

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: DIPLOMAT MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Angela Roles

SAC Chair: Judy Dennison

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph P. Burke

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 9/25/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Angela Roles	Degrees: BS – Mathematics, Florida Atlantic Univ.; MS – Ed Leadership, Nova Southeastern; Certifications: Mathematics 6-12, School Principal (All Levels)	7	12	2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 77% Math Mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 52% Writing Mastery: 94% 2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 77% Math Mastery: 72% Science Mastery: 47% Writing Mastery: 95% 2008-09. Grade: A Reading Mastery: 75% Math Mastery: 72% Science Mastery: 50% Writing Mastery: 99% AYP: Hispanics & Econ Disadv did not make AYP in Math, but we made safe harbor target 2007-08: Grade: A

					Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 48% Writing Mastery: 94%
Assis Principal	Linda K. Boyle	Degrees: BA – English Education, University of South Florida MS - Walden University Certifications: Ed Leadership K-12; English 6-12 ESOL Endorsement		8	Mrs. Boyle has been at the District Office overseeing School Improvement for the District. She is experienced in data analysis and coaching schools how to use data to improve student achievement. District Grade 11-12 - B 10-11 - A 09-10 - A
Assis Principal	Joan Massop-Fruitt	Degrees: BS – Human Development K-8 and Special Education K-12, Lee University; MS Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University; Certifications: Educational Leadership (All Levels), Elementary Education 1-6, English For Speakers of Other Languages Endorsement, Reading Endorsement, School Principal (All Levels), Varying Exceptionalities K-12	6	6	2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 77% Math Mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 52% Writing Mastery: 94% 2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 77% Math Mastery: 72% Science Mastery: 47% Writing Mastery: 95% 2008-09. Grade: A Reading Mastery: 75% Math Mastery: 72% Science Mastery: 50% Writing Mastery: 99% AYP: Hispanics & Econ Disadv did not make AYP in Math, but we made safe harbor target 2007-08: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 48% Writing Mastery: 94%

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Dr. Natalka Hromiak	Bachelor of Arts in English w/ a Minor in Education M.A. in English Literature Ed.D. in Teaching in Curriculum Certification: Middle Grades 5-9 Endorsements: Reading, ESOL, Gifted	9	1	2011-2012 2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mstery: 77% Math Mastery: 74% Science Mastery: 52% Writing Mastery: 94% 2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 77% Math Mastery: 72% Science Mastery: 47% Writing Mastery: 95%

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal- Ms. Boyle	Ongoing	
2	2. Following up with Highly Qualified plans.	Ms. Roles	Ongoing	

3	3. Mentoring	Veteran teachers to our school	Ongoing
---	--------------	--------------------------------	---------

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0% of Diplomat Middle Teachers are teaching out of field.	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
55	3.6%(2)	25.5%(14)	40.0%(22)	30.9%(17)	40.0%(22)	92.7%(51)	14.5%(8)	9.1%(5)	27.3%(15)

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
Natalika Hromiak	Lyndi Lukes	Similar certification	The mentor and mentee are meeting monthly in a professional learning community to discuss evidence-based strategies for each domain. The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee. Time is given for the feedback, coaching, and planning.
Sandra Villela	Peggy Walsh-Heffner	Similar certification	The mentor and mentee are meeting monthly in a professional learning community to discuss evidence-based strategies for each domain. The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee. Time is given for the feedback, coaching, and planning.
Beth Crosby	Mecheco Norwood	Similar certification	The mentor and mentee are meeting monthly in a professional learning community to discuss evidence-based strategies for each domain. The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee. Time is given for the feedback, coaching, and planning.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title I coordinates with other programs funded under NCLB through the SIP (School Improvement Plan) process. Within this plan, schools complete a Professional Development Plan in collaboration with Title II. The PDP is concentrated in reading, math, science and writing to meet the needs of the targeted subgroups not making annual AMO targets. The PDP includes teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators. As part of the School Advisory Council, parents are included in this planning process. Each school completes a needs assessment before writing goals for the year. School improvement plans are written to ensure compliance with all state and national regulations. This collaboration ensures that all programs funded under NCLB use funds to support schools, not supplant district obligations. All school improvement plans are reviewed at the district level for appropriate use of funds and effectiveness. This district level review prevents duplication of services and facilitates coordination between agencies. Each school's SIP is reviewed by all stakeholders and submitted to the Board for approval. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Title III

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title III to expand academic enrichment opportunities for ELLs. These services include after school tutorials, professional development, supplemental scientifically research based resources and materials. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Title X- Homeless

Title X coordinates with Title I, Part A, to provide comparable services to homeless children who are not attending Title I schools. By providing ongoing collaboration between Title X and Title I, Part A, program staff, the same services for homeless students in Non-Title I schools are provided to homeless students in Title I schools. In addition to serving homeless students not enrolled in Title I schools, set-aside funds are used to provide services to homeless students who are attending Title I schools. Homeless students who attend Title I school-wide or targeted assistance schools may have unique challenges that are not addressed by the regular Title I program at these schools. These challenges may create barriers to full participation in Title I programs and defeat the overarching program goal of helping all students meet challenging state standards. For instance, students residing in shelters, motels, or other overcrowded conditions may not have a quiet place to study at the end of the day and may require extended after-school library time; tutoring and/or accessibility to tutoring as needed, school supplies, expedited evaluations, extended days/ learning opportunities, Saturday schools, summer academic camps, coordination of services with shelters or other homeless service providers, or, a student who is dealing with the stress and anxiety associated with homelessness may not be able to focus on his or her studies and may benefit from school counseling services. Through Title I, Part A, or Title I, Part A, in conjunction with Title X, McKinney-Vento funding homeless students can take part in services that enable them to benefit more from a school's Title I program.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI is used to provide unique learning programs at schools. SAI funds are also used to fund summer school programs throughout the District. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Violence Prevention Programs

The Youth Coalitions within Lee County provide opportunities for partnerships between the District and other social services. These social services assist all at-risk students through after-school programs that include academic, social, and health services. Anticipated outcomes include a safe environment for children and increased academic achievement. Bullying prevention programs are offered throughout the District. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Nutrition Programs

Food and Nutrition Services offers healthy meals to all students. This includes ensuring that families are offered free and reduced lunch applications throughout the year. All students receive free breakfast at all school locations. Many Title I schools have also developed "Backpack Programs" in which nutritious food is sent home in a backpack each weekend to struggling families to ensure that children and families have food throughout the week. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Blended Head Start/Title 1/VPK/Migrant early childhood classrooms will be located on the school's campus. High risk students will attend a year long, high quality early childhood program that serves four year old children. The goal of the program is to prepare children for kindergarten by meeting the federal Head Start Framework for School Readiness and State Standards for Four Year Olds that are aligned with the Common Core Standards. The expected outcome is that enrolled children who complete the program will be deemed ready for kindergarten on the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screening (FLKRS).

Adult Education

Adult Education partners with several Title I schools to offer ESOL classes for parents to learn English. Adult Education partners with Title I, Part A to offer paraprofessional classes to prepare paraprofessionals to take the qualifying test, ParaPro. Adult Education instructors review reading, math and writing skills, as well as test administration. Title I paraprofessionals benefit by becoming highly qualified as defined by NCLB. The benefit of these classes is to help the monolingual parents learn English so that they can become more self-sufficient. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Career and Technical Education

The district provides extensive opportunity for Career and Technical Education including Industry Certification. Each attendance zone also includes a comprehensive high school with career academies.

Job Training

The district provides extensive opportunity for Career and Technical Education including Industry Certification. Each attendance zone also includes a comprehensive high school with career academies.

Other

Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS Problem-Solving Team for Diplomat Middle School consists of the following members:
Caroline Toadvine - Guidance Counselor
Gary Carden -Guidance Counselor
Linda Boyle Assistant Principal
Joan Massop-Fruitt- Assistant Principal

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

The MTSS Problem-Solving team at Diplomat Middle School meets on a monthly basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to identify students in need of further support and monitor the progress of students receiving interventions to ensure that the needs of all students are being met within a multi-tiered system of student supports. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's MTSS Manual. The roles of each member are as follows:
Principal/Assistant Principal

- Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in your building
- Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
- Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible

- Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process
 - Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity
- Guidance Counselor/Curriculum Specialist
- Often MTSS Team facilitators
 - Schedule and attend MTSS Team meetings
 - Maintain log of all students involved in the MTSS process
 - Send parent invites
 - Complete necessary MTSS forms
 - Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested

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

The MTSS Leadership Team assists with the analysis of school, classroom, and student level data in order to identify areas for school improvement. Additionally, the team assists with the evaluation of the student response to current interventions, curricula, and school systems.

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.

Diplomat Middle School utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics. This allows the school comprehensive access to all school and district databases, thereby assisting with the detailed analysis of district, school, classroom, and student level data. These analyses assist with the tracking of student progress, management of diagnostic, summative, and formative assessment data, and the response of students to implemented interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Lee County School District has developed a comprehensive training and support plan for schools. District level support personnel have been hired to sustain the implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process for all students within schools. They provide training, coaching, modeling, data analysis, and guidance to assist schools with the implementation of supplemental and intensive strategies designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs within a multi-tiered system of student supports.

Personnel are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, behavior management techniques, and ESOL strategies, and are provided on-going staff development training regarding the MTSS problem-solving process and research based practices to support the academic and behavioral needs of students within a multi-tiered student support system.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team for Diplomat Middle School consists of the following members:
Leidy Monteagudo, Alex Caldwell, Mitch Player, Nataalka Hromiak, Valerie LaPlante, Angela Roles, Joan Fruitt, Sandra Villela, David Migliore, and Linda Boyle.

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

Representatives from each subject area meet once a month to communicate and collaborate on reading strategies used in the classroom. Between meetings, members of the team meet with their PLCs to share what was discussed at the last meeting and continue our school's ongoing efforts to promote school-wide literacy initiatives.

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

This year's focus is on strategies that work across all content areas to promote learning and higher order thinking. In addition, morphology will be taught school-wide at each grade level in all content area classes. Additionally, the PLCs across the curriculum are working on text complexity to align with the Common Core Standards.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Teachers will discuss content area reading strategies every month within subject area PLCs and will collaborate to review and plan using data. PLCs will work to identify text to use in classroom instruction with appropriate text complexity, aligning with Common Core Standards.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:		There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:		In 2011-12, 64% of our students made learning gains on FCAT Reading. In 2012-2013, we will improve to 67% as measured by the School Accountability Report.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
The percentage of students making learning gains in 2012 was 64%.		The expected level of performance for the students making learning gains in 2013 is 67%.			
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
	Data needs to be gathered in order for basic reading skills to be	The school will administer the FAIR assessment to monitor student progress.	1. Principal and reading coach 2. Principal and	1. Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing	1. FAIR Assessment 2. Classroom

1	targeted and taught.	Include differentiated instruction in lesson plans. We will adhere to the guidelines of the district academic plan for reading.	reading coach 3. Reading department chair	students according to the created schedule. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs. 3. Administration will be aware of the Academic Plan and will monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	walkthrough log 3. FAIR Assessment and Quarterly Common Course Exams 4. STAR data
2	Teachers need to develop skills in using data to inform and shape instruction.	Teachers will receive data coaching on how to use Pinnacle Analytics to identify and monitor students in the lowest 25% (bottom 33% will be reviewed due to mobility/ new enrollment)	1. APC/ Administration 2. Data Coach 3. Teachers	Data Chats with teacher and administrator	1. FCAT Test results 2. CCE results- quarterly
3	Lack of continuity in reading strategies utilized across subject areas	Schoolwide monthly Content Area Reading Strategy- introduced by Reading Leadership Team, ongoing PD through PLC common planning time.	1. Administration 2. Reading Leadership Team 3. Teachers and PLC groups	1. PLC meetings 2. Lesson Plans	1. FCAT Reading results 2. CCE results- quarterly

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.
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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In 2011-2012, 65% of our students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in FCAT Reading. In 2012-2013 we will increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in FCAT Reading to 68%, as measured by the School Accountability report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 65% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	The expected level of performance in 2013 for the students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading is 68% or ___ students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Need to gather data and target basic reading skills to be taught	The school will administer the FAIR assessment to monitor student progress. Include differentiated instruction in lesson plans. We will adhere to the guidelines of the district academic plan for reading.	1. Principal and reading coach 2. Principal and reading coach 3. Reading department chair	1. Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs. 3. Administration will be aware of the Academic Plan and will monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	1. FAIR Assessment 2. Classroom walkthrough log 3. FAIR Assessment and Quarterly Common Course Exams 4. STAR data report identifies lowest 25%
2	Need for students to develop skills in using data to identify needs and to assist in shaping learning	Each student will complete a "Perscription for Success". This is a customized data review for prior year FCAT results. Each student will set their own goals for FCAT, or write their own "perscription".	1. APC/ Administration 2. Department Heads 3. Teachers	1. "Scripts" will be reviewed when Spring FCAT results arrive so that student can reflect on their academic progress and begin to set goals for the following school year.	FCAT Test
3	Need for teachers to develop skills in using data to inform and shape instruction	Teachers will receive data coaching on how to use Pinnacle Analytics to identify and monitor students in the lowest 25% (bottom 33% will be reviewed due to mobility/ new enrollment).	1. APC/ Administration 2. Data Coach 3. Teachers	Data Chats with teacher and administrator.	FCAT Test results

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # In 2011-2012 66% of white students scored in levels 3-5 on FCAT reading, but only 58% of both black and hispanic students scored in levels 3-5. This is a gap of 8 percentage points. In the next 6 years the achievement gap				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	8	7	6	5	4	

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 2011-2012, 67% of students in the white subgroup scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT reading. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 73% as measured by the School Accountability Report. In 2011-2012, 57% of students in the hispanic subgroup scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT reading. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 65% as measured by the School Accountability Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 67% Hispanic 57%	White 73% Hispanic 65%
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	Need to gather data and target basic reading skills to be taught	The school will administer the FAIR assessment to monitor student progress. Include differentiated instruction in lesson plans. We will adhere to the guidelines of the district academic plan for reading.	1. Principal and reading coach 2. Principal and reading coach 3. Reading department chair	1. Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs. 3. Administration will be aware of the Academic Plan and will monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	1. FAIR Assessment 2. Classroom walkthrough log 3. FAIR Assessment and Quarterly Common Course Exams
2	Need for teachers to develop skills in using data to inform and shape instruction as well as use in professional development	School will create a color coded data table on Sharepoint. Students who count in multiple subgroups will be easily identified. Teachers will track CCE assessment data and discuss at monthly PLC meetings	1. APC/ Administration 2. Department Heads 3. Teachers	1. Review progress at PLC and Curriculum Council meetings. 2. Data chats to develop IPDP with teacher and administrator.	1. Teacher IPDP results. 2. FCAT Test results.
3	Need for students to develop skills in using data to identify needs and to assist in shaping learning	Each student will complete a "Perscription for Success". This is a customized data review for prior year FCAT results. Each student will set their own goals for FCAT, or write their own "perscription".	1. APC/ Administration 2. Department Heads 3. Teachers	1. "Scripts" will be reviewed when Spring FCAT results arrive so that student can reflect on their academic progress and begin to set goals for the following school year.	1. FCAT Test 2. Quarterly Common Course Exams

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:	
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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In 2011-2012 36% of students in the students with disabilities subgroup scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT reading. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 44%, as measured by the School Accountability Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

36%						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	Need to gather data and target basic reading skills to be taught	The school will administer the FAIR assessment to monitor student progress. Include differentiated instruction in lesson plans. We will adhere to the guidelines of the district academic plan for reading.	1. Principal and reading coach 2. Principal and reading coach 3. Reading department chair	1. Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs. 3. Administration will be aware of the Academic Plan and will monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	1. FAIR Assessment 2. Classroom walkthrough log 3. CCE Assessment	
2	Monitoring student progress	IEP goals and objectives tracked daily.	1. Principal and teacher	1. The school will monitor student progress. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs.	1. Data chart on Excell 2. Lesson Plans	

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In 2011-2012, 60% of economically disadvantaged students scored a level 3 or above on FCAT Reading. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 67%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60%	67%

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	Data needs to be gathered in order for basic reading skills to be targeted and taught.	The school will administer the FAIR assessment to monitor student progress. Include differentiated instruction in lesson plans. We will adhere to the guidelines of the district academic plan for reading.	1. Principal and reading coach 2. Principal and reading coach 3. Reading department chair	1. Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs. 3. Administration will be aware of the Academic Plan and will monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	1. FAIR Assessment 2. Classroom walkthrough log 3. FAIR Assessment and Quarterly Common Course Exams	
2		School will create a color coded data table on Sharepoint. Students who count in multiple subgroups will be easily identified. Teachers will track CCE assessment data and	1. APC/ Administration 2. Department Heads 3. Teachers	1. Review progress at PLC and Curriculum Council meetings. 2. Data chats to develop IPDP with teacher and administrator.	1. Teacher IPDP results. 2. FCAT Test results.	

		discuss at monthly PLC meetings.			
3	Lack of continuity in reading strategies utilized across subject areas Schoolwide monthly Content Area Reading	Strategy- introduced by Reading Leadership Team, ongoing PD through PLC common planning time.	1. Administration 2. Reading Leadership Team 3. Teachers and PLC groups	1. PLC meetings 2. Lesson Plans	1. FCAT Reading results 2. CCE results- quarterly

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
Lesson Study	6-8 Reading	Content Area Master Teacher/Department Head	Subject Area PLC Group	November 2011 thru March 2012	Lesson Study Process Logs	Administration and Department Heads
FAIR Assessment	6-8 Reading	Reading Coach	Reading PLC	Aug. & Sept. 2011	Evaluation of FAIR Assessment data	Principal Assistant Principal and Reading Coach
School Grade, AYP, Common Course, and Value Added Data Coaching	6-8 Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, and Language Arts Teachers, Elective Area Teachers	Administration and Data Coach	Reading Department	September 2011 through May 2012	IPDP, Curriculum Council, PLC Meetings	Administration, Department Head, Data Coach
Professional Learning Communities PLC	Reading 6-8	Reading Chair/Reading Coach	Reading PLC	Twice Monthly Minimum/Daily Department Common Planning	Recording Sheet	Principal Assistant Principal and Reading Chair
Tools for Teaching Content Literacy	6-8 Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, and Language Arts Teachers, Elective Area Teachers	Department Members	Subject Area PLC group	Curriculum Council, Monthly RLT Meetings, Department PLC Meetings	Curriculum Council Meetings	Administration and Department Heads
Content Area Monthly Reading Strategy	6-8 Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, and Language Arts Teachers, Elective Area Teachers	Reading Leadership Team Member for Dept.	Subject Area PLC group	Monthly RLT Meetings, Department PLC Meetings	RLT Department Reports, Administration Class Walkthroughs	Administration and Department Heads

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading Across the Curriculum	Social Studies Text	District Textbook Funds	\$45,000.00
Reading Across the Curriculum	Sheet Music	District Textbook Funds	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$47,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Spring Board	Spring Board	District	\$0.00
Teen Biz	Teen Biz	District	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Positive Behavior Support	Win Win Discipline	Title II	\$5,149.00
			Subtotal: \$5,149.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$52,149.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:		There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
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				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:		There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
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				

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

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				

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 2a:	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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2011-2012, 68% of our students made learning gains on FCAT Math. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 71%, as measured by the School Accountability report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 the percentage of students that made learning gains in FCAT Math was 68%.	In 2013, the expected level of performance of the students that will make learning gains in 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	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Tests 2. Common Unit Exams 3. Adhering to the guidelines of the District Academic Plan	Principal, Math Department Chair	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Assessments. 2. Achievement Series 3. Classroom

				Huddle meeting. 3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs.	walkthrough logs
2	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	School will create a color coded data table on Sharepoint. Students who count in multiple subgroups will be easily identified. Teachers will track CCE assessment data and discuss at monthly PLC meetings.	1. APC/ Administration 2. Department Head 3. Math Teachers	1. Review progress at PLC and Curriculum Council meetings. 2. Data chats to develop IPDP with teacher and administrator.	1. Teacher IPDP results. 2. FCAT Test results.
3	Providing opportunities for additional support for struggling students.	Tutoring	Administration	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test results
4	Opportunity for students to monitor their own progress as well as the teacher.	Student Data folders	Math Teachers	1. Students will monitor their own progress and will set goals for themselves based on the data.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 3b:	There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.
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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2011-2012, 61% of our students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT Math. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 65%, as measured by the School Accountability report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 the percentage of students in the lowest 25% that made learning gains in FCAT Math was 61%.	In 2013, the expected level of performance of the students in the lowest 25% that will make learning gains in 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	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Tests 2. Common Unit Exams 3. Adhering to the guidelines of the District Academic Plan	Principal, Math Department Chair	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting. 3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Assessments. 2. Achievement Series 3. Classroom walkthrough logs
2	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	School will create a color coded data table on Sharepoint. Students who count in multiple subgroups will be easily identified. Teachers will track CCE assessment data and discuss at monthly PLC meetings.	APC/ Administration, Department Head, Math Teachers	1. Review progress at PLC and Curriculum Council meetings. 2. Data chats to develop IPDP with teacher and administrator.	1. Teacher IPDP results. 2. FCAT Test results.
3	Providing opportunities for additional support for struggling students.	Tutoring	Administration and Math tutors	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test results
4	Student self-monitoring progress as well as the teacher.	Student Data folders	Math Teachers	1. Students will monitor their own progress and will set goals for themselves based on the data.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test results

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal #					
	In 2011-2012 65% of white students scored in levels 3-5 on FCAT reading, but 58% of both black and hispanic students scored in levels 3-5. This is a gap of 7 percentage points. In the next 6 years the achievement gap will be					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	7	6	5	4	3	

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 2011-2012, 66% of students in the white subgroup scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT math. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 72% as measured by the School Accountability Report. In 2011-2012, 62% of students in the hispanic subgroup scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT math. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 69% as measured by the School Accountability Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 66% Hispanic 62%	White 72% Hispanic 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	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	School will create a color coded data table on Sharepoint. Students who count in multiple subgroups will be easily identified. Teachers will track CCE assessment data and discuss at monthly PLC meetings.	1. APC/ Administration 2. Department Head 3. Math Teachers	1. Review progress at PLC and Curriculum Council meetings. 2. Data chats to develop IPDP with teacher and administrator.	1. Teacher IPDP results. 2. FCAT Test results.
2	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Tests 2. Common Unit Exams 3. Adhering to the guidelines of the District Academic Plan	Principal, Math Department Chair	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting. 3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Assessments. 2. Achievement Series 3. Classroom walkthrough logs
3	Providing opportunities for additional support for struggling students.	Tutoring	Administration	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test results
4	Opportunity for students to monitor their own progress as well as the teacher.	Student Data folders	Math Teachers	1. Students will monitor their own progress and will set goals for themselves based on the data.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test 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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.
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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In 2011-2012, 34% of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT math. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 43%, as measured by the School Accountability Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34%	43%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Tests 2. Common Unit Exams 3. Adhering to the guidelines of the District Academic Plan	Principal, Math Department Chair	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting. 3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Assessments. 2. Achievement Series 3. Classroom walkthrough logs
2	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	School will create a color coded data table on Sharepoint. Students who count in multiple subgroups will be easily identified. Teachers will track CCE assessment data and discuss at monthly PLC meetings.	1. APC/ Administration 2. Department Head 3. Math Teachers	1. Review progress at PLC and Curriculum Council meetings. 2. Data chats to develop IPDP with teacher and administrator.	1. Teacher IPDP results. 2. FCAT Test results.
3	Providing opportunities for additional support for struggling students.	Tutoring	Administration	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test results
4	Opportunity for students to monitor their own progress as well as the teacher.	Student Data folders	Math Teachers	1. Students will monitor their own progress and will set goals for themselves based on the data.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test results
5	Monitoring student progress	IEP goals and objectives tracked daily.	1. Principal and teacher	1. The school will monitor student progress. 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs.	1. Data chart on Excell 2. Lesson Plans

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	In 2011-2012, 59% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT math. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 66%, as measured by the School Accountability Report.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%	66%

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	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Tests 2. Common Unit Exams 3. Adhering to the guidelines of the District Academic Plan	Principal, Math Department Chair	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting. 3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Assessments. 2. Achievement Series 3. Classroom walkthrough logs
2	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	1. School will create a color coded data table on Sharepoint. 2. Students who count in multiple subgroups will be easily identified. 3. Teachers will track CCE assessment data and discuss at monthly PLC meetings.	1. APC/ Administration 2. Department Head 3. Math Teachers	1. Review progress at PLC and Curriculum Council meetings. 2. Data chats to develop IPDP with teacher and administrator.	1. Teacher IPDP results. 2. FCAT Test results.
3	Providing opportunities for additional support for struggling students.	Tutoring	Administration	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test results
4	Opportunity for students to monitor their own progress as well as the teacher.	Student Data folders	Math Teachers	1. Students will monitor their own progress and will set goals for themselves based on the data.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test results

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2012-2013 Algebra I End of Course exam will be at or above 80%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
99%	80%

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	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Tests 2. Common Unit Exams 3. Adhering to the guidelines of the District Academic Plan	Principal, Math Department Chair	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting. 3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs.	1. District Pre, Mid, and Post Assessments. 2. Achievement Series 3. Classroom walkthrough logs
2	Gathering data to monitor student progress.	School will create a color coded data table on Sharepoint. Students who count in multiple subgroups will be easily identified. Teachers will track CCE assessment data and discuss at monthly PLC meetings.	1. APC/ Administration 2. Department Head 3. Math Teachers	1. Review progress at PLC and Curriculum Council meetings. 2. Data chats to develop IPDP with teacher and administrator.	1. Teacher IPDP results. 2. FCAT Test results.
3	Providing opportunities for additional support for struggling students.	Tutoring	Administration	1. Review District Pre, Mid Year, and Post test off of Pinnacle Analytics. 2. Review Common Unit assessment results in monthly Curriculum Huddle meeting.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test results
4	Opportunity for students to monitor their own progress as well as the teacher.	Student Data folders	Math Teachers	1. Students will monitor their own progress and will set goals for themselves based on the data.	1. District Pre, Mid Year, and Post Assessment results 2. FCAT Test 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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra 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%.	Algebra Goal #					
	3A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.				
Algebra Goal #3B:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		
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 Algebra.				
Algebra Goal #3C:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
Algebra Goal #3D:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
Algebra 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				

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.
Geometry Goal #1:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal #				
	3A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Learning Communities	Math 6-8	Math Chair	Math PLC	Twice Monthly Minimum/Daily Department Common Planning	PLC recording sheet	Principal Assistant Principal and Math Chair
Lesson Study Math	6-8 Content Area Master	Teacher/Department Head	PLC Group	November 2011 thru March 2012	Subject Area Lesson Study Process Logs	Administration and Department Heads
School Grade, AYP, Common Course, and Value Added Data Coaching	6-8 Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, and Language Arts Teachers, Elective Area Teachers	Administration and Data Coach	Mathematics Department	September 2011 through May 2012	IPDP, Curriculum Council, PLC Meetings	Administration, Department Head, Data Coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Math Tutoring	After School Math Tutors	School Improvement Funds	\$1,300.00
			Subtotal: \$1,300.00
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
Positive Behavior Support	Win Win Discipline	SAI (See Reading Goal)	\$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: \$1,300.00			

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:			In 2011-2012 53% of students scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT Science. In 2012-2013 we will increase to 57% or above as measured by the School Accountability Report.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
In 2012, 53% of students scored at a level 3 or higher in FCAT Science.			In 2013, the expected level of performance for students scoring at a level 3 or higher on the FCAT Science is 57%.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Incorporating hands-on laboratory experiments into lessons	1. Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments as needed	Principal Department Chair	1. Labs will be documented in teacher lesson plans	1. Monitored by classroom walk-throughs
2	Providing real world science experiences for students.	2. Provide real world science experiences	Principal Department Chair	2. Labs will be documented in teacher lesson plans	2. Monitored by classroom walk-throughs
3	Gathering and interpreting data to monitor student progress.	3. District Pre, Mid, and Post Test	Principal Department Chair	3. Monitor test data to determine student progress	3. Increase in student proficiency from Pre to Mid to Post test.
4	Gathering and interpreting data to monitor student progress.	4. Common Unit Assessments	Principal Department Chair	4. Monitor test data to determine student progress	4. Increase proficiency in common unit assessments as tied to the science SSS.

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:		There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A		N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	There are too few students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.
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
Lesson Study Science	6-8 Content Area Master Teacher/Department Head	Subject Area	PLC Group	November 2011 thru March 2012	Lesson Study Process Logs	Administration and Department Heads
Professional Learning Communities	Science 6-8	Science Chair Science	PLC	Twice Monthly Minimum/Daily Department Common Planning	PLC recording sheet	Principal Assistant Principal and Math Chair
Science Fair/ Scientific Process	6-8 Science	Science Department Chair	Science Department	Bi-Montly PLC Meetings	PLC Log, Common Course Exam Data Review	Science Chair, Assistant Principal for Curriculum
School Grade, AYP, Common Course, and Value Added Data Coaching	6-8 Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, and Language Arts Teachers, Elective Area Teachers	Administration and Data Coach	Science Department	September 2011 through May 2012	IPDP, Curriculum Council, PLC Meetings	Administration, Department Head, Data Coach

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
Positive Behavior Support	Win Win Discipline	Title II (See Reading Goal)	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In 2011-2012 90% of students scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT Writing. In 2012-2103, 90% of 8th grade students will score 3.5 or higher as measured by the School Accountability report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 90% of students scored at a level 3 or higher on FCAT Writes.	In 2013, the expected level of performance will be that 90% of students will score a level 3.5 or higher on FCAT Writes.

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	Gathering data to target potential areas for growth in student writing.	1. District Baseline and Midyear assessment	Principal and Department Chair	1. Monitor test data to determine student progress	1. Increase in student proficiency from Baseline to Midyear assessment.
2	Ability for students and teachers to track long term student growth	2. Student Data Folders	Principal and Department Chair	2. Monitor student growth/ long term data tracking	2. Increase in student proficiency from Baseline to Midyear assessment

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	There are not enough students in this subgroup to necessitate a goal.
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
Six Traits & Lee Writes	Language Arts 6-8	B Crosby	Language Arts 6-8	September 2011 and Spring 2012	Database and tracking of gain scores through student writing portfolios	LA Department Chair
Criterion	Language Arts 7-8	Language Arts Department Chair	6-8 Language Arts	Fall 2011 and Spring 2012	Database and tracking of gain scores through student writing portfolios	LA Department Chair
Lesson Study	Language Arts 6-8	Content Area Master Teacher/Department Head Subject Area	PLC Group	November 2011 thru March 2012	Lesson Study Process Logs	Administration and Department Heads
Professional Learning Communities	Language Arts 6-8	Language Arts Chair	Language Arts PLC	Twice Monthly Minimum/Daily Department Common Planning	PLC recording sheet	Principal Assistant Principal and Language Arts Chair
School Grade, AYP, Common Course, and Value Added Data Coaching	6-8 Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, and Language Arts Teachers, Elective Area Teachers	Administration and Data Coach	Language Arts Department	September 2011 through May 2012	IPDP, Curriculum Council, PLC Meetings	Administration, Department Head, Data Coach

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
Lee Writes	6 Traits Writing	District	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.

Civics Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.				
Civics Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Attendance	
Attendance Goal # 1:	
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	In the 2011-2012 school year Diplomat Middle had 162 out of school suspensions. In the 2012-2013 school year the number of suspensions will be decreased to 140.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

-	-
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
-	-
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
162	140
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
-	-

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	Student misbehavior	After hours detention	Administrators	Discipline data will be reviewed monthly	Analytics
2	Student misbehavior	Positive Behavior Support	Administrators	PBS data reviewed quarterly	PBS Team
3	Student Misbehavior	Second Step Violence Prevention Program	Administrators	Second Step participant data reviewed quarterly	Second Step Logs

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
Positive Behavior Support	Win Win Discipline	Title II (See Reading Goal)	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		The number of parent/visitor volunteer hours during the 2010-2011 school year was 5,380 hours. The number of parent/visitor volunteer hours in the 2011-2012 school year will be maintained at or above 1,000.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
5380 hours		1,000 hours			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parental Involvement	1. Volunteer training and orientation will be conducted in the fall for parent and community volunteers.	Volunteer Coordinator and Principal	1. Volunteer log-in sheet	1. Number of parent volunteers will increase as compared to the previous year
2	Parent and community involvement	1. Involve parent and community volunteers by partnering with Move Southwest Florida for a school-wide fundraiser.	Volunteer Coordinator and Principal	1. Volunteer log-in sheet	1. This event will increase the overall number of parent and community volunteer hours from the previous year.

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. CTE				
CTE Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

No Data Submitted

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Bullying Goal:

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

1. Bullying Goal Bullying Goal #1:	In the 2011-2012 school year Diplomat Middle school reported 19 incidents of Bullying. In the 2012-20-13 school year the incidents of bullying will be reduced to 15.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
19 incidents of bullying	15 incidents of bullying

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	Staff training	Staff Training during Pre-school week.	Administration	Bullying data	SESIR
2	Student Training	Bullying prevention training through elective classes and through Learning for Life	Guidance Counselors	Bullying Data	SESIR
3	Student Training	Individual student training for students referred to administration because of bullying	Administration and Guidance Counselors	Bullying Data	SESIR
4	Student Training	Student Mentors for students displaying bullying characteristics	Guidance Counselors	Bullying Data	SESIR
5	Student Training	Targets of bullying will receive individual bullying prevention counseling (Second Step) by the guidance counselors	Guidance Counselors	Bullying Data	SESIR
6	Student Training	Students who are targets of bullies will be given an opportunity to work with trained peer mediators in order to learn coping strategies and also to speak with peers about bullying prevention and strategies.	Guidance Counselors	Bullying Data	SESIR

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Bullying Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading Across the Curriculum	Social Studies Text	District Textbook Funds	\$45,000.00
Reading	Reading Across the Curriculum	Sheet Music	District Textbook Funds	\$2,000.00
Mathematics	Math Tutoring	After School Math Tutors	School Improvement Funds	\$1,300.00
				Subtotal: \$48,300.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Spring Board	Spring Board	District	\$0.00
Reading	Teen Biz	Teen Biz	District	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Positive Behavior Support	Win Win Discipline	Title II	\$5,149.00
Mathematics	Positive Behavior Support	Win Win Discipline	SAI (See Reading Goal)	\$0.00
Science	Positive Behavior Support	Win Win Discipline	Title II (See Reading Goal)	\$0.00
Writing	Lee Writes	6 Traits Writing	District	\$1,000.00
Suspension	Positive Behavior Support	Win Win Discipline	Title II (See Reading Goal)	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$6,149.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$54,449.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
The purpose of the School Advisory Council is to perform the functions that are prescribed by the regulations of the School Board. The SAC will assist in the preparation and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan, will give advice concerning the annual school budget, and will approve the use of the school improvement funds.	\$1,300.00

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

The purpose of the School Advisory Council is to perform the functions that are prescribed by the regulations of the School Board. The SAC will assist in the preparation and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan, will give advice concerning the annual school budget, and will approve the use of the school improvement funds.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Lee School District DIPLOMAT MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	76%	94%	52%	299	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%	69%			134	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	57% (YES)	73% (YES)			130	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					563	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District DIPLOMAT MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	72%	95%	47%	291	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	67%	65%			132	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	72% (YES)	62% (YES)			134	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					557	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested