FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: JULIA LANDON COLLEGE PREPARTORY & LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Sara Bravo

SAC Chair: Blake Menzel

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 1, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Sara Bravo	B.A. (Social Science) M.A. (Educational Leadership) Certifications include Secondary Social Science Education Educational Leadership School Principal (All levels)	4.5	4.5	Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2011-2012 (Grade A) / Increase of 136 total points in FCAT score Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2010-2011 (Grade A)/ Increase of 14 total points in FCAT score Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2009-2010 (Grade A)/ AYP Met Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2008-2009 (Grade A)/AYP Met Assistant Principal: Landon Middle School April 2008-2008 (Grade C)/ AYP Not Met
		B.A (Fine Arts)			

Assis Principal	David Cook	M.A. (Educational Leadership Technology) Certifications include Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum Educational Leadership	1.5	1.5	Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2011-2012 (Grade A)/ Increase of 136 total points in FCAT score Teacher: Kirby-Smith Middle School 2004-2011 (Grade A 2007-2011)/ 30 point increase in total FCAT score from 2010-2011)
Assis Principal	John Galeani	B.A. (Philosophy/Applied Ethics) M.A. (Educational Leadership) Certifications include Elementary Education Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum Exceptional Student Education Secondary Social Science Education	1.5	1.5	Assistant Principal: Julia Landon Middle 2011-2012 (Grade A)/ Increase of 136 total points in FCAT score Teacher: Sandalwood High School 2006-2011 (Grade C in 2009 to A in 2010)
Assis Principal	Talya Taylor	B.A. (Communications) M.A. (Curriculum and Instruction K-12) Certifications include: English 5-9 Educational Leadership	.5	.5	School Reading Coach: Highlands Middle School 2011-2012 (Grade C)/ Increase of 95 total points in FCAT score School Instructional Coach: Highlands Middle School 2010-2012 (Grade D)

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)

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Teachers on our staff are asked to communicate to leadership teachers who are potential candidates	Teachers/Leadership Team	Ongoing	
2	2. Leadership Team reviews and interviews potential candidates from the district teacher transfer list	Leadership Team/PLC Teacher Leaders	Spring 2013-Summer 2013	
3	3. School actively participates in all district recruitment fair activities (as available)	Leadership Team/District Personnel	Spring 2012	
4	4. Teachers currently on staff are given consistent feedback and support from the leadership team regarding instructional focus, PLC-driven collaboration, best practices and ongoing professional development. Professional development at the school-based level is embedded in PLC work. In addition to district-level PLC training, all core teachers are granted two TDE days per year to collaboratively plan with their fellow grade level instructor.	Leadership Team/District Personnel	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
37	2.7%(1)	27.0%(10)	43.2%(16)	29.7%(11)	29.7%(11)	73.0%(27)	5.4%(2)	13.5%(5)	13.5%(5)

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
Pamela Smith	Russell Petrick	Mentor is a National Board Certified instructor with extensive experience serving as a peer teacher. She has served all three levels of middle school students, has served as the lead science fair instructor for the past two years and has extensive experience working with Academically Talented and Gifted program students at two magnet schools in Duval County.	All mentee teachers are required to attend monthly Professional Development meetings with the Professional Development Facilitator, one administrator, and, at times, a district coach. These meetings are followed with monthly debriefs between the PDF and the mentor teachers.
		Mentor is currently in her third year as a guidance counselor at Julia Landon and has served all three grade	

Judith Kelly	Jennifer Southwell	levels. Mentor has worked extensively within and taken the lead on all aspects of guidance services including serving the ESE and ESOL population, testing coordination, full service referrals, credit checks and balances, high school goal planning, and progress monitoring.	All mentee teachers/guidance counselors are required to attend monthly Professional Development meetings with the Professional Development Facilitator, one administrator, and, at times, a district coach. These meetings are followed with monthly debriefs between the PDF and the mentor teachers.

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 III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition 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.

Sara Bravo: Principal - The Principal will ensure that the MTSS team has the assets and training needed to be efficient in their tasks, The Principal will oversee the use of student data and interventions through the use of technology and weekly data meeting. The RtI database will be made available for the principal to efficiently monitor the implementation of interventions throughout the school.
Kristie Putnal: MTSS/RtI Facilitator – The MTSS facilitator will oversee the monthly MTSS team meetings as well as participating in the weekly administrative data meetings. The facilitator will act a liaison between the MTSS team and the school as a whole. Lead the development of goals and the formatting of school based paperwork will also fall under the prevue of the facilitator.
David Cook: School Administrative Liaison – The administrative liaison will act as an intermediary between the MTSS team and administration when waiting for the weekly data meeting is not appropriate. The administrative liaison is also crucial line of communication available for the parents of students with interventions. An additional goal for this year is the maintenance and update of the RtI database.
Judith Kelly/Jennifer Southwell: School Counselor Representative - The school councilors provide training to teachers on MTSS, visit PLC meetings to communicate updates on MTSS, answer questions/concerns of teachers on implementation of interventions, conduct small group work session with students and make certain that all interventions are data driven. The councilors are also highly engaged in the updating of interventions listed in the RtI database.
John Manias: ESE Representative – The ESE representative is responsible for overseeing interventions utilized with students staffed into ESE services as well as providing insight into the effectiveness of interventions.

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 leadership team meets monthly to discuss items and situations broader than the scope handled daily by classroom teachers. At least one RtI leadership team representative also attends the bimonthly team meetings and weekly administrative data meetings. The monthly MTSS follow a planned agenda outlining new teacher concerns, interventions, students receiving MTSS interventions and students no longer needing interventions. Progress monitoring of students previously placed on interventions are also reviewed at the monthly leadership meeting. The school based administration is informed of the current progress of students within the RtI process at the weekly administrative data meetings. The MTSS leadership team members attend district training twice annually to receive updates and to collaborate with other schools regarding successful MTSS interventions.

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 participates heavily in the creation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Key safeguards and interventions as outlined by the MTSS team are utilized by the varying content area groups in determining appropriate goals and implementation strategies for the SIP. The RtI data-based problem-solving process is reflected throughout the SIP. The RtI Leadership Team met with the Instructional Leadership Team during the development of the SIP. These two teams reviewed school-wide, teacher, and individual student data. Recommendations were made in accordance with the data.

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.

Numerous data sources are utilized throughout the school year to assess student knowledge in each content area. Sources included previous year's FCAT data, LSAs, FAIR, Benchmark tests, and computer-based coursework. Pearson's Limelight will be used to monitor students' success and progress throughout the year.
This data will be reviewed at teacher team meetings on a bimonthly basis where teacher concerns about current student issues can be discussed. These meetings rely heavily on current student data as derived from district and school-based assessments. Data will also be reviewed at the weekly administrative data meetings where concerns from team meetings can be discussed by the leadership team. These concerns will also be reviewed at the monthly MTSS meeting.
End of year data will be collected through FCAT scores, state EOCs, district EOCs, Compass Odyssey and final student report card grades.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

At this point in our school's implementation of MTSS/RtI, faculty has integrated essential pieces of the tier framework into their daily routines. This is evidenced by the ongoing discussion during bimonthly team meetings and its notation on many teachers' lesson plans. Professional development regarding MTSS updates will be provided through various means during the course of the school year including faculty meetings, team meetings, and one-on-one discussions with teachers. MTSS/RtI has been added to the PLC and team meeting agenda as well as the agenda for the bimonthly administrative data meeting.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The school's MTSS support system has been integrated into a database that can be utilized through an iPad interface. Each member of the administrative and MTSS/RtI leadership teams has an iPad linked to this database so that pertinent information and interventions can be added or monitored at any time. This provides support by allowing the MTSS team to stay informed of interventions put in place by any member of the MTSS team.
The flexibility of utilizing a mobile database to track the implementation and success of interventions allows teachers more student contact time to implement interventions on a regular basis and reduces the paperwork required on minor interventions.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) includes the five PLC teacher leaders for ELA, Math, Science Social Studies and Electives, the three Assistant Principals, the two Intensive Reading teachers and the principal.

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

The school-based LLT functions by meeting on a weekly basis to review ongoing reading and writing data. This data includes FCAT, Benchmark, FAIR, Compass Odyssey reading and SRI data. These pieces of data to taken to the bi-monthly principal's meetings with the PLC teacher leaders in addition to individual PLCs for review. This process is a standing agenda item within each PLC, at the bi-monthly PLC teacher leader meetings and at the weekly leadership team data meetings. LLT members guide individual teaching staff in making instructional modifications as a result of data analysis. Additionally, the LLT guides major initiatives and rollouts regarding school-based literacy topics.

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

The largest change that addresses literacy this school year is the focus on bottom quartile reading students across all contents including elective courses. The bottom quartile at Julia Landon is comprised of a large number of level three readers. These level three students are not enrolled in Intensive Reading and are not receiving the support they need through the core courses alone. Additionally, many of the students who are not showing gains in reading are also enrolled in Intensive Math, which is a course offered during the "skinny" or Team Time. These bottom quartile level three students are not receiving the differentiation and additional practice using reading strategies necessary to grow their reading skills. All non-PE and Health elective teachers are now implementing reading strategy-based bell ringers within their daily lesson planning to reach more of this population.
Additionally, the Intensive Reading curriculum has changed at all three grade levels to Edge, a program which allows teachers more flexibility in their planning.
Student portfolios in all ELA and Social Studies classes involve ongoing expectations of the use of reading and writing

strategies for all grade levels. Students take ownership of the use of these strategies through use of the portfolios.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

At Julia Landon, the teaching and implementation of reading strategies is non-negotiable. Reading strategies are an essential element of our work, and part of the practiced routines and rituals of every teacher in our building. All teachers are trained on how to teach reading strategies, how to differentiate reading strategies to meet the needs of their students and how to help embed the strategies in their content curriculum. School-wide reading strategies were chosen based on the strands of the FCAT Reading Assessment that were continuous areas of deficiency. It is the expectation that all core teachers utilize reading strategies on a weekly basis and the ELA and Social Studies teachers have embedded the school-wide reading strategies into their content area student portfolios. All ELA and Social Studies teachers also utilize the FAIR Data Spreadsheet Tool to identify the reading strategies that best suit individual students who score low or moderately low on the FAIR assessment. All non-PE and Health Elective teachers (Spanish, Technology, Critical Thinking, Art, Drama and Leadership) use Reading Strategies-focused bell ringers on a daily basis in an effort to reach those level three students who comprise a significant portion of Julia Landon's reading bottom quartile.
The Leadership Team monitors the implementation and infusion of reading strategies school-wide through weekly pop-in visits, CAST informal and formal observations and ongoing dialogue through PLCs. These findings are reported weekly as a standing agenda item at leadership data meetings and through a leadership accessed database which provides communication to teachers and among members of the leadership team.

*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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 24% (173 of 722) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, it is expected that 26% (185 of 715) of students are expected to score at Achievement Level 3 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 24% (173 of 722) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	In grades 6-8, 26% (185 of 715) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 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	1A. 1)"Every teacher a Reading Teacher" Working towards a paradigm shift: Content teachers must evolve in an understanding that content is learned through the process of reading. 2)Understanding that the portfolio use and purpose is different than a teacher tracking device – it is a student driven progress monitoring tool. 3)Critical thinking must be an integral part of learning in all content areas. 4)Ensuring the maximization PLC time to bridge the instructional gaps with common language.	1A. 1)Each portfolio cover aligns with the reading categories of vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text. 2)Portfolios are student driven progress monitoring tools. Social Studies track Reading Application and Informational Text. EDGE monitors all four categories. 3)Question stems, CRISS, NHD, RAFT, DBQ, and SQ3R will provide the instructional roadmap for critical thinking. 4)Increase the percentage of interaction between the Social Studies department and Language arts to share ideas, knowledge, and materials with a goal of common ideas, knowledge, and	1A. 1)PLC leads will take a more autonomous role in guiding and leading the work. 2)The Leadership team will look for evidence of movement within the process.	1A. 1)Students will be able to articulate their portfolio work; what is on their tracking sheet as well as what is contained within the portfolio and how the two are connected. 2)Deeper level conversation within the classrooms that promote student driven query. 3)There is uniform instructional conversation that occurs across content. 4)Students use the reading strategies in the elective areas. 5)All teachers are pulling their own reading data and understand how to use it to drive their instruction.	1A. 1)Student Portfolios 2)Leadership PLC/Pop In weekly visits 3)CAST evaluation system 4)District mandated assessments

	5)Pulling reading data from Insight/Inform, and FAIR to drive instruction.	materials. 5)Elective teachers will support the school driven initiative by implementing reading strategies in their content area. 6)Utilization of DAT liaison, Edge teacher to set up professional development training in how to pull appropriate reading reports for specific needs and instructional focus from Insight/Inform, and FAIR.			

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 66% (475 of 722) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, it is expected that 68% (486 of 715) of students are expected to score at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 66% (475 of 722) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.	In grades 6-8, 68% (486 of 715) of students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A. 1)“Every teacher a Reading Teacher” Working towards a paradigm shift: Content teachers must evolve in an understanding that content is learned through the process of reading. 2)Understanding that the portfolio use and purpose is different than a teacher tracking device – it is a student driven progress monitoring tool. 3)Critical thinking must be an integral part of learning in all content areas. 4)Ensuring the maximization PLC time to bridge the instructional gaps with common language. 5)Pulling reading data from Insight/Inform, and FAIR to drive instruction.	2A. 1)Each portfolio cover aligns with the reading categories of vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text. 2)Portfolios are student driven progress monitoring tools. Social Studies track Reading Application and Informational Text. EDGE monitors all four categories. 3)Question stems will provide the instructional roadmap for critical thinking with emphasis on inferring, analysis and synthesizing. 4)Increase the percentage of interaction between the Social Studies department and Language arts to share ideas, knowledge, and materials with a goal of common ideas, knowledge, and materials. 5)Elective teachers will support the school driven initiative by implementing reading strategies in their content area. 6)Utilization of DAT liaison, Edge teacher to set up professional development training in how to pull appropriate reading reports for specific needs and instructional focus from Insight/Inform, and FAIR.	2A.1. 1)PLC leads will take a more autonomous role in guiding and leading the work. 2) The Leadership team will look for evidence of movement within the process.	2A.1. 1)Students will be able to articulate their portfolio work. 2)Deeper level conversation within the classrooms that promote student driven query and student facilitated learning. 3)There is uniform instructional conversation that occurs across content. 4)Students use the reading strategies in the elective areas. 5)All teachers are pulling their own reading data and understand how to use it to drive their instruction.	2A.1. 1)Student Portfolios 2)Leadership PLC/Pop In weekly visits 3)CAST system evaluations 4)District mandated assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in 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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 77% (556 of 722) of students made learning gains in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, 79% (565 of 715) of students are expected to make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 77% (556 of 722) of students made learning gains in reading.	In grades 6-8, 79% (565 of 715) of students will make learning gains 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	3A.1. 1)“Every teacher a Reading Teacher” Working towards a paradigm shift: Content teachers must evolve in an understanding that content is learned through the process of reading. 2)Understanding that the portfolio use and purpose is different than a teacher tracking device – it is a student driven progress monitoring tool. 3)Critical thinking must be an integral part of learning in all content areas. 4)Ensuring the maximization PLC time to bridge the instructional gaps with common language. 5)Pulling reading data from Insight/Inform, and FAIR to drive instruction.	3A.1. 1)Each portfolio cover aligns with the reading categories of vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text. 2)Portfolios are student driven progress monitoring tools. Social Studies track Reading Application and Informational Text. EDGE monitors all four categories. 3)Question stems, CRISS, NHD, RAFT, DBQ, and SQ3R will provide the instructional roadmap for critical thinking. 4)Increase the percentage of interaction between the Social Studies department and Language arts to share ideas, knowledge, and materials with a goal of common ideas, knowledge, and materials. 5)Elective teachers will support the school driven initiative by implementing reading strategies in their content area. 6)Utilization of DAT liaison, Edge teacher to	3A.1. 1)PLC leads will take a more autonomous role in guiding and leading the work. 2)The Leadership team will look for evidence of movement within the process.	3A.1. 1)Students will be able to articulate their portfolio work; what is on their tracking sheet as well as what is contained within the portfolio and how the two are connected. 2)Deeper level conversation within the classrooms that promote student driven query. 3)There is uniform instructional conversation that occurs across content. 4)Students use the reading strategies in the elective areas. 5)All teachers are pulling their own reading data and understand how to use it to drive their instruction.	3A.1. 1)Portfolios 2)Leadership PLC/Pop In weekly visits 3)CAST evaluation system 4)District mandated assessments

		set up professional development training in how to pull appropriate reading reports for specific needs and instructional focus from Insight/Inform, and FAIR.			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading 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 group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 73% (527 of 722) of bottom quartile reading students made learning gains in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, 78% (558 of 715) bottom quartile reading students are expected to make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 73% (527 of 722) of bottom quartile reading students made learning gains in reading.	In grades 6-8, 78% (558 of 715) of bottom quartile reading students will make learning gains 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
	4A.1. 1)“Every teacher a Reading Teacher” Working towards a paradigm shift: Content teachers must evolve in an understanding that content is learned through the process of reading. 2)Understanding that the	4A.1. 1) Each portfolio cover aligns with the reading categories of vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text. 2)Portfolios are student driven progress monitoring tools. Social Studies track Reading	4A.1. 1)PLC leads will take a more autonomous role in guiding and leading the work. 2)The Leadership team will look for evidence of movement within the process.	4A.1. 1)Students will be able to articulate their portfolio work; what is on their tracking sheet as well as what is contained within the portfolio and how the two are connected. 2)Deeper level conversation within the classrooms that promote	4A.1. 1) Portfolios 2)Leadership PLC/Pop In weekly visits 3)CAST evaluation system 4)District mandated

1	portfolio use and purpose is different than a teacher tracking device – it is a student driven progress monitoring tool. 3)Critical thinking must be an integral part of learning in all content areas. 4)Ensuring the maximization PLC time to bridge the instructional gaps with common language. 5)Pulling reading data from Insight/Inform, and FAIR to drive instruction.	Application and Informational Text. EDGE monitors all four categories. 3)Question stems, CRISS, NHD, RAFT, DBQ, and SQ3R will provide the instructional roadmap for critical thinking. 4)Increase the percentage of interaction between the Social Studies department and Language arts to share ideas, knowledge, and materials with a goal of common ideas, knowledge, and materials. 5)Elective teachers will support the school driven initiative by implementing reading strategies in their content area. 6) Utilization of DAT liaison, Edge teacher to set up professional development training in how to pull appropriate reading reports for specific needs and instructional focus from Insight/Inform, and FAIR.		student driven query. 3)There is uniform instructional conversation that occurs across content. 4)Students use the reading strategies in the elective areas. 5)All teachers are pulling their own reading data and understand how to use it to drive their instruction.	assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 5A : Reading Goal #5A: Julia Landon's target AMO for the 2011-2012 school year was 86%. That target was met. The target AMOs for the next			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	1)"Every teache	1)Each portfolio	1)PLC leads wil	1)Students will l	1)Students will l	

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, one subgroup failed to make satisfactory progress in reading when compared to the other subgroups. A particular emphasis will be placed on black students, particularly those scoring in the bottom quartile in the area of reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:6% (30 of 504) Black:33% (38 of 115) Hispanic:17% (5 of 29) Asian:2% (1 of 73) American Indian: N/A	White:5% (24 of 475) Black:30% (34 of 115) Hispanic:15% (6 of 40) Asian:1% (0 of 55) American Indian: N/A
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. 1)“Every teacher a Reading Teacher” Working towards a paradigm shift: Content teachers must evolve in an understanding that content is learned through the process of reading. 2)Understanding that the portfolio use and purpose is different than a teacher tracking device – it is a student driven progress monitoring tool. 3)Critical thinking must be an integral part of learning in all content areas. 4)Ensuring the maximization PLC time to bridge the instructional gaps with common language. 5)Pulling reading data from Insight/Inform, and FAIR to drive instruction.	5B.1. 1)Each portfolio cover aligns with the reading categories of vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text. 2)Portfolios are student driven progress monitoring tools. Social Studies track Reading Application and Informational Text. EDGE monitors all four categories. 3)Question stems, CRISS, NHD, RAFT, DBQ, and SQ3R will provide the instructional roadmap for critical thinking. 4)Increase the percentage of interaction between the Social Studies department and Language arts to share ideas, knowledge, and materials with a goal of common ideas, knowledge, and materials. 5)Elective teachers will support the school driven initiative by implementing reading strategies in their content area. 6)Utilization of DAT liaison, Edge teacher to set up professional development training in how to pull appropriate reading reports for specific needs and instructional focus from Insight/Inform, and FAIR.	5B.1. 1)PLC leads will take a more autonomous role in guiding and leading the work. 2) The Leadership team will look for evidence of movement within the process.	5B.1. 1)Students will be able to articulate their portfolio work; what is on their tracking sheet as well as what is contained within the portfolio and how the two are connected. 2)Deeper level conversation within the classrooms that promote student driven query. 3)There is uniform instructional conversation that occurs across content. 4)Students use the reading strategies in the elective areas. 5)All teachers are pulling their own reading data and understand how to use it to drive their instruction.	5B.1. 1)Student portfolios 2)Leadership PLC/Pop In weekly visits 3)CAST evaluation system 4)District mandated assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	During the 2011-2012 school year, both ELL students maintained their previous FCAT score with only a minimal DSS change of 8 points in both cases. One student was exited from the ESOL program. During the 2012-2013 school year, all three ELL students are expected to make satisfactory progress in reading with at minimum a 50 point DSS change in all three cases.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 7, both ELL students made minimal progress in reading with one ELL student exited from the ESOL program.	In grades 6 and 8, all three ELL students will make satisfactory progress in reading with at minimum a 50 point DSS change in all three cases.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C.1. 1)“Every teacher a Reading Teacher” Working towards a paradigm shift: Content teachers must evolve in an understanding that content is learned through the process of reading. 2)Understanding that the portfolio use and purpose is different than a teacher tracking device – it is a student driven progress monitoring tool. 3)Critical thinking must be an integral part of learning in all content areas. 4)Ensuring the maximization PLC time to bridge the instructional gaps with common language. 5)Pulling reading data from Insight/Inform, and FAIR to drive instruction.	5C.1. 1)Each portfolio cover aligns with the reading categories of vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text. 2)Portfolios are student driven progress monitoring tools. Social Studies track Reading Application and Informational Text. EDGE monitors all four categories. 3)Question stems, CRISS, NHD, RAFT, DBQ, and SQ3R will provide the instructional roadmap for critical thinking. 4)Increase the percentage of interaction between the Social Studies department and Language arts to share ideas, knowledge, and materials with a goal of common ideas, knowledge, and materials. 5)Elective teachers will support the school driven initiative by implementing reading strategies in their content area. 6)Utilization of DAT liaison, Edge teacher to set up professional development training in how to pull appropriate reading reports for specific needs and instructional focus from Insight/Inform, and FAIR.	5C.1. 1)PLC leads will take a more autonomous role in guiding and leading the work. 2)The Leadership team will look for evidence of movement within the process.	5C.1. 1)Students will be able to articulate their portfolio work; what is on their tracking sheet as well as what is contained within the portfolio and how the two are connected. 2)Deeper level conversation within the classrooms that promote student driven query. 3)There is uniform instructional conversation that occurs across content. 4)Students use the reading strategies in the elective areas. 5)All teachers are pulling their own reading data and understand how to use it to drive their instruction.	5C.1. 1)Student portfolios 2)Leadership PLC/Pop In weekly visits 3)CAST evaluation system 4)District mandated assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 26% of the students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, the 26% of students with disabilities that did not make satisfactory progress in reading will drop to 23%. It is expected that 77% (17 of 23) of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 74% (22 of 30) of the students with disabilities made satisfactory progress in reading.	In grades 6-8, 77% (17 of 23) of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in reading.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. 1) “Every teacher a Reading Teacher” Working towards a paradigm shift: Content teachers must evolve in an understanding that content is learned through the process of reading. 2)Understanding that the portfolio use and purpose is different than a teacher tracking device – it is a student driven progress monitoring tool. 3)Critical thinking must be an integral part of learning in all content areas. 4)Ensuring the maximization PLC time to bridge the instructional gaps with common language. 5)Pulling reading data from Insight/Inform, and FAIR to drive instruction.	5D.1. 1)Each portfolio cover aligns with the reading categories of vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text. 2)Portfolios are student driven progress monitoring tools. Social Studies track Reading Application and Informational Text. EDGE monitors all four categories. 3)Question stems, CRISS, NHD, RAFT, DBQ, and SQ3R will provide the instructional roadmap for critical thinking. 4)Increase the percentage of interaction between the Social Studies department and Language arts to share ideas, knowledge, and materials with a goal of common ideas, knowledge, and materials. 5)Elective teachers will support the school driven initiative by implementing reading strategies in their content area. 6)Utilization of DAT liaison, Edge teacher to set up professional development training in how to pull appropriate reading reports for specific needs and instructional focus from Insight/Inform, and FAIR.	5D.1. 1)PLC leads will take a more autonomous role in guiding and leading the work. 2)The Leadership team will look for evidence of movement within the process.	5D.1. 1)Students will be able to articulate their portfolio work; what is on their tracking sheet as well as what is contained within the portfolio and how the two are connected. 2)Deeper level conversation within the classrooms that promote student driven query. 3)There is uniform instructional conversation that occurs across content. 4)Students use the reading strategies in the elective areas. 5)All teachers are pulling their own reading data and understand how to use it to drive their instruction.	5D.1. 1) Student portfolios 2)Leadership PLC/Pop In weekly visits 3)CAST evaluation system 4)District mandated assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 31% economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, the 31% economically disadvantaged students who did not make satisfactory progress in reading will drop to 29%. It is expected that 71% (62 of 88) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 69% (62 of 90) of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in reading.	In grades 6-8, 71% (62 of 88) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. 1)“Every teacher a Reading Teacher” Working towards a paradigm shift: Content teachers must evolve in an understanding that content is learned through the process of reading. 2) Understanding that the portfolio use and purpose is different than a teacher tracking device – it is a student driven progress monitoring tool. 3) Critical thinking must be an integral part of learning in all content areas. 4)Ensuring the maximization PLC time to bridge the instructional gaps with common language. 5)Pulling reading data from Insight/Inform, and FAIR to drive instruction.	1)Each portfolio cover aligns with the reading categories of vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text. 2) Portfolios are student driven progress monitoring tools. Social Studies track Reading Application and Informational Text. EDGE monitors all four categories. 3) Question stems, CRISS, NHD, RAFT, DBQ, and SQ3R will provide the instructional roadmap for critical thinking. 4)Increase the percentage of interaction between the Social Studies department and Language arts to share ideas, knowledge, and materials with a goal of common ideas, knowledge, and materials. 5)Elective teachers will support the school driven initiative by implementing reading strategies in their content area. 6)Utilization of DAT liaison, Edge teacher to set up professional development training in how to pull appropriate reading reports for specific needs and instructional focus from Insight/Inform, and FAIR.	5E.1. 1)PLC leads will take a more autonomous role in guiding and leading the work. 2)The Leadership team will look for evidence of movement within the process.	5E.1. 1)Students will be able to articulate their portfolio work; what is on their tracking sheet as well as what is contained within the portfolio and how the two are connected. 2)Deeper level conversation within the classrooms that promote student driven query. 3)There is uniform instructional conversation that occurs across content. 4)Students use the reading strategies in the elective areas. 5)All teachers are pulling their own reading data and understand how to use it to drive their instruction.	5E.1. 1. 1)Student Portfolios 2)Leadership PLC/Pop In weekly visits 3)CAST evaluation system 4)District mandated 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
				Ongoing		

District PLC Work Categorizing the Curriculum	6-8 ELA Social Studies	R. Cormier B. England Leadership Team	ELA PLC, Social Studies PLC All grade levels	Bi-monthly early release meetings and PLC Plus district trainings four times a year Bi-monthly meetings between PLC Leads and Principal	Continued dialogue during PLC meetings using standing agendas Weekly Friday Data meetings with leadership team and RtI team members	ELA and Social Studies PLC Teacher Leaders Leadership Team
School-wide reading strategies	6-8 All subjects	PLC Teacher Leaders Intensive Reading Teacher Leadership Team	All PLC participants	Ongoing standing agenda item at bi-monthly early release meetings Bi-monthly meetings between PLC Leads and Principal	Continued dialogue during PLC meetings using standing agendas Weekly Friday Data meetings with leadership team and RtI team members	All PLC Teacher Leaders Leadership Team
RtI Training	6-8 All subjects	RtI Team Leadership Team All Grade Level Team Leaders All PLC Teacher Leaders	All subjects All grades	Ongoing portion of agenda at Friday Data meetings Ongoing standing agenda item at all bi-monthly grade level team meetings	Continued dialogue during bi-monthly grade level team meetings at which the grade level administrator is always present Use of RtI database by leadership team and RtI team to continually track and monitor all students in need of additional tiered support	RtI Team Leadership Team Grade level teacher leaders PLC Teacher Leaders

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide laminated reading strategies posters to every ELA, SS and Elective teacher	Laminated Posters	School Operating Funds	$400.00
			Subtotal: $400.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PLC District Training: Providing teachers the tools and knowledge needed to collaborate effectively in creating common assessments and data-driven instructional units to provide students with the best possible differentiated instruction.	PLC Training: In house through TDE training and work sessions and District Trainings held at the Schultz Center for Teaching and Leadership. Substitute teachers needed these days.	School Operating Funds	$4,000.00
			Subtotal: $4,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $4,400.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students 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
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students 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
No Data Submitted				

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students 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
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 16% (114 of 722) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, 17% (122 of 715) of students are expected to score at Achievement Level 3 in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 16% (114 of 722) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in math.	In grades 6-8, 17% (122 of 715) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. 1) Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom.	1A.1. 1) The computer lab will be available to all students before school each day. 2) Access to computers for all community education, Team Up and athletes in the after school study hall programs.	1A.1. 1) Computer lab teacher 2) Community Education teachers 3) Team-Up teachers 4) Athletic coaches	1A.1. 1) The computer lab teacher will remain in constant contact with classroom teachers about student progress.	1A.1. 1) Weekly reports/updates from classroom teachers. 2) Compass Odyssey reports generated by compass odyssey teacher.
2	1A.2. 1)All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level.	1A.2. 1) Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. 2) Use daily FCAT bell ringers in all PE and Health classes, developed by the math PLC. 3) Give enrollment priority to all level 1 and 2 math students into the team-up program. 4) Progress Monitor each Module through the use of PLC collaboratively created exit slips and quizzes. 5) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into	1A.2. 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2) Classroom teachers 3) Math PLC lead teacher 4) Compass Odyssey teacher	1A.2. 1) Attend district PLC training and provide time during early release days for collaboration by grade level and subject area. 2) Provide TDEs for teachers to plan out Math Modules and create lesson plans utilizing the Categorizing the Curriculum process. 3) Incorporate Higher Order Thinking questions collaboratively developed during PLC meetings and training into the math curriculum. 4) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students reflect	1A.2. 1) LSA district baseline and Post Tests 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds

		instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 6) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.		upon their work, and recycle their work. 5) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST Evaluation system
3	1A.3. 1) Students need to increase their reading stamina in order to be able to interrupt word problems.	1A.3. 1)Have students routinely create word problems that expand upon their mathematical knowledge.	1A.3 1) Classroom teacher 2)PLC Lead Teacher	1A.3. 1) On-going use of rubric will be utilized to monitor student progress.	1A.3. 1) PLC created word problem rubric
4	1A.4. 1) Insufficient time to move deeply into the curriculum while maintaining a solid pace with the learning schedule.	1A.4. 1) Skillfully design Research (Team Time) classes to allow for exploration of discovery learning; increasing movement from concrete thinkers to abstract learners. 2) Strategically review and remediate skills from the previous year.	1A.4. 1) Team Time teachers 2) PLC Lead Teacher	1A.4. 1) Progress monitor students using Pearson data management system	1A.4. 1) Pearson data management system

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:	
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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 71% (513 of 722) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, it is expected that 73% (521 of 715) of students are expected to score at or above Achievement Level 4 in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 71% (513 of 722) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in math.	In grades 6-8, 73% (521 of 715) of students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. 1) The challenge of moving students forward who are already proficient in math while deepening and extending their knowledge.	2A.1. 1) Progress Monitor each Module through the use of collaboratively created exit slips and quizzes. 2) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 3) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction. 4) Embed Webb's DOK questions into daily routine. 5) Participation in Florida Math League which encourages problem solving skills.	2A.1. 1) Classroom teacher 2) PLC Lead Teacher	2A.1. 1) Attend district PLC training and provide time during early release days for collaboration by grade level and subject area. 2) Provide TDEs for teachers to plan out Math Modules and create lesson plans utilizing the Categorizing the Curriculum process. 3) Incorporate Webb's DOK and Higher Order Thinking questioning techniques, collaboratively developed during PLC meetings and training, into the math curriculum. 4) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 5) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson	2A.1. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST system evaluations 9) Florida Math League Contest
2	2A.2. 1) Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom.	2A.2. 1) The computer lab will be available to all students before school each day. 2) Access to computers for all community education, Team Up and athletes in the after school study hall programs.	2A.2. 1) Computer lab teacher 2) Community Education teachers 3) Team-Up teachers 4) Athletic coaches	2A.2. 1) The computer lab teacher will remain in constant contact with classroom teachers about student progress.	2A.2. 1) Weekly reports/updates from classroom teachers. 2) Odyssey reports generated by compass odyssey teacher.

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 93% (671 of 722) of students made learning gains in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, 94% (672 of 715) of students are expected to make learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 93% (671 of 722) of students made learning gains in math.	In grades 6-8, 94% (672 of 715) of students will make learning gains in math.

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	3A.1. 1)All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	3A.1. 1)Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. 2)Use daily FCAT bell ringers in all PE and Health classes that were developed by the math PLC. 3)Give enrollment priority to all level 1 and 2 math students into the team-up program. 4) Progress Monitor each Module through the use of collaboratively created exit slips and quizzes in addition to daily assessment of class work/homework. 5) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 6)Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.	3A.1. 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2)Classroom teachers 3)Math PLC lead teacher 4)Compass Odyssey teacher	3A.1. 1)Attend district PLC training and provide time during early release days for collaboration by grade level and subject area. 2) Provide TDE for teachers to plan out Math Modules and create lesson plans utilizing the Categorizing the Curriculum process. 3) Incorporate Higher Order Thinking questions collaboratively developed during PLC meetings and training into the math curriculum. 4) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 5)Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson	3A.1. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2)PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3)Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6)District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8)CAST system evaluations
	3A.2. 1) Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom.	3A.2. 1)The computer lab will be available to all students before school each day.	3A.2. 1)Computer lab teacher 2)Community	3A.2. 1) The computer lab teacher will remain in constant contact with classroom teachers about	3A.2. 1) Weekly reports/updates from classroom teachers.

2		2)Access to computers for all community education, Team Up and athletes in the after school study hall programs.	Education teachers 3)Team-Up teachers 4)Athletic coaches	student progress.	2)Odyssey reports generated by compass odyssey teacher.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
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:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Mathematics Goal #4: During the 2011-2012 school year, 93% (671 of 722) of bottom quartile math students made learning gains in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, 94% (672 of 715) of bottom quartile math students are expected to make learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 93% (671 of 722) of bottom quartile math students made learning gains in math.	In grades 6-8, 94% (672 of 715) of bottom quartile math students will make learning gains in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4A.1. 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level 2) Lack of parental support	4A.1. 1) Build caring, nurturing classroom environments and strong relationships with students 2) Strategically pair high need students with community-based mentors. 3) Contact parents	4A.1. 1) Classroom teacher 2) Grade Level Administrator	4A.1. 1) Progress monitor students using Pearson data management system 2) RtI reports generated by the RtI Leadership Team	4A.1. 1) Pearson data management system 2) RtI evaluation instruments

		(utilizing notification letters and School Messenger) to emphasize the importance of regular and timely attendance at school.	3) RtI Leadership Team		
2	4A.2. 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	4A.2 1) Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. 2) Use daily FCAT bell ringers in all PE and Health classes that were developed by the math PLC. 3) Give enrollment priority to all level 1 and 2 math students into the team-up program. 4) Progress Monitor each Module through the use of collaboratively created exit slips and quizzes in addition to daily assessment of class work/homework. 5) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 6) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.	4A2. 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2) Classroom teachers 3) Math PLC lead teacher 4) Compass Odyssey teacher	4A.2. 1) Attend district PLC training and provide time during early release days for collaboration by grade level and subject area. 2) Provide TDEs for teachers to plan out Math Modules and create lesson plans utilizing the Categorizing the Curriculum process. 3) Incorporate Higher Order Thinking questions collaboratively developed during PLC meetings and training into the math curriculum. 4) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 5) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson	4A.2. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST system evaluations
3	4A.3. 1) Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom.	4A.3. 1) The computer lab will be available to all students before school each day. 2) Access to computers for all community education, Team Up and athletes in the after school study hall programs.	4A.3. 1) Computer lab teacher 2) Community Education teachers 3) Team-Up teachers 4) Athletic coaches	4A.3. 1) The computer lab teacher will remain in constant contact with classroom teachers about student progress.	4A.3. 1) Weekly reports/updates from classroom teachers. 2) Odyssey reports generated by compass odyssey teacher.

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 : Julia Landon's target AMO for the 2011-2012 school year was 93%. That target was met. The target AMOs for the next six years are as follows: Target AMO for 2013: 93%

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	1)PLC develops	1)PLC develops	1)Student portfc	1)Student portfc	1)Student portfc	

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, one subgroup failed to make satisfactory progress in math when compared to the other subgroups. A particular emphasis will be placed on black students, particularly those scoring in the bottom quartile in the area of math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 2% (10 of 504) Black: 27% (31 of 115) Hispanic: 3% (1 of 29) Asian:0% (all students made satisfactory progress) American Indian: N/A	White: 1% (5 of 475) Black: 24% (28 of 115) Hispanic: 2% (1 of 40) Asian: 0% (all students will make satisfactory progress) American Indian: N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level 2) Lack of parental support	5B.1. 1)Collegial conversations and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team. 2) Seat students in need close to the front of the room. 3)Assign buddies and peer tutors.	5B.1. 1) Classroom teacher 2) PLC Lead Teacher 3) Guidance Counselors 4) ESE Teacher 5) Leadership team 6) RtI Team	5B.1. 1)Formal and informal observations 2)Close monitoring of each of these students by teachers, RtI Team, counselors, and Leadership.	5B.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership.
2	5B.2. 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	1) Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. 3) Give enrollment priority to all level 1 and 2 math students into the team-up program. 3) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing differentiated instruction to students who are falling behind. 6) Analysis of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.	5B2. 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2) Classroom teachers 3) Math PLC lead teacher 4) Compass Odyssey teacher	5B.2. 1) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work and reflect upon their progress and growth. 2)Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	5B.2. 1) LSA district baseline, and post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmark Assessments 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST Evaluation system

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, both ELL students made satisfactory progress in mathematics. One ELL student raised her math FCAT score from a level 1 to a level 3. The other ELL student raised his math FCAT score from a level 4 to a level 5. During the 2012-2013 school year, all three ELL students are expected to make satisfactory progress in math with each raising their math FCAT score one level or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 7, both ELL students made satisfactory progress in math with an increase of one or two math FCAT levels.	In grades 6 and 8, all three ELL students will make satisfactory progress in math with each raising their math FCAT score one level or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C.1. 1)Non-English speaking parents 2)Lack of training for teachers on proper accommodations for English Language Learners in their classroom.	5C.1. 1)Ensure all teachers have sufficient training to accommodate ELL learners. 2)Seat students close to center instruction 3)Create student-centered leaning strategies that best meets the needs of each ELL student and provide alternative instruction whenever need arises. 4) Give verbal and written information and explanation along with visual presentations. 5)Auditory plus written directions in a brief format. 6)Assign buddies and peer tutors.	5C.1. 1)Classroom teacher 2)PLC Lead 3)Guidance Counselor 4)ESE Teacher 5)Leadership team 6)RtI Team	5C.1. 1) Attend district PLC training and provide time during early release days for collaboration by grade level and subject area. 2) Provide TDE for teachers to plan out Math Modules and create lesson plans utilizing the Categorizing the Curriculum process. 3) Incorporate Higher Order Thinking questions collaboratively developed during PLC meetings and training into the math curriculum. 4) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work and reflect upon their progress. 5) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using the Pearson data management system.	5C.1 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmark Assessments 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST Evaluation system
	5E.2. 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	5E.2. 1) Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. 2) Give enrollment priority to all level 1 and 2 math students into the team-up program. 3) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while	5E.2. 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2) Classroom teachers 3) Math PLC lead teacher 4) Compass Odyssey teacher	5E.2. 1) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 2) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	5E.2. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo

2		providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 6) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.			reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST system evaluations

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 11% (3 of 30) of the students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, the 11% of students with disabilities that did not make satisfactory progress in reading will drop to 10%. It is expected that 90% (20 of 23) of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 89% (26 of 30) of the students with disabilities made satisfactory progress in math.	In grades 6-8, 90% (20 of 23) of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. 1) Proper identification of RtI Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 2) Lack of parental support	5D.1. 1)Collegial conversation and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team. 2)Seat student close to the front of the room. 3)Assign buddies and peer tutors.	5D.1. 1)Classroom teacher 2)RtI Team 3)Guidance Counselor	5D.1. 1)Formal and informal observations 2)Close monitoring of each of these students by teachers, RtI Team, counselors, and Leadership.	5D.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership.
	5D.2. 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	5D.2. 1) Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. 3) Give priority to all level 1 and 2 math students	5D.2. 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2) Classroom teachers	5D.2. 1) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth.	5D.2. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes

2		enrolling in the team-up program. 3) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 4)Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.	3) Math PLC lead teacher 4)Compass Odyssey teacher	2) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4)Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6 District Benchmark assessments 7)Pearson data management system 8)CAST Evaluation system

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 19% (23 of 122) economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, the 19% of economically disadvantaged students who did not make satisfactory progress in reading will drop to 18%. It is expected that 82% (72 of 88) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 19% (23 of 122) of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math.	In grades 6-8, 18% (72 of 88) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. 1) Proper identification of RtI Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 2) Lack of parental support	5E.1. 1) Collegial conversation and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team. 2) Seat student close to the front of the room. 3) Assign buddies and peer tutors.	5E.1. 1) Classroom teacher 2) RtI team	5E.1. 1)Formal and informal observations 2) Close monitoring of each of these students by teachers, RtI Team, counselors, and Leadership.	5E.1. 1) Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, guidance counselors and the Leadership Team.
	5E.2. 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	5E.2. 1) Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. 2) Give enrollment priority	5E.2. 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2) Classroom	5E.2. 1) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth.	5E.2. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes

2		to all level 1 and 2 math students into the team-up program. 3) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 4) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.	teachers 3) Math PLC lead teacher 4)Compass Odyssey teacher	2) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST system evaluations
3	5E.3. 1) Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom.	5E.3. 1) The computer lab will be available to all students before school each day. 2) Access to computers for all community education, Team Up and athletes in the after school study hall programs.	5E.3. 1) Computer lab teacher 2) Community Education teachers 3) Team-Up teachers 4) Athletic coaches	5E.3. 1) The computer lab teacher will remain in constant contact with classroom teachers about student progress.	5E.3. 1) Weekly reports/updates from classroom teachers. 2) Odyssey reports generated by compass odyssey teacher.

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 9% (7 of 78) of 7th graders scored at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra I. 50% (72 of 143) of 8th graders scored at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra I. During the 2012-2013 school year, 8% (9 of 111) of 7th graders are expected to score at Achievement level 3 in Algebra I. 49% (64 of 132) of 8th graders are expected to share at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra I.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 7, 9% (7 of 78) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra I. In grade 8, 50% (72 of 143) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra I.	In grade 7, 9% (10 of 111) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra I. In grade 8, 52% (69 of 132) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra I.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	1.1. 1) Computer literacy/skills necessary to successfully complete Algebra EOC online.	1.1. 1) Provide routine access to online LSAs as a means to practice online testing.	1.1. 1) Classroom teacher 2) Testing Coordinator 3)Computer Lab Teacher	1.1. 1) Progress monitor students using Pearson data management system	1.1. 1) Pearson management system
2	1.2 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	1.2 1) Placement of all level 1, 2 and 3 students in intensified algebra class. 3) Give priority to all level 1 and 2 math students enrolling in the team-up program. 3) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 6) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.	1.2 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2) Classroom teachers 3) Math PLC lead teacher 4) Compass Odyssey teacher	1.2 1) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 2) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	1.2 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST system evaluations

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 91% (71 of 78) of 7th graders scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra I. 50% (71 of 143) of 8th graders scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra I. During the 2012-2013 school year, 92% (102 of 111) of 7th graders are expected to score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra I. 53% (70 of 132) of 8th graders are expected to score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra I..
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 7, 91% (71 of 78) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra I. In grade 8, 50% (71 of 143) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra I	In grade 7, 92% (102 of 111) of students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra I. In grade 8, 53% (70 of 132) of students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra I

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	2.1. 1) The challenge of moving students forward who are already proficient in math while deepening and extending their knowledge.	2.1. 1) Progress Monitor each Module through the use of collaboratively created exit slips and quizzes. 2) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 3) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction. 4) Embed Webb's DOK questions into daily routine. 5) Participation in Florida Math League which encourages problem solving skills.	2.1. 1) Classroom teachers 2) PLC Lead Teacher	2.1. 1) Provide time during early release days for collegial collaboration. 2) Provide TDE for teachers to plan out Math Modules and create lesson plans utilizing the Categorizing the Curriculum process. 3) Incorporate Webb's DOK and Higher Order Thinking questioning techniques, collaboratively developed during PLC meetings and training, into the math curriculum. 4) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 5) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson	2.1. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST system evaluations 9) Florida Math League Contest

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 : Algebra 1 Goal #3A: Julia Landon's target AMO for the 2011-2012 school year was 93%. That target was met. The target AMOs for the next					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	1)PLC develops	1)PLC develops	1)Student portfc	1)Student portfc	1)Student portfc	

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, all subgroups of students enrolled in Algebra I made satisfactory progress. 95% (210 of 221) of students enrolled in Algebra I made satisfactory progress. During the 2012-2013 school year, all student subgroups enrolled in Algebra will make satisfactory progress in Algebra I with a decrease in the non-satisfactory numbers within both the white and black subgroups.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The numbers below reflect the students who did not make satisfactory progress. White:6% (4 of 151) Black:8% (8 of 44) Hispanic 0% (5 of 5) Asian:0% (21 of 21) American Indian: N/A	The numbers below reflect the students who will not make satisfactory progress. White: 5% (8 of 171) Black:7% (3 of 44) Hispanic:1% (1 of 14) Asian: 0% (11 of 11) American Indian: N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3B.1. 1)Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom 2)Accelerated placement of students in all grades 3)Computer literacy/skills necessary to successfully complete Algebra End of Course exam	3B.1. 1) Collegial conversation and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team. 2)Seat student close to the front of the room. 3)Assign buddies and peer tutors.	3B.1. 1) Classroom teacher 2)PLC Lead Teachers 3) Guidance Counselor 4)ESE Teacher 5)Leadership team 6)RtI Team	3B.1. 1)Formal and informal observations 3)Close monitoring of each of these students by teachers, RtI Team, counselors, and Leadership Team	3B.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership.

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, there were no ELL students enrolled in Algebra I. During the 2012-2013 school year, it is expected that 100% (1 of 1) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra I earning a score of 3 or higher on the Algebra I EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, there were no ELL students enrolled in Algebra I..	In grade 8, 100% (1 of 1) ELL students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra I by earning a score of 3 or higher on the Algebra I EOC.

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	3C.1. 1)Non-English speaking parents 2) Lack of training for teachers on proper accommodations for English Language Learners in their classroom.	3C.1. 1) Ensure all teachers have sufficient training to accommodate ELL learners. 2) Seat students close to center instruction 3) Create student centered leaning strategies that best meets the needs of each individual ELL student and provide alternative instruction whenever need arises. 4) Give verbal and written information and explanation along with visual presentations. 5) Auditory plus written directions in a brief format. 6) Assign buddies and peer tutors.	3C.1. 1) Classroom teacher 2) PLC Lead 3) Guidance Counselor 4) ESE Teacher 5) Leadership team 6)RtI Team	3C.1. 1) Attend district PLC training and provide time during early release days for collaboration by grade level and subject area. 2) Provide TDE for teachers to plan out Math Modules and create lesson plans utilizing the Categorizing the Curriculum process. 3) Incorporate Higher Order Thinking questions collaboratively developed during PLC meetings and training into the math curriculum. 4) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 5) Evaluate effectiveness	3C.1 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data

				of instruction using Pearson	management system 8)CAST system evaluations

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 100% (2 of 2) of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory progress in Algebra I. During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% (22 of 22) of Students with Disabilities are expected to make satisfactory progress in Algebra I.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 7 and 8, 100 % (2 of 2) of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory progress in Algebra I.	In grades 7 and 8, 100% (22 of 22) of Students with Disabilities will made satisfactory progress in Algebra I.

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	3D.1. 1) Proper identification of RtI Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 2)Lack of parental support	3D.1. 1)Collegial conversation and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team. 2)Seat student close to the front of the room. 3)Assign buddies and peer tutors.	3D.1. 1)Classroom teacher 2. RtI Team 3)Guidance Counselors	3D.1. 1)Formal and informal observations 2)Close monitoring of each of these students by teachers, RtI Team, counselors, and Leadership.	3D.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership.
2	5D.2. 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	3D.2. 1) Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. 3) Give priority to all level 1 and 2 math students enrolling in the team-up program. 3) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 6) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.	3D.2. 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2)Classroom teachers 3)Math PLC lead teacher 4)Compass Odyssey teacher	3D.2. 1) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 2) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	3D.2. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmarks 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST system

					evaluations

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 17% (39 of 222) of Algebra students were part of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup. 79% (31 of 39) of these students made satisfactory progress in Algebra I. During the 2012-2013 school year, 22% (42 of 192) of Algebra students are part of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup. 80% (34 of 42) of these students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra I.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 7 and 8, 79% (31 of 39) of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup made satisfactory progress in Algebra I.	In grades 7 and 8, 80% (34 of 42) of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will make satisfactory progress in Algebra I.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3E.1. 1)Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom 2) Proper identification of RtI Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 3)Lack of parental support	3E.1. 1 Collegial conversation and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team. 2) Seat student close to the front of the room. 3)Assign buddies and peer tutors.	3E.1. 1) Classroom teacher 2) RtI team	3E.1. 1)Formal and informal observations 2 Close monitoring of each of these students by teachers, RtI Team, counselors, and Leadership.	3E.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadershp.
2	5E.2. 1) All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	5E.2. 1) Placement of all level 1 and 2 6th and 7th grade students in daily intensive math classes. 2 Give enrollment priority to all level 1 and 2 math students into the team-up program. 3)Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 4) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.	5E.2. 1) Team-up coordinator and team-up math teachers 2)Classroom teachers 3)Math PLC lead teacher 4)Compass Odyssey teacher	5E.2. 1) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 2)Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	5E.2. 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2)PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3)Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4)Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6)District Benchmark assessments 7) Pearson data management system 8) CAST Evaluation system

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 0% of students scored at the Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. During the 2012-2013 school year, it is expected that 0% of students will score at the Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 8, 0% of students scored at the Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	In grade 8, 0% of students will score at the Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. 1) Computer literacy/skills necessary to successfully complete Algebra EOC online.	1.1. 1) Provide routine access to online LSAs as a means to practice online testing.	1.1. 1)Classroom teacher 2)Testing Coordinator 3)Computer Lab Teacher	1.1. 1)Progress monitor students using Pearson data management system	11. 1)Pearson management system
2	1.2 1)All students are placed in accelerated math classes at each grade level	1.2 1) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 2) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction.	1.2 1) Classroom teachers 2)Math PLC lead teacher	1.2 1) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 2) Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	1.2 1) LSA district baseline, and Post test 2)PLC created exit slips and quizzes 3) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 4) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 5) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 6) District Benchmark assessments 7) Pearson data

					management system 8) CAST Evaluation system

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 100% (79 of 79) students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% (87 of 87) students are expected to score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 8, 100% (79 of 79) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	In grade 8, 100% (87 of 87) of students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. 1) The challenge of moving students forward who are already proficient in math while deepening and extending their knowledge.	2.1. 1) Progress Monitor each Module through the use of collaboratively created exit slips and quizzes in addition to daily assessment of class work/homework. 2) Incorporate Compass Odyssey and Gizmos into instruction while providing Differentiated Instruction to students who are falling behind. 3) Analyses of data using Pearson data management system to drive instruction. 4) Embed Webb's DOK questions into daily routine. 5) Participation in Florida Math League which encourages problem solving skills	2.1. 1) Classroom teacher 2) PLC Lead Teacher	2.1. 1) Provide time during early release days for collegial collaboration. 2) Incorporate Webb's DOK and Higher Order Thinking questioning techniques, collaboratively developed during PLC meetings and training, into the math curriculum. 3) Self-evaluation by students using the PLC developed portfolios in which students recycle their work, reflect upon their work and growth. 4)Evaluate effectiveness of instruction using Pearson data management system	2.1. 1) PLC created exit slips and quizzes 2) Standard portfolios used in all math classes 3) Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports used to differentiate instruction 4) Formal and informal assessments using interactive white boards and iResponds 5) District Benchmark assessments 6)Pearson data management system 7)CAST Evaluation system 8)Florida Math League Contest

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	Geometry Goal # Julia Landon's target AMO for the 2011-2012 school year was 93%. That target was met. The target AMOs for the next six years are as follows:

50%.	3A : Target AMO for 2013: 93%				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	1)PLC develops	1)Student portfc	1)Student portfc	1)Student portfc	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 100% of the students subgroups made satisfactory progress in Geometry. During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of the student subgroups are expected to make satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 100% (73 of 79) Black: 100% (2 of 79) Hispanic:100% (1 of 79) Asian: 100% (3 of 79) American Indian: N/A	White: 100% (64 of 87) Black: 100% (8 of 87) Hispanic: 100% (3 of 87) Asian: 100% (3 of 87) American Indian: 100% (1 of 1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3B.1. 1)Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom 2)Accelerated placement of students in all grades 3)Computer literacy/skills necessary to successfully complete Geometry End of Course Exam	3B.1. 1)Collegial conversation and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team. 2)Seat student close to the front of the room. 3)Assign buddies and peer tutors.	3B.1. 1)Classroom teacher 2)PLC Lead Teacher 3)Guidance Counselors 4)ESE Teacher 5)Leadership team 6)RtI Team	3B.1. 1)Formal and informal observations 2)Close monitoring of each of these students by teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership Team	3B.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership Team

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, there were no ELL students enrolled in Geometry. During the 2012-2013 school year, there are no ELL students enrolled in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 100% (1 of 1) of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory progress in Geometry. During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% (1 of 1) Students with Disabilities is expected to make satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 8, 100% (1 of 1) of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory progress in Geometry.	In grade 8, 100% (1 of 1) of Students with Disabilities will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3D.1. 1)Proper identification of RtI Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 2)Lack of parental support	3D.1. 1)Collegial conversation and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team. 2)Seat student close to the front of the room. 3)Assign buddies and peer tutors.	3D.1. 1)Classroom teacher 2)RtI Team 3)Guidance Counselors	3D.1. 1)Formal and informal observations 2)Close monitoring of each of these students by teachers, RtI Team, counselors, and Leadership.	3D.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	During the 2011-2012 school year, no students enrolled in Geometry were Economically Disadvantaged. During the 2012-2013 school year, no students enrolled in Geometry are Economically Disadvantaged.
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	3E.1. 1)Inadequate access to technology outside the classroom 2)Proper identification of RtI Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 3)Lack of parental support	3E.1. 1)Collegial conversation and monitoring of student data with PLC team, grade level team and RtI Team. 2)Seat student close to the front of the room. 3)Assign buddies and peer tutors.	3E.1. 1)Classroom teacher 2)RtI team	3E.1. 1)Formal and informal observations 2)Close monitoring of each of these students by teachers, RtI Team, counselors, and Leadership.	3E.1. 1)Feedback from teachers, RtI Team, counselors and Leadership Team

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
District PLC Work Categorizing the Curriculum	Math PLC All grades	K. Putnal Leadership Team	MJ1, MJ2, and Algebra	Ongoing Bi-monthly early release meetings and quarterly PLC Plus district trainings for 6th grade teachers Bi-monthly meetings between PLC Leads and Principal	Continued dialogue during PLC meetings with standing agendas, weekly Friday Data Meetings with Leadership Team and RtI Team members	Math PLC Lead Teacher and Leadership Team
District PLC Work Categorizing the Curriculum	Math PLC All grades	K. Putnal Leadership Team	MJ1, MJ2, and Algebra	Ongoing Bi-monthly early release meetings and quarterly PLC Plus district trainings for 6th grade teachers Bi-monthly meetings between PLC Leads and Principal	Continued dialogue during PLC meetings with standing agendas, weekly Friday Data Meetings with Leadership Team and RtI Team members	Math PLC Lead Teacher and Leadership Team

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
PLC District Training: Providing teachers the tools and knowledge needed to collaborate effectively in creating common assessments and data-driven instructional units to provide students with the best possible differentiated instruction.	PLC Training: In house through TDE training and work sessions and District Trainings held at the Schultz Center for Teaching and Leadership. Substitute teachers needed these days.	School Operating Funds	$4,000.00
			Subtotal: $4,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $4,000.00

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 38% (83 of 220) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Science. During the 2012-2013 school year, 40% (87 of 219) of students are expected to score at Achievement Level 3 in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 8, 38% (83 of 220) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Science.	In grade 8, 40% (87 of 219) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1 1) The Science FCAT is cumulatively based on skills from 6th through 8th grade. 2) The Science FCAT is only administered to 8th grade. 3) The District Science Benchmark is only administered to 8th grade students. 4) Students in Intensive Reading and Math class do not have Research (Team Time) class with science teacher.	1A.1. 1) Utilization of Research (Team Time) class to strategically reinforce/review previous grade level curriculum. 2). Science PLC will continue to categorize curriculum and analyze student data within and across grade levels. 3) Modeling and implementation of test taking strategies and student self-assessment across grade levels. 4) Students in all grade levels take a school-staff created benchmark, aligned to appropriate FCAT Specs. 5) Students will take district baseline and posttest LSAs for each unit according to district timeline. 6) Analysis of ongoing Benchmark data (both District and School-level) using the Pearson database system to determine RtI for those not on target. 7) Incorporate 5E model into weekly	1A.1. 1)All Science Teachers 2)Science PLC Teacher Leader 3)Science PLC administrative Liaison 4)Team Up Teachers 5)Community Education Teachers	1A.1. 1) Pearson Limelight student data reports on LSAs and Benchmarks. 2) Evaluation of student data from iResponse reports. 3) Teacher evaluation of Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports. 4) Student analysis of data including pretests, posttests and exit slips. 5) Continuous monitoring of student data within and across grade levels during bi-monthly PLC meetings. 6) Teacher/student conferences utilizing student goal setting documents to build student awareness and responsibility for learning. 7) PLC developed student self – reflection/recycle correlated to classroom assessments. 8) Evaluate exit slip data looking for statistical differences between those in science Research Class	1A.1. 1) Benchmark Assessments 2) District LSAs 3) PLC developed exit slips 4) CAST Evaluation system 5) Leadership classroom drop-ins 6) Student reflections 7) Student portfolios

			instruction. 8) Give enrollment priority to level 1 and 2 math and ELA students into Team Up program where they will receive assistance on Science instruction/homework. 9) Targeted science assistance given to students enrolled in Community Education Program. 10) Small group pull out in class and selective grouping will be utilized in class to reinforce Research (Team Time) class materials.		and those who do not have Research class (students enrolled in Intensive Math)	
2	1A.2. 1) Students need to increase their reading stamina in order to interpret science content questions. 2) Students need to increase their ability to decode level III and IV DOK questions.	1A.2. 1) Utilize daily bellringers, exit slips, collaborative assessments and higher order questioning within daily instruction. 2) Embedding Webb's DOK into science curriculum. 3) Incorporate use of Science Reading Strategies into instruction. 4) Reinforcing content writing skills, using F.R.I.E.S. writing strategy, emphasizing writing with evidence. 5) Probing students to respond to higher order thinking questions with evidence to support their reasoning during analysis of labs and hands on activities. 6) 8th grade students utilize vocabulary strategy based on Frayer Model, visualization and making connections to deepen their understanding of content vocabulary. 7) Utilization of Science Reading Strategies.	1A.2. 1) All Science Teachers 2) Science PLC Lead Teacher 3) Science PLC Administrative Liaison	1A.2. 1) Teacher analysis of FCAT Explorer, Gizmos and Compass Odyssey data. 2) Teacher analysis of student work to determine successful application of reading strategies. 3) Teacher analysis of Benchmark and LSA data. 4) Peer evaluation and Teacher evaluation of labs/hands on activities. 5) Continuous monitoring of student data within and across grade levels during bi-monthly PLC meetings. 6) PLC Teachers will collaborate to share best practices, enhance lesson content, and reflect on previous lessons.	1A.2. 1) Benchmark assessments and LSAs 2) FCAT Explorer, Gizmos and Compass Odyssey 3) Lab rubrics
	1A.3. 1) Students need to increase ability in analysis of data, graphs and scientific models.	1A.3. 1) Utilize technology to deepen student use of and comfort with models, graphs and data including but not limited to iResponse, interactive white	1A.3. 1) All Science Teachers 2) Science PLC Lead Teacher 3) Science PLC	1A.3. 1) Teacher analysis of FCAT Explorer, Gizmos and Compass Odyssey data 2) Teacher analysis of Student Lab Reports	1A.3. 1) iReponse and interactive whiteboard usage 2) Gizmos/Compass

3		board, Compass Odyssey and FCAT Explorer. 2) All Students will design and conduct a Science Project through which they will demonstrate application of scientific process. 3) Students will learn and utilize the proper techniques to collect, graph and analyze data during in class labs and hands on activities. 4) Modeling and implementation of test taking strategies associated with the analysis of data/graphs/models. 5) Remedial resources such as tutoring, before and after school computer lab, Team Up and Community Education.	Administrative Liaison.	3) Informal assessment of knowledge through iResponse and interactive whiteboard usage. 4) Teacher/Peer analysis of Science projects 5) Student self reflection 6) Teacher evaluation of exit slip data	Odyssey/FCAT Explorer 3) LSAs 4) Benchmarks 5) Teacher generated Rubrics for Labs/Hands Activities 6) Science Project Rubric 7) Guiding questions for student self reflection differentiated by assignment. 8) Exit Slips
4	1A.4 1) Limited technology inside the classroom inhibits access to most current science content. 2) Absence of scientific equipment at each grade level inhibits full implementation of hands on science learning.	1) Seek fundraising opportunities through SAC committee.	1) PLC Lead Teacher 2) Science teachers	1) PLC will send representative to SAC meeting	1. Feedback from SAC Treasurer

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:	
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:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 53% (117 of 220) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science. During the 2012-2013 school year, 55% (120 of 219) of students are expected to score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 8, 53% (117 of 220) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science.	In grade 8, 55% (120 of 219) of students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. 1) The Science FCAT is cumulatively based on skills from 6th through 8th grade. 2) The Science FCAT is only administered to 8th grade. 3) District Science Benchmark is only administered to 8th grade students.	2A.1. 1) Analysis of ongoing Benchmark data (both District and School-level) using the Pearson database system to target students for continued growth. 2) Utilization of Research (Team Time) class to strategically enhance and deepen previous grade level curriculum. 3) Science PLC will continue to categorize curriculum and analyze student data within and across grade levels. 4) Modeling and implementation of test taking strategies and student self-assessment across grade levels. 5) Students in all grade levels take a school-staff created benchmark assessments aligned to appropriate FCAT	2A.1. 1) All Science Teachers 2) Science PLC Lead Teacher 3) Science PLC Administrative Liaison. 4) Community Education teachers	2A.1. 1) Pearson Insight/Inform student data reports on LSAs and Benchmarks. 2) Evaluation of student data from iReponse reports. 3) Teacher evaluation of Compass Odyssey and Gizmo reports 4) Student analysis of data including pretests, posttests and exit slips. 5) Continuous monitoring of student data within and across grade levels during bi-monthly PLC meetings 6) Teacher/student conferences utilizing student goal setting documents to build student awareness and responsibility for learning. 7) PLC developed student self – reflection/recycle correlated to classroom assessments.	2A.1. 1) Benchmark Assessments 2) District LSAs 3) PLC developed exit slips 4) CAST system evaluation 5) Leadership classroom drop-ins 6) Student reflections 7. Student portfolios

		Specs. 6) Students will take district pretest and posttest LSAs for each unit according to district timeline. 7) Incorporate 5E model into weekly instruction. 8.) Targeted science assistance given to Community Education program students.			
2	2A.2. 1) Students who are already proficient need to be challenged to deepen and extend their knowledge of content through high-level rigor. 2) Students need to increase their ability to decode level III and IV DOK questions.	2A.2 1) Differentiated student instruction including but not limited to Student Centers for break out/reinforcement sessions; 'Menu' style projects; and labs. 2) Students create their own assessment questions using Webb's DOK, aligned to units of study. 3) Embedding Webb's DOK and higher order questioning into science curriculum. 4) Students are pushed to deepen their analysis of a concept by engaging in extended research and application of topics. 5) Students utilize technology in their study of science content including but not limited to student MAC computers, flip cameras and interactive white board.	2A.2. 1) All Science teachers 2) Science PLC Lead teacher 3) Science PLC Administrative Liaison	2A.2. 1) Teacher and peer evaluation of student generated questions and assignments. 2) Student analysis though self- reflection. 3) Continuous monitoring of student data within and across grade levels during bi-monthly PLC meetings. 4) Teacher analysis of Pearson Insight/Inform student data reports on LSAs and Benchmarks. 5) PLC teachers will collaborate to share best practices, enhance lesson content and reflect on previous lessons. 6) Teacher analysis of exit slip data.	2A.2. 1) Teacher generated rubrics aligned to standards. 2) Guiding questions for student self reflection on projects. 3) Benchmarks and LSAs 4) Exit Slips
3	2A.3 1) Limited technology inside the classroom inhibits access to most current science content. 2) Absence of scientific equipment at each grade level inhibits full implementation of hands on science learning.	2A.3 1) Seek fundraising opportunities through SAC committee.	2A.3 1) PLC Lead teacher 2) Science teachers	2A.3 1) PLC will send representative to SAC meeting.	2A.3 1) Feedback from SAC Treasurer.

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
Categorizing the Curriculum	Grades 6-8	Robyn Wilhelm and Leadership Team	Science PLC Members	Bi-Monthly Early Release Dates	Continued Dialogue w/in PLC using standing agendas at each meeting. Mentoring within Grade-levels	PLC Teacher Lead Leadership Team

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
One in-house TDE day per nine weeks for each grade level of the Science PLC		School Operating Funds	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 99% (218 of 220) of students scored at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing. During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% (219 of 219) of students are expected to score at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 8, 99% (218 of 220) of students scored at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.	In grade 8, 100% (219 of 219) will score at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher 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
1	1A. 1)"Every teacher a Writing Teacher" Working towards a paradigm shift: Content teachers must evolve in an understanding that writing is an integral component of how students are able to articulate their thinking and their understanding. 2)Understanding that the portfolio use and purpose is different than a teacher tracking device – it is a student driven progress monitoring tool. 3)Analytical and reflective writing must be an integral part of learning in all content areas. 4)Continued alignment (common writing language/common rubric) between Social Studies department and the English Language Arts/Edge department. 5)Folding in common writing language/common rubric between all other	1) Each portfolio cover aligns with the writing categories of focus, organization, support, and conventions 2)Portfolios are student driven progress monitoring tools. Social Studies and EDGE monitor all four writing categories. 3)Question stems, CRISS, NHD, RAFT, DBQ, and SQ3R, and essay assessments will provide the instructional roadmap for analytical and reflective writing. 4)Increase the percentage of interaction between the Social Studies department and Language arts to share ideas, knowledge, and materials with a goal of common ideas, knowledge, and materials. 5)All teachers will support the school driven initiative by implementing the Julia Landon College Prep Extended Response	1A.1. 1)PLC leads will take a more autonomous role in guiding and leading the work. 2)The Leadership team will look for evidence of movement within the process.	1A.1. 1)Through the portfolio, students will be able to use teacher feedback and writing data to analyze, reflect and evaluate their progress in writing. 2)Expansive writing within the classrooms that promote creative and expressive writing through CRISS, NHD, RAFT, DBQ, and SQ3R. 3)There is uniform instructional conversation that occurs across content. 4)All students use the JLCP Extended Response rubric to guide the writing process. 5)All teachers are pulling their own writing data and understand how to use it to drive their instruction.	1A.1. 1)Student Portfolios 2)Leadership PLC/Pop In weekly visits 3)CAST assessment system 4)District mandated assessments

	content areas (Math, Science, and Electives). 6)Pulling writing data from Insight/Inform, and FAIR to drive instruction.	Rubric in their content areas. 6)Utilization of DAT liaison, Edge teacher to set up professional development training in how to pull appropriate writing reports for specific writing targets and instructional focus from Insight/Inform.			

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
District LSA Writing Workshops	Grade 8	District ELA coaches	Wells and Knighton	October 2012	Wells and Knighton will share training information within November 2012 PLC meeting	ELA PLC Teacher Lead Leadership Team

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
WriteScore Assessment System is purchased for all District Timed Writing Assessments across each grade level, four times over the course of the year.	WriteScore Program	School Operating Funds	$8,549.96

			Subtotal: $8,549.96
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: $8,549.96

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The expected attendance rate for the 2012-2013 school year is 99% (717). The expected number of students with excessive absences for the 2012-2013 school year is less than 1% (7) The expected number of students with excessive tardies for the 2012-2013 school year is less than 6% (39)
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
99% (713 of 720)	99% (717 of 724)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
2% (16 of 720)	1% (7 of 724)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
6% (41 of 720)	5% (39 of 724)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. 1)Parent provided transportation due to removal of district-provided busing.	1.1. 1)Contact parents utilizing the school website and School Messenger to emphasize the importance of regular and timely school attendance.	1.1. 1)Attendance clerk 2)Grade level assistant principals 3)Social Worker 4)School webmaster	1.1. 1)Monitor attendance numbers weekly at Friday Data Meetings.	1.1. 1)Oncourse Attendance Report
2	1.2. 1)Family (student and parent) attitude and perception of the importance of attending school	1.2. 1)Contact parents of students that have accumulated five (5) or more absences per nine week period to emphasize the importance of attendance.	1.2. 1)Attendance clerk 2)Grade level assistant principals	1.2. 1)Monitor attendance numbers weekly at Friday Data meetings.	1.2. 1)Oncourse Attendance Report
3	1.3. 1)Inconsistent teacher documentation of attendance using Oncourse.	1.3. 1)Daily email reminders sent to specific teachers by administrative attendance liaison.	1.3. 1)Administrative Attendance liaison 2)All Teachers	1.3. 1)Monitor attendance numbers weekly at Friday Data meetings.	1.3. 1)Oncourse Attendance Report

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
Decrease the number of student morning tardies for the 2012-2013 school year.	Student upload into the ID Badging Software System	School Operating Funds	$300.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
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: $300.00

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:	The expected number of In-School suspensions for the 2012-2013 school year is 40. The expected number of students suspended in-school for the 2012-2013 school year is 30. The expected number of out-of-school (ATOSS) suspensions for the 2012-2013 school year is 14. The expected number of students suspended out-of-school (ATOSS) for the 2012-2013 school year is 14.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
41	40

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
33	30
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
15	14
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
15	14

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. 1)Less experienced teachers' lack of familiarity with C.H.A.M.P.s. 2)Less experienced teachers' lack of familiarity working with disciplinary issues. 3)Inconsistent implementation of the team-based discipline plans.	1.1. 1)C.H.A.M.Ps training for less experienced teachers. 2)Mentor teachers and team leaders work with less experienced teachers to provide strategies for working with disciplinary issues. 3)Standing agenda item for all bi-monthly team meetings to address implementation of team-based discipline plan. 4)Ongoing use of RtI database system by administration and guidance to document and track behavioral RtI interventions. 5)Standing agenda item for all weekly administrative leadership meetings to address and track discipline data school-wide. 6)Pair identified students with a mentor from Faith-Based partner. 7)Standing agenda item for all monthly Foundations Team meetings to address	1.1. 1)Leadership Team 2)RtI Team 3)Foundations Team 4)Mentor teachers	1.1. 1)Weekly review of school discipline results during Friday Data Meetings. 2)Bi-monthly review of team-based discipline plan effectiveness . 3)Monthly review of school-wide discipline plan and ongoing discipline data by Foundations Team. 4)Weekly review of RtI behavioral interventions using RtI database system by the RtI team during Friday Data Meetings.	1.1. 1)Data from School Environmental Safety Incident Report 2)School-wide Genesis Discipline Reports

		school-wide discipline plan and ongoing discipline data			

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Student Code of Conduct Training	All	District Personnel	Grade Level Administrators and Principal	August 2012	Assistant Principals meet bi-monthly. A standing agenda item is a grade level review of student code of conduct violations. The entire leadership team meets weekly and a standing agenda item is also a brief review of school-wide student code of conduct violations.	Leadership Team/Principal

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:	
	During the 2011-2012 school year, the school climate

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	survey indicates an overwhelming satisfaction in the area of school experiences with 88% (48 of the 55 parents surveyed) reporting that the school provides a positive experience for them while on campus. During the 2012-2013 school year, it is expected that 90% of parent responses will agree or strongly agree that the school provides positive experiences for parents on the 2012-2013 School Climate Survey.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Based on the 2011-2012 school climate survey, 88% (48 of 55) of parents surveyed agree or strongly agree that the school provided positive experiences for parents.	On the 2012-2013 school climate survey, it is expected that 90% of parents surveyed will agree or strongly agree that the school provided positive experiences for parents.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. 1)Parent response to survey is typically low and an accurate barometer of the parents/ experiences may not be a true reflection.	1.1. 1)Send School Messenger call to notify all parents of the impending survey. 2)Note the importance of the survey on the school website and include information about the survey in the monthly parent newsletter. 3)Utilize the high volume of car riders in the morning and afternoons to distribute the survey to parents and guardians.	1.1. 1)PTSA Board members 2)PTSA Administrative liaison 3)Grade level team leaders	1.1. 1)PTSA administrative liaison tracks the number of parent responses on a daily basis during the survey window	1.1. 1)2012-2013 School Climate Survey compared to the 2011-2012 School Climate Survey
2	1.2. 1)Lack of knowledge of the type of experiences the parent wants the school to offer	1.2. 1)PTSA Board members conduct research on existing successful parent involvement programs at schools with similar demographics. 2)PTSA will offer monthly parent-involvement programs in addition to one quarterly weekend event.	1.2. 1)PTSA Board members 2)PTSA administrative liaison	1.2. 1)Tracking the number of participants at each monthly PTSA parent involvement event	1.2. 1)PTSA tracking document used to document parent participation
3	1.2. 1)Lack of knowledge of the type of experiences the parent wants the school to offer 1.3. 1) Breakdown in communication between home and school regarding parent involvement system	1.3. 1)PTSA will continually update their informational website which is easily accessed through the school website 2)Communication will be sent home through a combination of flyers, School Messenger phone calls and the monthly parent newsletter	1.3. 1)PTSA Board members 2)PTSA Administrative liaison	1.3. 1)Tracking the number of parents at each monthly PTSA parent involvement event.	1.3. 1)PTSA tracking document used to document parent participation

		3)All PTSA events will be posted on the school calendar through the school year	3)All teachers 4)All parents		

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
DCCPTA 2012 Fall Leadership Workshop and Community Resources Fair	N/A	Duval County Council of PTA	All PTSA parents at JLCP	September 2012	Debrief to be conducted at the October 2012 PTSA Board meeting	PTSA President

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	Teachers will endeavor to create collaborative projects between Science and Math at each grade level. These

STEM Goal #1:	projects will enable students to see the interconnected nature of Science and Math as it relates to engineering.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. 1)Many students have an unfamiliarity with engineering as a formal or academic concept.	1.1. 1)Utilize science theory and specific science concepts to design projects with construction elements. Students can use mathematics to analyze their projects as well as interpret data from trials.	1.1. 1)Core teachers in the 6th, 7th and 8th grade levels as well as PLC leads.	1.1. 1)Teacher observations and assessments designed to assess individual areas of content as well as the understanding of the synergy between Science and Math as it relates to engineering.	1.1. 1)Teacher assessments and reflection as well as data derived from state/district 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
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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Student Promotion Goal Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Student Promotion Goal Goal Student Promotion Goal Goal #1:	For the past four consecutive school years, a particular emphasis has been placed on learning and credit recovery utilizing an in-school Compass Odyssey lab rotation cycle. This system has been effectively used to promote students to the next grade level. During the 2011-2012 school year there was a .35% (1 student) retention rate at the 6th grade level, a 0% retention rate at the 7th grade level and a .45% (1 student) retention rate at the 8th grade level. During the 2012-2013 school year, it is expected that 99% (707 of 715) of students will promote to the next grade level.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
In grade 6, 99.5% (287 of 288) of students promoted to grade 7. In grade 7, 100% of students promoted to grade 8. In grade 8, 99.5% (219 of 220) of students promoted to high school.	In grades 6-8, it is expected that 99% (707) students will promote to the next grade level.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. 1)Change to the Student Progression Plan mandating that students admitted into quarterly learning recovery must show completion of 75% or more coursework over the nine week grading period. 2)Lack of parental support 3)Chronic tardiness or absenteeism 3)Lack of access to technology at home	1.1. 1)Recruit students who scored a level 1 or 2 in reading or math for Team Up and Community Education where they will receive tutoring and access to technology. 2)Mid-year conferences with Assistant Principals and parents for any child with a grade point average below a 2.0 at the end of the second nine week grading period. 3)Use of FCAT Math bell ringers in PE and Health classes. 4)Use of FCAT Reading bell ringers in all other Elective courses. 5)Three-day Learning Recovery program held at the end of each nine week grading period for all students eligible. 6)Credit Recovery	1.1. 1)All teachers 2)Compass Odyssey teacher 3)Leadership Team 4)RtI Team 5)Community Education Teachers 6)Team Up Teachers 7)Athletic Coaches	1.1. 1)Ongoing and continuous monitoring of all students' grades at weekly Friday Data meetings 2)Monitor computer lab sign in logs 3)Personal goal setting for students within all core content portfolios 4)Analysis of ongoing Learning Recovery and Course Recovery data at weekly Friday data meetings 5)Ongoing use of RtI database system at weekly Friday data meetings by Leadership Team and Guidance counselors 6)Analysis of emerging student grades through Oncourse on a bi-monthly basis at Friday data meetings	1.1. 1)Compass Odyssey 2)RtI Database system 3)Oncourse 4)Student Portfolios

		Program beginning at the start of the fourth nine week grading period for all students in danger of retention due to failure of an entire course. 7)Compass Odyssey computer lab open and available for students each morning for forty-five minutes prior to the start of school. 8)Mandatory study hall for all athletes during each athletic season.			
2	1) Proper identification of RtI Tier 2 and 3 students	1) Use RtI Tier 2 and 3 interventions using evidence-based instructional strategies. 2) Differentiate team time instruction starting in the 3rd nine week grading period based FCAT, Benchmark, PMA, FAIR, SRI, and ongoing PLC-developed assessments. 3) Use of grade and credit recovery on a quarterly in-school cyclical basis as an RtI Tier 2 intervention.	1) All teachers 2) Leadership team members 3) Compass Odyssey teacher 4) RtI team 5) Grade level teacher leaders 6) Guidance counselor 7) ESE teacher	1) RtI team provides professional development on RtI through bi-monthly team meetings and, when necessary, through entire faculty meetings. 2) Analysis of Compass Odyssey diagnostic assessments and ongoing Benchmark, FAIR, PMA, and SRI assessments. 3) Weekly analysis of Compass Odyssey grade and credit recovery data to determine fluid movements of RtI.	1) Teacher and RtI team documentation using school-based RtI templates and the Pearson database system

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

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

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

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide a month-long Saturday School Learning and Credit Recovery program for students at risk of retention	One or two teachers hired to instruct and facilitate	SAI Funds	$1,200.00

			Subtotal: $1,200.00
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: $1,200.00

End of Student Promotion Goal Goal(s)

Student Safety Goal Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Student Safety Goal Goal Student Safety Goal Goal #1:	During the 2011-2012 school year, students and staff evacuated the building and were accounted for at at the evacuation site in 20 minutes. During the 2012-2013 school year, students and staff will improve on the 2011-2012 evacuation response time of 20 minutes by 10%.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
During the 2011-2012 school year, students and staff evacuated the building and were accounted for at the evacuation site in 20 minutes.	During the 2012-2013 schoolyear, a 10% decrease in the time frame will occur with a total elapsed time of 18 minutes from the sounding of the alarm and announcing evacuation to all students and staff accounted for at the evacuation site.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. 1)Communication between varying teachers traversing the blocks to the secondary evacuation site can be difficult. If a student is not in the correct class during the transition this must be corrected and the student located and accounted for at the secondary site holding area.	1.1. 1)All pertinent personnel will have radios to aid in communication. Teacher evacuation clipboards will have full class rosters and Administrators/Team Leads will have full grade level student rosters. Role will be taken accurately prior to leaving primary evacuation areas at the school. Inaccuracies in student counts will then be reviewed upon arrival at the secondary holding site.	1.1. 1)Leadership Team 2)Teacher Leaders 4) RtI Team	1.1. 1)Administrative observations and communication during the evacuation drill. 2)Review and reflection on the degree of success in accounting for all students and staff members quickly and accurately.	1.1. 1)Accuracy of attendance rosters 2)Evacuation time keeping

2	1.2. T1)he reduction of police auxiliaries this fiscal year means that fewer officers may be available to assist with road closures.	1.2. 1)Utilize resources from our Faith-based partner, school staff, and local fire station to ensure safe student crossing of thoroughfares.	1.2. 1)Leadership Team 2)Faith-based partner staff 3)Local law enforcement and fire/rescue	1.2. 1)Administrative observations and monitoring of timelines during the evacuation drill 2)Review and reflection on the degree of success in accounting for all students and staff members quickly and accurately.	1.2. 1)Reflection on the effectiveness on the usage of non-police assets in crossing thoroughfares 2)Evacuation time keeping

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Student Safety Goal Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Provide laminated reading strategies posters to every ELA, SS and Elective teacher	Laminated Posters	School Operating Funds	$400.00
Writing	WriteScore Assessment System is purchased for all District Timed Writing Assessments across each grade level, four times over the course of the year.	WriteScore Program	School Operating Funds	$8,549.96
Student Promotion Goal	Provide a month-long Saturday School Learning and Credit Recovery program for students at risk of retention	One or two teachers hired to instruct and facilitate	SAI Funds	$1,200.00
				Subtotal: $10,149.96
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attendance	Decrease the number of student morning tardies for the 2012-2013 school year.	Student upload into the ID Badging Software System	School Operating Funds	$300.00
				Subtotal: $300.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	PLC District Training: Providing teachers the tools and knowledge needed to collaborate effectively in creating common assessments and data-driven instructional units to provide students with the best possible differentiated instruction.	PLC Training: In house through TDE training and work sessions and District Trainings held at the Schultz Center for Teaching and Leadership. Substitute teachers needed these days.	School Operating Funds	$4,000.00
Mathematics	PLC District Training: Providing teachers the tools and knowledge needed to collaborate effectively in creating common assessments and data-driven instructional units to provide students with the best possible differentiated instruction.	PLC Training: In house through TDE training and work sessions and District Trainings held at the Schultz Center for Teaching and Leadership. Substitute teachers needed these days.	School Operating Funds	$4,000.00
Science	One in-house TDE day per nine weeks for each grade level of the Science PLC		School Operating Funds	$2,000.00
				Subtotal: $10,000.00
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: $20,449.96

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	NA
○	○	●	○

Are you a reward school: ● Yes ○ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

☑ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Small items requested by Grade Level Teams and/or PLCs	$297.00

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

The School Advisory Council at Julia Landon meets monthly with the principal and two teachers who all serve as members along with one assistant principal who serves as SAC secretary and is a non-voting member. The focus of SAC is to assist the principal in continuous review of school goals and progress and to advise any next steps that may need to occur. Each month new data regarding student learning gains are reviewed. The monthly SAC agenda allows for determinations to be made regarding SAC monies and how these monies should be allocated toward teacher requests, PLC requests and instructional materials. Additionally, the School Improvement Plan is broken into segments with a portion reviewed each month to determine fidelity of implementation. Other data reviewed includes disciplinary data , parent involvement data and school climate survey data. The school budget is also reviewed with SAC.
Each month one school highlight will be shared with SAC by way of students. Some examples include students sharing Global Leadership videos, students acting a portion of dramatic scene or students explaining how they used math strategies in their social studies classroom.
The following are the 2012-2013 SAC members:
2010-2011 SAC Members
1. Sara Bravo, Principal
2. Blake Menzel, SAC President, 8th grade parent
3. Carolyn Rubin, Vice-Chair, 7th grade parent
4. Jean Spiwak, 8th grade teacher
5. Mary Gaj, 6th grade teacher
6. Lisa Marie Winslow, parent
7. Renata Henderson, parent
8. Melissa Long, parent
9. TeRona Feacher, parent
10. Ebru Bilgili, parent
11. Lori Lunitz, parent
12. Wayne Young, parent
13. Matt Hemphill, parent
14. Kim Bednarek, parent
15. Gary Webber, Community partner, parent
16. Kim Wheeler, parent
17. Mark Maclean, parent
18. Faye Hamilton , parent
19. BJ Ibach, parent

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District
JULIA LANDON COLLEGE PREPARTORY & LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	94%	92%	75%	350	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	71%	85%			156	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?	78% (YES)	85% (YES)			163	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					669	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
JULIA LANDON COLLEGE PREPARTORY & LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	91%	89%	90%	70%	340	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	77%	80%			157	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?	80% (YES)	78% (YES)			158	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					655	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested