative data. | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, FCAT results. |
| 3 | Lack of opportunity for students to attend tutoring | Extended Core Instruction during lunch. | Academic Coach, Teachers | Attendance records of those attending ECI and monitoring their progress | FCAT Scores |

---

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Middle School Mathematics Goal # |
|---|---|
| | 5A : In 2012-2013, we will reduce the achievement gap in mathematics by meeting the Safe Harbor target below (57% scoring proficient). |

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 52% | 57% | 65% | 69% | 73% | |

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: | In 2012-2013, each subgroup will reduce the achievement gap by meeting the Safe Harbor target listed below. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 58% proficient | White: 62% proficient |
| Black: 30% proficient | Black: 37% proficient |
| Hispanic: 49% proficient | Hispanic: 54% proficient |
| Asian: N/A | Asian: N/A |
| American Indian: N/A | American Indian: 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | We have a number of | Ensure that all teachers | Reading Coach | Ongoing monitoring of | District |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Hispanic students, some of which receive services in our ESOL program. | receive professional development related to effective instructional strategies in reading for ELL Students. Follow up and coaching will be provided. | ESOL Teacher Administrators | formative assessments and teacher observation by administration. | Assessments and FCAT results |
| 2 | Teachers and staff may not understand cultural differences related to students of varying backgrounds. | Continue VSET training, particularly in the components related to meeting individual student needs (Knowledge of Students, Assessing Student Learning, Respect and Rapport, etc.) | Administrators Peer Assistance & Review (PAR) Teachers | Ongoing classroom and teacher observations | Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 3 | Teachers and staff may not understand cultural differences related to students of varying backgrounds | Continue VSET training, particularly in components related to individual student needs (Knowledge of Students, Assessing Student Learning, Respect and Rapport, etc.) | Administrators and Instructional Coaches | Ongoing classroom and teacher observations/conferences | Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | In 2012-2013, English Language Learners (ELL) will reduce the achievement gap in mathematics by meeting the Safe Harbor target listed below. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 24% proficient | 32% proficient |

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 | Challenges working with students who come ELL backgrounds with significant gaps in vocabulary | Provide high-quality vocabulary instruction throughout the day.<br><br>Teach essential content words in depth.<br><br>Use instructional time to address the meanings of common words, phrases, and expressions not yet learned | Instructional Coaches<br><br>Administration | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observation by administration. | District Assessments and FCAT results<br><br>Progress monitoring of weekly data using graphs/trend lines. |
| 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 subgroup:

| | |
|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | In 2012-2013, Students with Disabilities (SWD) will reduce the achievement gap in mathematics by meeting the Safe Harbor target listed below. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | 18% proficient | | 26% proficient | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | 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 individual needs of some students in the Exceptional Student Education program are not being met. | Provide intensive, systematic instruction on 3 foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the proficient level. Typically, these groups meet between three and five times a week, for 20 to 40 minutes | ESE Assistant Principal, ESE Lead Team | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments | FAIR FCAT |
| 2 | The majority of our Students with Disabilities are below grade level. | Ensure that all teachers receive professional development related to effective instructional strategies in reading for SWD's. | Academic Coach and Administrators | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observation by Principal or designee | District Assessments and FCAT results |

| 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: | In 2012-2013, Economically Disadvantaged students will reduce the achievement gap in mathematics by meeting the Safe Harbor target listed below. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 47% proficient | 52% proficient |

| | 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 | Challenges of working with students who do not have exposure to high-level academic vocabulary in their homes | Implementation of a school-wide literacy system that emphasizes a unified, systematic approach to the teaching of vocabulary using research-based strategies | Administration Reading Coach Literacy Leadership Team | Classroom Walkthrough Literacy Leadership Team Meetings | VSET Observations Domain 3 |
| 2 | Challenges of working with students who come from low SES backgrounds. | Ensure that all teachers receive professional development related to effective instructional strategies in reading. | Academic Coach and Administrators | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessment and teacher observation by Principal or designee | FCAT Results |

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

# Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #1: | The percentage of students scoring Level 3 in Algebra will increase by 5%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 60% | 65% |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Teachers who are not familiar enough with literary strategies necessary to accomplish the rigor required by Common Core Standards</td><td>Train teachers to use High Impact Literacy Strategies that support achieving the Anchor Literacy Standards</td><td>Administrative Staff<br>Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches</td><td>Ongoing monitoring through VSET observations<br><br>Teacher records of reflections on literary strategy use</td><td>FAIR data, FCAT results, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET)</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Teachers who do not clearly understand terms or acronyms being used, and teachers using different terminology with students causes confusion.</td><td>Provide a common language that all teachers can use in collaboration and teaching.</td><td>Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches<br>PLC<br>Administrators</td><td>PLC meetings and minutes<br><br>Faculty meetings<br><br>Word walls</td><td>Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET), FCAT results</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Teachers are unfamiliar with the Common Core curriculum.</td><td>All teachers working on students reading, writing, and conversing about what they are reading to support Common Core standards</td><td>Administrators<br>Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches<br>Teachers</td><td>VSET observations<br><br>lesson plans</td><td>FCAT results, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET)</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Challenges in working with students who exhibit behaviors which impede their learning.</td><td>Increase level 3's in math.</td><td>Administrator<br>Reading Coach<br>Academic Coaches</td><td>VSET observations<br><br>lesson plans</td><td>FCAT results</td></tr>
</table>

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #2: | The percentage of students scoring level 4 in Algebra will increase by 2%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 12% | 14% |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated</td><td>Teams (with the support of the coaching staff) will meet weekly in</td><td>Coaching Staff<br>Administrator<br>Teachers</td><td>Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data</td><td>Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Math</td></tr>
</table>

| 1 | instruction, and deliver the instruction within the school day. | Professional Learning Communities to work collaboratively in collecting and analyzing data in order to plan effective differentiated instruction and enrichment. | | Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students | assessment data, Science assessment data, FCAT results |
| 2 | More rigorous instruction is needed, with more opportunities for higher-level thinking skills. | Professional development on Charlotte Danielson's Framework 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques | Curriculum Team | Ratio of higher-level questions to lower-level questions will be assessed during walk-throughs and coaching provided to those with a low percentage of higher-level questions. | Walk-throughs |

---

**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 # <br><br> In 2012-2013, we will reduce the achievement gap in mathematics by meeting the AMO targets below. <br><br> 3A : |

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 52% | 61% | 65% | 69% | 73% | |

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

| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <br><br> Algebra Goal #3B: | In 2012-2013, each subgroup will reduce the achievement gap by meeting the AMO target listed below. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 58% proficient <br> Black: 30% proficient <br> Hispanic: 49% proficient <br> American Indian: N/A <br> Asian: N/A | White: 66% proficient <br> Black: 48% proficient <br> Hispanic: 57% proficient <br> American Indian: N/A <br> Asian: N/A |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | We have a number of Hispanic students, some of which receive services in our ESOL program. | Ensure that all teachers receive professional development related to effective instructional strategies in reading for ELL Students. Follow up and coaching will be provided. | Reading Coach ESOL Teacher Administrators | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observation by administration. | District Assessments and FCAT results |
| 2 | Teachers and staff may not understand cultural differences related to students of varying backgrounds. | Continue VSET training, particularly in the components related to meeting individual student needs (Knowledge of Students, Assessing Student Learning, Respect and Rapport, etc.) | Administrators Peer Assistance & Review (PAR) Teachers | Ongoing classroom and teacher observations | Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3C: | In 2012-2013, English Language Learners (ELL) will reduce the achievement gap in mathematics by meeting the AMO target listed below. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 24% proficient | 40% proficient |

| 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 | Challenges working with students who come ELL backgrounds with significant gaps in vocabulary | Provide high-quality vocabulary instruction throughout the day.<br><br>Teach essential content words in depth.<br><br>Use instructional time to address the meanings of common words, phrases, and expressions not yet learned | Instructional Coaches<br><br>Administration | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments and teacher observation by administration. | District Assessements and FCAT results<br><br>Progress monitoring of weekly data using graphs/trend lines. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3D: | In 2012-2013, Students with Disabilities (SWD) will reduce the achievement gap in mathematics by meeting the AMO target listed below. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 18% proficient | 35% proficient |

| 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 individual needs of some students in the Exceptional Student Education program are not being met. | Provide intensive, systematic instruction on 3 foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the proficient level. Typically, these groups meet between three and five times a week, for 20 to 40 minutes | ESE Assistant Principal, ESE Lead Team | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments | FAIR<br><br>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: |
|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.**<br><br>Algebra Goal #3E: | | In 2012-2013, Economically Disadvantaged students will reduce the achievement gap in mathematics by meeting the AMO target listed below. | | |
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** | | |
| 47% proficient | | 57% proficient | | |

| 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 | Challenges of working with students who do not have exposure to high-level academic vocabulary in their homes | Implementation of a school-wide literacy system that emphasizes a unified, systematic approach to the teaching of vocabulary using research-based strategies | Administration<br><br>Reading Coach<br><br>Literacy Leadership Team | Classroom Walkthrough<br><br>Literacy Leadership Team Meetings | VSET Observations Domain 3 |

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

# Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

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

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

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

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

| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Geometry Goal # <br><br> 3A : |
|---|---|

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

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

| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <br><br> Geometry Goal #3B: |  |
|---|---|

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

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

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

| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <br><br> Geometry Goal #3C: |  |
|---|---|

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core | 6-8 all subjects | Principal | HMS Faculty | August 29 September 26 October 10 October 24 November 14 December 5 January 23 February 6 | VSET Observations | VSET Administrator |
| CCSS Team Trainings | N/A | Volusia County Schools Professional Development Department | CCSS Team | September 7 September 14 September 28 October 12 November 2 November 16 January 11 January 25 | Common Core Trainings | Administrators |
| Specific Common Core Topics and Strategies | 6-8 all subjects | ALT Leaders, Reading Coach, CCSS Team | PLC groups | bi-weekly | Meeting minutes | ALT leader |

Mathematics Budget:

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

*End of Mathematics Goals*

# Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define

areas in need of improvement for the following group:

| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a: | Students achieving level 3 in Science will increase by 5%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 39% | 44% |

| 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 who are not familiar enough with literary strategies necessary to accomplish the rigor required by Common Core Standards | Train teachers to use High Impact Literacy Strategies that support achieving the Anchor Literacy Standards | Administrative Staff Reading Coach Academic Coaches | Ongoing monitoring through VSET observations  Teacher records of reflections on literary strategy use | FAIR data, FCAT results, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 2 | Teachers who do not clearly understand terms or acronyms being used, and teachers using different terminology with students causes confusion. | Provide a common language that all teachers can use in collaboration and teaching. | Reading Coach Academic Coaches PLC Administrators | PLC meetings and minutes  Faculty meetings  Word walls | Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET), FCAT results |
| 3 | Teachers are unfamiliar with the Common Core curriculum. | All teachers working on students reading, writing, and conversing about what they are reading to support Common Core standards | Administrators Reading Coach Academic Coaches Teachers | VSET observations  lesson plans | FCAT results, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 4 | Challenges in working with students who exhibit behaviors which impede their learning. | Increase level 3's in reading. | Administrators Reading Coach Academic Coaches | VSET observations  lesson plans | FCAT results, FAIR data, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 5 | Challenges of working with studetns from low SES families. | Teachers are giving common formative assessments and comparing data at bi-weekly department meeting | Department Chair and Administrators | Summative Assessments and County DA Assessment. | Assessment and FCAT Results |

| 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: | Students scoring at Achievement Levels 4, 5, or 6 in science will increase by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 50% | 60% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Difficulty of finding high-quality lessons for students with cognitive disabilities that also address varying complexity levels | District training for teachers on the implementation of Unique Learning System for Access courses<br><br>Follow-up coaching provided by program specialists | Administration ESE Team | Check usage and implementation, as well as student progress data using Unique Reports<br><br>Administrative observation tools | Unique Reports FAA Scores |
| 2 | There is a need for more collaboration time amongst teachers of students with cognitive disabilities | Participation of Access course teachers in District's monthly Virtual PLC using webinar platform<br><br>Evaluation of the student's need to access more rigorous courses and change placement if necessary<br><br>Discussion of application of skills and knowledge at a higher level and in various settings | Administration ESE Team | District follow-up survey<br><br>Check student progress data using Unique Reports | Unique Reports Survey |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5) will increase FCAT scores by 1%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 17% | 18% |

| 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 | Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated instruction, and deliver the instruction within the school day. | Teams (with the support of the coaching staff) will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to work collaboratively in collecting and analyzing data in order to plan effective differentiated instruction and enrichment. | Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data<br><br>Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Math assessment data, Science assessment data, FCAT results |
| 2 | More rigorous instruction is needed, with more opportunities for higher-level thinking | Professional development on Charlotte Danielson's Framework 3b: Using Questioning and | Curriculum Team | Ratio of higher-level questions to lower-level questions will be assessed during walk-throughs and coaching | Walk-throughs |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | skills. | Discussion Techniques | | provided to those with a low percentage of higher-level questions. | |
| 3 | Lack of hands-on experiments during class | Students are engaged in more labs which require higher cognitive skills.<br><br>Utilize the Science Olympiad program | Science Teachers | Lab Write-Ups and Assessments | FCAT Results |

| |
|---|
| 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.<br><br>Science Goal #2b: | Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science will increase by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 50% | 60% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Difficulty of finding high-quality lessons for students with cognitive disabilities that also address varying complexity levels | District training for teachers on the implementation of Unique Learning System for Access courses<br><br>Follow-up coaching provided by program specialists | Administration ESE Team | Check usage and implementation, as well as student progress data using Unique Reports<br><br>Administrative observation tools | Unique Reports FAA Scores |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core State Standards | 6-8 all subjects | Administrators, CCSS Team | HMS Faculty | August 29 September 26 October 10 November 14 December 5 January 23 February 6 | VSET Observations | VSET Administrator |
| | | | | September 7 | | |

| Core Team Trainings | N/A | Volusia County Schools Professional Development Department | CCSS Team | September 14 September 28 October 12 November 2 November 16 January 11 January 25 | Common Core Trainings | Administrators |
| Specific Common Core Topics and Strategies | 6-8 all subjects | ALT Leaders, CCSS Team | PLC groups | bi-weekly | Meeting minutes | Administrators |

Science Budget:

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

*End of Science Goals*

# Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. <br><br> Writing Goal #1a: | Students scoring proficient (FCAT 3.0 or higher) in writing will increase by 2%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 84% proficient | 86% proficient |
| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Students do not have | Use of writing samples | Department Chair | Scores on Volusia | Florida Writes |

| | | | | Writes Assessment | Results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | adequate background knowledge in writing. | and visual guides as models. Practice writing. | and Administrators | | |
| 2 | Challenges of working with students from low SES backgrounds. | Using grade level common writing assessments and rubrics across all levels | Department Chair and Administrators | Scores on common assessment rubrics | Florida Writes Results |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.<br><br>Writing Goal #1b: | Students scoring at Achievement Level 4 or higher in writing will maintain current level of performance. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 100% | 100% |

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students do not have adequate background knowledge in writing. | Use of writing samples and visual guides as models. Practice writing. | ESE Teacher | Scores on Florida Alternate Assessment (Writing) | Florida Alternate Assessment |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core State Standards | 6-8 all subjects | Administrators, CCSS Team | HMS Faculty | August 29 September 26 October 10 November 14 December 5 January 23 February 6 | VSET Observations | VSET Administrator |
| Specific Common Core Topics and Strategies | 6-8 all subjects | ALT Leaders, CCSS Team | PLC groups | bi-weekly | Meeting minutes | Administrators |
| Common Core Team Trainings | N/A | Volusia County Schools Professional Development Department | HMS Faculty | September 7 September 14 September 28 October 12 November 2 November 16 January 11 January 25 | Common Core Trainings | Administrators |

Writing Budget:

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

*End of Writing Goals*

# Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Teachers who are not familiar enough with literary strategies necessary to accomplish the rigor required by Common Core Standards | Train teachers to use High Impact Literacy Strategies that support achieving the Anchor Literacy Standards | Administrative Staff Reading Coach Academic Coaches | Ongoing monitoring through VSET observations

Teacher records of reflections on literary strategy use | FAIR data, FCAT results, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 2 | Teachers who do not clearly understand terms or acronyms being used, and teachers using different terminology with students causes confusion. | Provide a common language that all teachers can use in collaboration and teaching. | Reading Coach Academic Coaches PLC Administrators | PLC meetings and minutes

Faculty meetings

Word walls | Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET), FCAT results |
| | Teachers are unfamiliar with the Common Core | All teachers working on students reading, | Administrators Reading Coach | VSET observations | FCAT results, Volusia System |

| 3 | curriculum. | writing, and conversing about what they are reading to support Common Core standards | Academic Coaches Teachers | lesson plans | for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |
| 4 | Challenges in working with students who exhibit behaviors which impede their learning. | Increase level 3's in reading. | Administrators Reading Coach Academic Coaches | VSET observations lesson plans | FCAT results, FAIR data, Volusia System for Empowering Teachers (VSET) |

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.<br><br>Civics Goal #2: | N/A |
|---|---|
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** |
| N/A | N/A |

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |

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

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

*End of Civics Goals*

# Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Attendance<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | The attendance rate will increase by 1% |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 96% | 97% |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 277 | 260 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 411 | 389 |

| 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 | Inconsistent Enforcement of Tardy Policy | Utilize a school-wide tardy policy. | Administrators, Teachers, Campus Advisors | Decrease in tardies | Tardy Data (Pinnacle), Referral Data, Observation |

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 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<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | The number of in-shool and out-of-school suspensions will decrease by 10%. |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 618 | 557 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 234 | 211 |

| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
|---|---|
| 451 | 406 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 195 | 175 |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students' behavior in the classroom | Alternative Classroom Management Professional Development | Academic Coaches and Administration | Reduced rate of suspensions | Suspension Data |

---

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

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

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

---

Suspension Budget:

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

| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | Subtotal: | $0.00 |
| | | Grand Total: | $0.00 |

# 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<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>*\*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | To earn 5 Star Award for the second year in a row by increasing parent involvement at school functions by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| Received 5 Star Award | Maintain current status of 5 Star Award |

| 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 | Few non-members involved in School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings or functions | Increase advertisement of SAC meetings and activities. | SAC Chairs, Administration | Meeting minutes and sign-in sheets | 5 Star School criteria |
| 2 | Low membership in PTSA | Recruit and retain new PTSA members. | PTSA President, Administrators | Meeting minutes and sign-in sheets | Membership dues |
| 3 | Less than desired attendance at parent breakfasts: iMoms and AllPro Dad | Advertise free breakfast in a variety of ways | Sonia Pina | Sign-in sheets | Parent Exit Cards |

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g. , frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| No Data Submitted |
| --- |

---

STEM Budget:

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

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 | Parent Liasion (part-tme) for Parent Center | 1 hour daily for 180 days | Title 1 Parenting | $3,648.60 |
| Reading | Supplies for Parent Programs | Materials and supplies | Title 1 Parenting | $3,083.40 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $6,732.00 |

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

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

| Other | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Hire 1 AVID teacher | Teacher Unit | Title 1 AVID | $49,908.19 |
| Reading | Training | AVID Summer Institute | Title 1 AVID | $1,838.00 |
| Reading | Program activities | Tutors and field trips | Title 1 AVID | $3,763.81 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $55,510.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: $62,242.00 |

# Differentiated Accountability

**School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance**

| jn Priority | jn Focus | jn Prevent | jn NA |
|---|---|---|---|

Are you a reward school:  jn Yes  jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/27/2012)

# School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
|---|---|
| No data submitted | |

Goals for the 2012-2013 Heritage Middle School School Advisory Council
1. To increase membership
2. To provide more trainings on educational issues

The Heritage Middle School Advisory Council (SAC) serves in an advisory capacity on a variety of issues related to the operation of Heritage Middle School. In addition to reviewing and evaluating any requests for SAC funding, the parents, teachers, staff, and community leaders serving on SAC also assist as liaisons to the community regarding issues affecting education and Heritage Middle. A representative from the HMS SAC serves on the district's District Advisory Committee (DAC) to represent Heritage.

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

**Volusia School District**
**HERITAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL**
**2010-2011**

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 74% | 67% | 95% | 64% | 300 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 65% | 66% | | | 131 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>• Improve FCAT Levels<br>• Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>• Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 67% (YES) | 68% (YES) | | | 135 | 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 | | | | | 566 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

**Volusia School District**
**HERITAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL**
**2009-2010**

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 73% | 69% | 96% | 51% | 289 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 65% | 70% | | | 135 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>• Improve FCAT Levels<br>• Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>• Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 69% (YES) | 69% (YES) | | | 138 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 562 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |