

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: LEXINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Mrs. Linda Caprarotta

SAC Chair: Mrs. Linda Harmon

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph Burke

Date of School Board Approval: pending

Last Modified on: 9/21/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
		University of South Florida BA of Elementary Education Master's of Administrative Leadership K-12			2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 69% Math Mastery: 63% Science: 65% Writing Mastery: 88% 2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 80% Math Mastery: 78% Science Mastery: 65% Writing Mastery: 91% AYP: All sub groups did not meet AYP in math, reading or writing. 2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 78% Math Mastery: 73% Science Mastery: 58% Writing Mastery: 86% AYP: READING: White Sub-group made

Principal	Linda Caprarotta	Professional Educators Certificate: Elementary Education (1-6) ESOL Endorsement School Principal (all Levels)	6	15	AYP with 84%. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged (ED), and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP MATH: White sub-group made AYP 78%. Hispanic, ED, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP. WRITING: Whites, Hispanics, and ED all met AYP. 2008-2009 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 81% Math Mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 57% Writing Mastery: 97% AYP: READING: White Sub-group made AYP with 81%. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged (ED), and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP MATH: White sub-group made AYP @ 77%. Hispanic, ED, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP. WRITING: Whites, Hispanics, and ED all met AYP. Students with Disabilities did not make AYP.
Assis Principal	Lisa Eastridge	B.S. Elementary Christian Education, Cincinnati Christian University... Master's Degree in Elementary Education @ Xavier University.... specialist Degree in Administrative Leadership (k-12), Nova Southeastern University Professional Educators Certificate: Bible (7-12) Educational Leadership Elementary Education (1-6) English (5-9) ESOL School Principal (all Levels) Specific Learning Disabilities (K-12)	6	6	Same as above
Assis Principal	Jason Peters	B.S. Special Educaton from Florida Gulf Coast University, Master's in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University Florida Educator's Certificate: Educational Leadership Elementary Education (K-6) ESOL Exceptional Student Education (K-12)	5	2	Same as above

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	Cheryl Darbyshire	Bachelor Degree of Education from Miami University of Ohio Master's Degree-Elementary Education from Nova Southeastern University Reading Endorsement (k-12) National Board Certified Teacher ESOL Endorsement	8	8	see Principal's scores above

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	Meetings of New Teachers with the Principal and Assistant Principals	Principal: Linda Caprarotta	On-going	
2	Observations of New Teachers (formal & in-formal)	Assistant Principal: Lisa Eastridge and Jason Peters	On-going	
3	Professional Development Opportunities	Principal: Linda Caprarotta	On-going	
4	District Mentoring of New Teachers or those with less than 3 years experience	Qualified Teachers	On-going	
5	Collaborating with another International Baccalaureate school in order to create Unit Plans and Assessments as a follow up for a pre-school training on IB Unit Plans, Area of Interactions and IB Assessments.	IB Coordinators and Administration	May 2013	
6	Professor contacts with the Edison College and FGCU for recruiting purposes.	Administration	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
1) Teachers out of field = 1 2) Teachers NOT effective/highly effective	Providing information to these teachers about subject area exams including course study guides, classes, and times when tests are offered.

based on their 2012 manager's evaluation = 3

Meetings with admin and mentor teachers to provide support for improvement.

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
60	6.7%(4)	31.7%(19)	40.0%(24)	21.7%(13)	33.3%(20)	88.3%(53)	13.3%(8)	5.0%(3)	20.0%(12)

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
Dr. Charles O'Connor	Allison Batts	new teacher, O'Connor has completed the district mentoring program, and Batts is the other 8th grade science teacher with O'Connor	Regular meetings In class observation by mentor and assistant principal Pre and Post conferences Lesson planning
Deb Schieber	Robert Haas	new teacher and Schieber has completed the district mentoring program and is another 6th grade teacher with Haas	Regular meetings In class observation by mentor and assistant principal Pre and Post conferences Lesson planning
Anthony Volpe	Christa Burks	new teacher and Volpe has completed the district mentoring program and is another math teacher	Regular meetings In class observation by mentor and assistant principal Pre and Post conferences Lesson planning
Cheryl Darbyshire	Michelle Ryckaert	new teacher and Darbyshire has completed the district mentoring program and is the school's reading coach	Regular meetings In class observation by mentor and assistant principal Pre and Post conferences Lesson planning
Lynn Buchholz	Jeff Talbott	new teacher and Buchholz has completed the district mentoring program and teaches the same content area	Regular meetings In class observation by mentor and assistant principal Pre and Post conferences Lesson planning
Noel Kellams	Patrick Dorward	New teacher, Kellams has been through the mentoring district training and they teach the same subject	Regular meetings In class observation by mentor and assistant principal Lesson planning

Lynn Buchholz	Timothy Kowalski	matter new teacher, Buccholz has completed the district mentoring program, and she teaches the same subject	Regular meetings In class observation by mentor and assistant principal Pre and Post conferences Lesson 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 AYP. Teachers will develop a PDP using data folders and AYP subgroup data to determine the focus subgroups. Lexington is also in the process of being formally authorized as an International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme through IBNA. Title II provides the training and follow up support to implement this program in every classroom as well as complete the authorization.

Title III

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title III to expand academic enrichment opportunities for English Language Learners. 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. 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

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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 Leadership Team for Lexington Middle School consists of the following members:

Linda Caprarotta-Principal
Lisa Eastridge-Assistant Principal
Jason Peters-Assistant Principal
Cheryl Darbyshire-Reading Coach
Diana Simmons-Math Department Head
Kim Houghton-Reading
Marty Irwin-Guidance Counselor
Julie Clapood-Guidance Counselor
Kumar Nandar-Speech Pathologist
Laurie Rhinehardt-ESE Co-teacher
Christina McLean-ESOL Representative
Dorothy Lauber-Social Worker
All general education teachers that pertain to the student
Parent(s) of student

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 Lexington Middle School meets on an as needed 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:

Choose appropriate members and roles below; and add any additional roles/responsibilities each may have.

Classroom Teacher

- Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (FAIR, curriculum assessments, STAR or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling
- Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports.
- Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity

Reading Coach/Specialist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings
- Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
- Implement supplemental and intensive interventions
- Keep progress monitoring notes & anecdotes of interventions implemented
- Administer screenings
- Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students

Speech-Language Pathologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports.
- Completes Communication Skills screening for students unsuccessful with Tier 2 interventions
- Assist with supplemental and intensive interventions through collaboration, training, and/or direct student contact
- Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible Speech/Language referral & when making eligibility decisions

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

School Psychologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings on some students receiving supplemental supports & on all students receiving intensive supports
- Monitor data collection process for fidelity
- Review & interpret progress monitoring data
- Collaborate with MTSS Team on effective instruction & specific interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible ESE referral & when making eligibility decisions

ESE Teacher/Staffing Specialist

- Consult with MTSS Team regarding intensive interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when making eligibility decisions

Specialist (Behavior, OT, PT, ASD)

- Consult with MTSS Team
- Provide staff trainings

Social Worker

- Attend MTSS Team meetings when requested
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with MTSS Team

ESOL/ELL Representative

- Attend all MTSS Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
- Conduct language screenings and assessments
- Provide ELL interventions at all tiers

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.

Lexington Middle School utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics and the Achievement Series. These programs allow 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. The District Discipline Support Application is used for tracking student behavior management. The teams are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, behavior management techniques, and ESOL strategies. All team members are provided on-going staff development training regarding the RtI process and research based practices to support the academic and behavioral needs of students.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Lee County School District has developed a comprehensive training and support plan for schools. District teams have been established to support schools in the implementation of the RtI process for all students. The teams 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.

The teams are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, behavior management techniques, and ESOL strategies. All team members are provided on-going staff development training regarding the RtI process and research based practices to support the academic and behavioral needs of students.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Linda Caprarotta-Principal
Lisa Eastridge-Assistant Principal
Jason Peters-Assistant Principal
Katie Riemenschneider-IB Coordinator/Media
Cheryl Darbyshire-Reading Coach
Diane Simmons-Math
Kim Houghton-Reading
Joanie Pauwels-PE
Randy DeBarr-SS
Charles O'Connor-Science
Kat Bruns-Art
Christina McLean-SS
Julie Claprood-Counselor

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

The Literacy Leadership team will meet monthly. The purpose of this team is to analyze data, identify an academic need for the school, research and decide on appropriate strategies to address the needs, communicate to departments and facilitate department meetings to support the implementation of these strategies.

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

The major initiatives for the 2012-2013 school year are to focus on the stages of implementing the IB criterion assessments, research and review scientific based reading strategies including differentiated instruction and implementing these strategies in all content area classes. The LLT will also be developing plans to assist teachers with implementing the Common Core Standards in all content areas.

*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.

The focus of the LLT for 2011-12 is to research reading strategies and differentiated instruction to implement in all content area classrooms. Reading strategies are being identified in all textbooks and teachers are documenting reading strategies in lesson plans. Each grade level will implement one reading strategy and all teachers in that grade will use it in the classroom. Sixth grade will use CUCC (Circle, Underline, Count, Check), 7th grade will use Clink and Clink (reading comprehension strategy), and 8th grade will use Cornell Notes. Administration will use walkthroughs, view lesson plans, and observe lessons to document the use of reading strategies in all classrooms.

*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
1					
2					

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 reading. Reading Goal #2b:				
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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:		In 2011-12, 67% (597) of our students made learning gains in reading. In 2012-13, we will improve to 69% (624) as measured by the school grades report.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
67%		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
	Limited funding, after school transportation,	Reading teachers will pilot the Springboard	Principal and Reading Coach.	Analyze FAIR data reports to ensure	Student Data Folders containing

1	Reading Curriculum in the developmental reading classes	Principal, Reading Coach and content area department heads.	teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	fluency, FAIR and STAR data
	The school will implement the FAIR Assessments to monitor student progress.	Reading Teachers	Use progress monitoring with the data collected on Teen Biz 3000.	CCE, FCAT Explorer Reports, Fluency Testing, FAIR Assessments
	The reading department will implement Teen Biz 3000 to provide teachers with individual student strengths and weakness and used for a guide for individual instruction in reading.	All content area teachers will monitor the lower 25% student progress.	Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted to Assistant Principal.	Classroom walkthrough log and focused walkthroughs to determine the frequency of higher order questions and student engagement.
	Use differentiated instruction.		Meet to analyze data collected on the lower 25% and implement strategies to guide instruction.	
	Teachers include higher order question strategies including Bloom's Taxonomy in their lesson plans, assignments and assessments.		Graphing fluency results	Progress monitoring assessments, such as fluency, comprehension and vocabulary.
	Students in the lower 25% will be identified and strategies will be developed to increase student achievement.			
Fluency testing 3 times per year for progress monitoring.				
Utilizing supportive facilitators and para-professionals to assist teachers with ESOL and IEP students in the classrooms				
Utilize FCAT Explorer				

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:	No FFA goal is necessary, as there are too few students enrolled at our site.
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:	
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

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2011-12, of the Hispanic group met AYP in Reading. In 2012-13 we will improve to as measured by the
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
	Language, Funding limited, transportation for after school tutoring	Identifying students in subgroup, Abbreviated after school tutoring, implementing reading strategies and	Administration, all teachers Reading Coach Reading Teachers	Data Reports to track identified students Progress Monitoring Graphing student fluency results	Fcat Explorer Reports, FAIR State Testing, Content Mastery

1	<p>monitoring students in content area classrooms for ESOL and ESE students</p> <p>Level 1 and 2 students are placed in Language! class. (Intensive Reading)</p> <p>Fluency testing 3 times per year for progress monitoring.</p> <p>Utilize FCAT Explorer</p> <p>Use the ESOL Language! lessons with cards for ESOL students and Level one students</p> <p>Utilize the supportive facilitators and paraprofessionals in the classrooms with ESOL and IEP students</p>	Student Data Folders	<p>Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Progress Indicator Assessments</p> <p>Student data folders</p>
---	--	----------------------	---

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 2012-13, scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT reading. In 2012-13, we will improve to
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Funding limited, transportation for after school tutoring, level and number of students	Identifying students in subgroup, Abbreviated after school tutoring, implementing reading strategies and monitoring identified SWD students in content area classes, using paraprofessionals for assistance in classrooms Small group instruction with Support Facilitator as needed Fluency testing 3 times per year for progress monitoring. Utilize FCAT Explorer	Administration and teachers Support Facilitator Teacher	monitor, data reports tracking identified students, grade level content reading materials, modifications and accommodations Student work folders Graphing fluency results	Fcat Explorer Reports, FAIR State Testing, Content Mastery Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Progress Indicator Assessments Summative Assessments Student data folder

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 2011-12, of the Economically Disadvantaged group met AYP in Reading. In 2012-13 this group will improve
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Funding limited, transportation for after school tutoring	Level 1 and 2 students are placed in Language! class. (Intensive Reading) Reading strategies will be implemented and documented by lesson plans and observations in subject content area classrooms. The school will implement the FAIR Assessments to monitor student progress. Use differentiated instruction. Teachers include higher order question strategies including Bloom's Taxonomy in their	Administration and teachers	Analyze FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule. OnCourse Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted to Principal. Department meetings to analyze data collected on the lower 25% and make decisions for implementing new strategies to guide instruction. Student work folders Graphing fluency results	Fcat Explorer Reports, FAIR State Testing, Content Mastery Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Progress Indicator Assessments Student Data Folders

		lesson plans, assignments and assessments. Students in the lower 25% will be identified and strategies will be developed to increase student achievement. Fluency testing 3 times per year for progress monitoring. Utilize FCAT Explorer		
--	--	--	--	--

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
FAIR Test Training	6-8	Cheryl Darbyshire	Reading Teachers 6-8	August 2012	Analyzing and Progress Monitoring FAIR Data	Reading Coach Reading Teachers
Achieve3000 Teen Biz Training	6-8	Cheryl Darbyshire, Karen Kuzer and Kim Sanders	Reading Teachers 6-8	August 2012	Analyzing the data from Teen Biz to guide instruction for student needs	Reading Coach Reading Teachers
Reading Strategies in Content Areas	6-8	Reading Coach/Admin	6-8	On-going	Lesson Plans, Student Data Folders	All Teachers

Reading Budget:

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:		In 2011-2012, 43% (6) of students are proficient in listening and speaking. In 2012-13, 46% (6) of students will be proficient in listening/speaking.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
In 2011-2012, 43% (6) students are proficient in listening/speaking.					
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	ESOL classes are not available for students Mobility Limited after school tutoring Communication with parents	Para professionals Peer student speaking same language (if available) Clarify and restate instructions frequently Simplify test directions and provide examples Give extra time Alternative assessment	ESOL School Contact Person Admin Teachers	Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted to Assistant Principal. Meet to analyze data collected on the lower 25% and implement strategies to guide instruction. Graphing fluency results Teacher conferences	Oral Tests Classroom walkthrough log and focused walkthroughs to determine the frequency of higher order questions and student engagement. Progress monitoring assessments, such as fluency, comprehension and vocabulary

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:	In 2011-2012, 0% (14) of students were proficient in reading. In 2012-2013, 30% (4) of students will be proficient in reading.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
In 2011-2012, 0% (14) students were proficient in reading.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>Transportation for ESOL parents</p> <p>ESOL classes are not available for students</p> <p>Limited after school tutoring</p> <p>Communication with parents</p>	<p>Use simplified directions</p> <p>Parent conference with ESOL team</p> <p>Cooperative Learning</p> <p>Activate Prior knowledge</p> <p>Use visuals, demonstrations, manipulatives, and gestures to increase comprehension</p> <p>Give students opportunity to use diagrams, charts, and graphic organizers</p> <p>Give extra time for assignments and assessments</p> <p>Use of bilingual dictionaries</p> <p>Alternative assessments</p> <p>Para professionals</p> <p>Peer student speaking same language (if available)</p>	<p>ESOL School Contact Person</p> <p>Admin</p> <p>Teachers</p> <p>Reading Coach</p>	<p>Analyze FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.</p> <p>Use progress monitoring with the data collected on Teen Biz 3000.</p> <p>Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted to Assistant Principal.</p> <p>Meet to analyze data collected on the lower 25% and implement strategies to guide instruction.</p> <p>Graphing fluency results</p> <p>Teacher conferences</p>	<p>Oral Tests</p> <p>FCAT Explorer Reports, Fluency Testing, FAIR Assessments</p> <p>Classroom walkthrough log and focused walkthroughs to determine the frequency of higher order questions and student engagement.</p> <p>Progress monitoring assessments, such as fluency, comprehension and vocabulary</p> <p>CCE's</p> <p>Portfolios</p> <p>Group projects</p>

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

In 2011-2012, 7% (1) of students were proficient in writing. In 2012-13, 20% (3) will be proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

In 2011-12, 7% (1) were proficient in writing.

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
	<p>ESOL classes are not available for students</p> <p>Limited after school tutoring</p> <p>Communication with parents</p>	<p>Use of writing program Criterion</p> <p>Use simplified directions</p> <p>Cooperative Learning</p> <p>Give students opportunity to use diagrams, charts, and</p>	<p>ESOL School Contact Person</p> <p>Admin</p> <p>Teachers</p>	<p>Check lessons plans for ESOL strategies</p> <p>Teacher conferences</p> <p>Analyzing student writing reports through Criterion</p>	<p>Oral Tests</p> <p>CCE's</p> <p>Portfolios</p> <p>Group projects</p> <p>Writing Assessments</p>

1	<p>graphic organizers</p> <p>Give extra time for assignments and assessments</p> <p>Use of bilingual dictionaries</p> <p>Alternative assessments</p> <p>Para professionals</p> <p>Peer student speaking same language (if available)</p>			
---	--	--	--	--

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
1					
2					

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	
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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2011-12, 63% (548) of students made math gains on FCAT 2.0 math. In 2012-13, we will improve to 65% (588) as measured by the School Grade Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63%	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
	Funding, Abbreviated after school tutoring	Levels 1,2,and 3 on FCAT math get math daily Differentiated instruction and cooperative learning	Administration, math teachers AP	Student data folders Data collection and tracking student achievement	Semester Exams, CCE tests, end of school year exams,

1		<p>groups to allow students to assist each other in mastery of knowledge.</p> <p>Scaffolding standards throughout the year in all assessments to assist with mastery of standards.</p> <p>Weekly problem solving and critical thinking through higher level word problems.</p> <p>Abbreviated After School Tutoring Program</p> <p>Utilizing supportive facilitators and para-professionals to assist teachers with ESOL and IEP students in the classrooms</p> <p>Implementing IB unit plans and assessments</p> <p>Utilize FCAT Explorer on a regular basis to offer students higher level thinking experiences.</p>	<p>Bell Ringers</p> <p>Lesson Plans</p> <p>IB Unit Plan</p>	<p>FCAT Explorer Reports,</p> <p>Bell Ringers</p> <p>Classroom walkthrough log and focused walkthroughs to determine the frequency of higher order questions and student engagement.</p> <p>Rubrics</p> <p>Chapter Tests and Quizzes from textbooks</p>
---	--	--	---	---

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:

<p>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #3b:</p>	<p>No FFA goal is necessary, as there are too few students enrolled at our site.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

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
<p>No Data Submitted</p>				

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:

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #4:</p>	
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>

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						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : <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:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In 2011-12, of the Hispanic group scored at level 3 or higher in FCAT Math. In 2012-13 they will improve
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited Funding, transportation for after school tutoring Language	Intensive math classes for Level 1 and 2 FCAT, Identifying students in subgroup, Abbreviated After School Tutoring Program Implementing new district pacing guides Utilize supportive facilitators and paraprofessionals in classrooms with ESOL and IEP students Utilize FCAT Explorer	Administration, teachers	Student data folders Data Reports tracking identified students, practice workbooks Lesson Plans	Semester Exams, CCE tests, end of school year exams, FCAT Explorer Reports, Assessment Books

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:	
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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In 2011-12, of the Students with Disabilities scored level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math. In 2012-13 they will improve
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited funding, transportation for after school program	Identify students in SWD, Intensive Academics Abbreviated After School Tutoring Program Implementing new district pacing guides Use of supportive facilitators and paraprofessionals in the classrooms to assist ESOL and IEP students Small group instruction Use of manipulatives Utilize FCAT Explorer	Administration and teachers Support Facilitor	IEP's, Specific modifications and accommodations, Data folders, tracking identified students Lesson Plans Student work folder	Semester Exams, CCE tests, end of school year exams FCAT Explorer Reports Unit and Chapter tests and quizzes

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 2011-12, of the Economically Disadvantaged group scored 3.0 or higher on the FCAT Math. In 2012-13 they will improve to
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited Funding, transportation for after school tutoring	Intensive math classes, new district math curriculum, co-teachers, Identifying students, Abbreviated After School Tutoring Program Implementing new district pacing guide (Academic Plans) Supportive facilitators and paraprofessionals will assist ESOL and IEP students in the classrooms Implementing IB unit plans and assessments Utilize FCAT Explorer	Administration and teachers	Data collection, tracking identified students Lesson Plans IB Unit Plan	Semester Exams, CCE tests, end of school year exams FCAT Explorer Reports Rubrics Unit and Chapter tests and quizzes

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:	In 2011-12, 95% (111) of our students scored Level 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC. In 2012-13, we will increase the number of students taking the Algebra 1 EOC and we will have % score a Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
95% (111)	na

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
	Not offered to all students on a daily basis	Differentiated instruction and cooperative learning	Admin	Collaborative planning and teaching	CCE's

2	(funding)	groups	Teachers	Algebra Fantasy League	Test from Textbooks
		Use of FCAT Explorer and Florida Achieves on a regular basis to offer students higher order thinking experiences		Analyzing data from FCAT Explorer and Florida Achieves	Florida Achieves and FCAT Explorer
		Algebra Fantasy EOC League			
		Weekly problem solving			
		Computer lab opportunities to help prepare students for the high stakes computer based state tests			

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

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:

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:

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				

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #1:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

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
Training in differentiated instruction and cooperative learning groups	6-8	Admin Dept. Head	Math Teachers	On-going	Lesson Plans Administrator Walk Throughs	Dept. Head Admin
Weekly Department Meeting and Common planning time	6-8	Admin Dept. Head	Math Teachers	On-going	Agendas Lesson Plans	Admin

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a:	In 2011-12, 65%(175) scored at level 3.0 or higher on the FCAT Science. In 2012-13, we will improve to 67% (168) as measured by the school grade report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

65%

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	Textbook adoption transition period from the 3 years cumulative curriculum content to new science adopted curriculum, mobility rate	<p>Implementation of reading strategies in science classes such as Cornell Notes and vocabulary mapping</p> <p>Identify "big ideas", key concepts, knowledge and skills that describe what the students will understand.</p> <p>Daily Questions for preparation for FCAT Science.</p> <p>Engage students in science inquiry to develop understanding of science concepts and nature of science.</p> <p>Weekly lab concentrating on the measurement subtest of the FCAT math and science by employing the skills of: graphing, data and chart interpretation, direct measurement and calculation, and reinforcing the scientific method.</p> <p>All teachers will incorporate Bloom's Taxonomy into the classroom by asking higher order questions and having students generate questions.</p> <p>Utilizing supportive facilitators and para-professionals to assist teachers with ESOL and IEP students in the classrooms</p> <p>Development of IB Units and assessments</p> <p>Utilize FCAT Explorer</p>	<p>Administration, science teachers</p> <p>IB Coordinator</p> <p>Science Teachers</p>	<p>Student data folders</p> <p>Assess student response to Daily Questions.</p> <p>Formal lab results concentrating on measurement subtests.</p> <p>OnCourse Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted to principal.</p> <p>Review of IB Units and assessments by IB Coordinator</p> <p>Science taught with accommodations and modifications</p>	<p>Semester Exams,</p> <p>CCE tests,</p> <p>end of year evaluations,</p> <p>FCAT Science Practice questions</p> <p>Classroom walkthrough log and focused walkthroughs to determine the frequency of higher order questions and student engagement.</p> <p>Student data folders</p> <p>Unit Tests, rubrics</p> <p>FCAT Explorer Reports</p>

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:

No FFA goal is necessary, as there are too few students enrolled at our site.

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:				
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
Solar Energy Training	6-8	Florida Power and Light	Science Teachers	November 2012	Building a solar energy station on campus	Science Teachers Admin

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In 2011-12, 88% (111) of all students scored 3.0 or higher on the FCAT Writes! In 2012-13, 85% (242) will score a 3.5 or higher or meet the district average as measured by the School Grades report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

88%	85% or above				
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	Funding for the Criterion Writing Program Number of computer labs and availability	Students using Criterion at school and accessing it at home for writing essays and getting immediate feedback. Give students varied opportunities to write: response journals, fiction pieces, reflection journals, including fiction and non fiction source text. Scaffold writing by incorporating read-discuss-write- cycle in the classroom. Provide time and opportunity for revision, making many more formative assessments than summative. Teaching students the FCAT Writing Rubric Small group assistance	Administration, LA teachers Supportive Facilitator	Student Data folders, Criterion graded essays with feedback, accommodations and modifications for students in subgroups.	Criterion Grading Reports Student data folders

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:	No FFA goal is necessary, as there are too few students enrolled at our site.
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
FCAT Writes!	6-8	Helen Davis	Language Arts and Reading Teachers 6-8	October 2012	Lesson Plans Department Meetings Writing Prompts	Department Heads Admin Reading Coach
The Bridge to PARCC	6-8	Helen Davis	School-wide	November 2012	Lesson Plans Admin Walk Throughs	Admin
Writing Across Content Area	6-8	Helen Davis	School-wide	November 2012	Lesson Plans Student Papers	Teachers Admin

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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:	
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			
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
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						

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal # 1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	In 2011-12, 50 parent link phone calls were used to inform parents about the LXMS events. In 2012-13, we will implement a process to send parent link messages informing parents of events, guest speakers, the International Baccalaureate Newsletter, LXMS school newsletter and other student activities only on Tuesday evenings as needed. In 2011-12, we had 1,136 parent volunteer hours. In 2012-13, we will increase those parent volunteer hours by 100.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
50 Parent Link Phone Messages 1,136 Parent Volunteer Hours	Establish Tuesday to send out all parent link messages for a total of 36 times. 1,236 Parent Volunteer 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	Having current parent phone numbers and email address.	Implement use of email and phone for parent communication, Inviting parents to participate in community service projects Volunteer Coordinator keeps track of volunteer information and hours worked at LXMS. OnCourse Teacher Web Pages	Administration Tech Specialist, Teachers Volunteer Coordinator	Monitor Parent Link Report Attendance of parents Volunteer Sign In Sheets Number of parent contacts on teachers OnCourse web pages	Parental Feed back Parent Link Reports Activity Request Forms for Parent Link messages

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
Parent and Community Volunteers	N/A	Volunteer Coordinator and Admin	Parent and community volunteers	Oct. Nov. 2012	Volunteer sign in sheets School Procedures Volunteer Meetings	Volunteer Coordinator Admin

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:		In 2012-13, we will begin the enrollment of 6th grade students (40) in Computer Applications in Business to learn Microsoft PowerPoint. 50% of students to take the certification test will pass.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Funding	Practicing Keyboarding skills	Technology teacher	Keyboarding drills	Powerpoint presentations
	Scheduling		admin	Safety and Security processes using computer	Certification test
	Certified teachers	Cooperative Learning		Research Skills	
	Availability of computer labs	Non-fiction reading skills and strategies Understanding of computer components		Summerization of informational text	

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Career and Technical Education Training	6th Grade Tech Teachers/ PowerPoint	District Trainers	Technology teachers	August 2012	Students Passing the Certification for PowerPoint	Technology Teachers and Admin

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)

International Baccalaureate 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. International Baccalaureate Goal International Baccalaureate Goal #1:	In 2011-12, 95% of LXMS instructional staff will be trained by an International Baccalaureate professional trainer in the area of assessment based on IB criteria. In 2012-13, 1 teacher from each of the core academics will be sent to IB training for further training on unit planning, areas of interaction, and assessment.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
95%	96%

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	New teachers being hired after the initial preschool IB training funding	School-wide training by an IB trainer on how to design units and assessments based on IB criteria in each subject areas On-going school-wide training by IB Coordinator for writing IB units and assessments	IB Coordinator, Department heads and administration	student achievement, teachers planning assessments using the IB criterion for subject areas, use of rubrics with projects,	Reflection journals, Classroom walk throughs by administrators, IB Unit Plans and assessments

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
School-wide training by an IB trainer on how to design units and assessments based on IB criteria in each subject areas	6-8	IB Coordinator	Teachers 6-8	On-going	IB Units IB Assessments Lesson Plans	IB Coordinator Admin

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 International Baccalaureate Goal(s)

Anti-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. Anti-bullying Goal		In 2011-12, we had less than 5% founded bullying incidences and 40 "peer conflict" incidences. In 2012-13, we will maintain 5% or less founded bullying incidences and reduce "peer conflict" incidences by 10%.			
Anti-bullying Goal #1:					
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
Less than 5%		5% or less			
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	mobility	Guidance counselor gives anti-bullying lesson to each grade level. Students complete a quiz and anti-bullying pledge forms	Guidance counselors admin teachers	School wide staff training on bullying and anti-bullying School level processes in place for investigating/confirming bullying incidences	Quiz results Student anti-bullying pledge School data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Guidance counselor presents anti-bullying workshop to staff and visits each grade level	6-8	Marty Irwin	School-wide	August 2012 and on-going	Student Bullying Quiz Follow up in classroom visits and student conferencing	Marty Irwin, Teachers and Admin

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 Anti-bullying Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 8/30/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The SAC committee will dialog about research based strategies and the implementation of these strategies to focus on student

achievement in all subject areas. The committee will also be reviewing and following the process of the implementation of IB unit plans and criterion assessments in the International Baccalaureate Programme. SAC will continue to research and dialog about improving parent involvement and communication. The SAC approved the SIP on September 13, 2012.

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 LEXINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	80%	78%	91%	65%	314	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%	70%			137	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	66% (YES)	67% (YES)			133	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					584	
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 LEXINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	73%	86%	58%	295	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	66%	67%			133	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	62% (YES)	67% (YES)			129	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