

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: CRESTWOOD COMMUNITY MIDDLE

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Dr. Stephanie Nance

SAC Chair: Duana Daniels

Superintendent: Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval: October 2012

Last Modified on: 10/14/2012

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)
Assis Principal	Martin A. Pasquariello	BS- Mental Retardation, Florida State University; Master of Science-Educational Leadership, NOVA Southeastern University; Certification-Educational Leadership,	7	7	2011-2012 Grade A, 64% reading, 61% in Math, 64% REading Gains, 86% Math Gains, 64% making gains in lowest 25%, 58% making learning gains in math,61% in science, 90% above level 3 in writing. 2010-2011 Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 77%, Math 75%, Writing 93, Science 69%. AYP: 69%, None of the subgroups represented at CMS used to determine AYP status made AYP under the No Child Left Behind Act. 2009-2010 Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 78%, Math 80%, Writing 99%, Science 62%. AYP: 90%, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. SWD did not Make AYP in Math. 2008-2009: Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 77%, Math 77%, Writing 99%, Science 54%. AYP: 90%, Black and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Black and FRLP did not Make AYP in Math. 2007-2008: Grade: A, Meeting High

					Standards in: Reading 74%, Math 76%, Writing 99%, Science 50%. AYP: 90%, Black, FRPL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Black and SWD did not make AYP in Math. 2006-2007: Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 71%, Math 72%, Writing 99%, Science 51%. AYP: 97%, Black, FRPL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math. SWD did not make AYP in Reading.
Assis Principal	Terri Livingston	BS-Education, University of Louisiana; Master of Science-Educational Leadership, Lynn University	5	6	2011-2012 Grade A, 64% reading, 61% in Math, 64% REading Gains, 86% Math Gains, 64% making gains in lowest 25%, 58% making learning gains in math,61% in science, 90% above level 3 in writing. 2010-2011 Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 77%, Math 75%, Writing 93%, Science 69%. AYP: 69%, None of the subgroups represented at CMS used to determine AYP status made AYP under the No Child Left Behind Act. 2009-2010 Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 78%, Math 80%, Writing 99%, Science 62%. AYP: 90%, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. SWD did not Make AYP in Math. 2008-2009: Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 77%, Math 77%, Writing 99%, Science 54%. AYP: 90%, Black and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Black and FRLP did not Make AYP in Math. 2007-2008: Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 74%, Math 76%, Writing 99%, Science 50%. AYP: 90%, Black, FRPL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Black and SWD did not make AYP in Math. AP Glades Central HS: 2006-2007: Grade: F, Reading Mastery 15%, Math Mastery 42, Science Mastery . AYP: 69, Only Hispanic subgroup made AYP in Math.
Principal	Dr. Stephanie Nance	BS- Florida A&M University; Master of Science-Educational Leadership, NOVA Southeastern University; Principal Certification-State of Florida	16	10	2011-2012 Grade A, 64% reading, 61% in Math, 64% REading Gains, 86% Math Gains, 64% making gains in lowest 25%, 58% making learning gains in math,61% in science, 90% above level 3 in writing. 2010-2011 Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 77%, Math 75%, Writing 93%, Science 69%. AYP: 69%, None of the subgroups represented at CMS used to determine AYP status made AYP under the No Child Left Behind Act. 2009-2010 Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 78%, Math 80%, Writing 99%, Science 62%. AYP: 90%, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. SWD did not Make AYP in Math. 2008-2009: Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 77%, Math 77%, Writing 99%, Science 54%. AYP: 90%, Black and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Black and FRLP did not Make AYP in Math. 2007-2008: Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 74%, Math 76%, Writing 99%, Science 50%. AYP: 90%, Black, FRPL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Black and SWD did not make AYP in Math. 2006-2007: Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 71%, Math 72%, Writing 99%, Science 51%. AYP: 97%, Black, FRPL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math. SWD did not make AYP in Reading.

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.

			# of	# of Years as	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide
--	--	--	------	---------------	---

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Years at Current School	an Instructional Coach	Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Debbie Still	Professional Educators: Reading K-12	19	4	2011-2012 Grade A, 64% reading, 61% in Math, 64% REading Gains, 86% Math Gains, 64% making gains in lowest 25%, 58% making learning gains in math, 61% in science, 90% above level 3 in writing. 2010-2011 Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 77%, Math 75%, Writing 93%, Science 69%. AYP: 69%, None of the subgroups represented at CMS used to determine AYP status made AYP under the No Child Left Behind Act. 2009-2010 Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 78%, Math 80%, Writing 99%, Science 62%. AYP: 90%, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. SWD did not Make AYP in Math. 2008-2009: Grade: A, Meeting High Standards in: Reading 77%, Math 77%, Writing 99%, Science 54%. AYP: 90%, Black and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Black and FRLP did not Make AYP in Math.

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. Beginning teachers are assigned a mentor and a buddy and are introduced to the Educator's Support Program	Assistant Principal	Year long mentoring period ending June 2013	
2	2. District Job Fairs	Principal/Assistant Principal	On-going ending June 2013	
3	3. New Eagle Pow-Wows	Principal	On-going ending June 2013	
4	4. All teachers receive ongoing staff development through scheduled PDD days, Learning Team Meetings, and monthly staff meetings.	Administration; PDD Team	On-going ending June 2012	

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
69	7.2%(5)	15.9%(11)	26.1%(18)	50.7%(35)	29.0%(20)	92.8%(64)	11.6%(8)	4.3%(3)	31.9%(22)

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
Annette Marquez	Amanda Jolly	Pairing of ESE Strategist	Shadowing Daily informal meetings with mentor Weekly formal meetings with mentor Monthly meetings with ESP contact
Deborah Basso	Frederick Sobel	Familiar Contact	Shadowing Daily informal meetings with mentor Weekly formal meetings with mentor Monthly meetings with ESP contact
Elaine Ealy	Raquel Lockhart	8th Grade Language Arts Pairing	Shadowing Daily informal meetings with mentor Weekly formal meetings with mentor Monthly meetings with ESP contact

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.

The school based RtI Leadership Team is comprised of the following members: Principal, Assistant Principals, ESE Contact/School Based Team/RTI leader, ELL Facilitator, Guidance Counselors, School Psychologist, Reading Coach, RtI/Inclusion Facilitator, School Nurse, and School Resource Officer.

Principal and Assistant Principals
Our school administration provides the leadership necessary to oversee and ensure the validity and fidelity of the RTI process. The principal and assistant principals will be responsible for scheduling professional development to support RTI implementation. Assistant principals often act as case managers for students and provide a necessary link between parent and school throughout this process. Administrators assist teachers with developing appropriate interventions and the data collection process.

General Education Teacher
Teachers who identify students for interventions will be a part of the team. Interventions appropriate to the specific tier will be developed and implemented by the general education teacher with assistance and guidance from team members.

Instructional Reading Coach
Our instructional reading coach will assist in developing and evaluating school core content standards/programs and identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. She will also assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis.

ESE Contact/School Based Team/RTI leader
The ESE Contact/School Based Team/RTI leader will collaborate with the RTI Leadership Team and staff to provide knowledge of all Tiers of interventions.

Guidance Counselors
Our guidance counselors have knowledge of community resources and behavioral interventions, act as case managers, assist in the data interpretation and are instrumental in providing information on the social/emotional needs of our students.

School Psychologist
Detailed information and expertise will be provided by the school psychologist on the interpretation and analysis of data. Consults with teachers and guidance counselors on appropriate tiered interventions.

School Nurse
The school nurse will assist the team with medical updates that may also include the emotional state of a student. She also provides community resources and support.

School Resource Officer
Our school resource officer will assist the team by providing his knowledge of students based on his personal contact with them while on campus and from information gathered while collaborating with local law enforcement agencies, and county judicial system.

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

The school based RtI Leadership Team will meet regularly to review universal screening data, diagnostic data, and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team will identify the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. After determining that effective Tier 1 Core Instruction is in place, the team will identify

students who are not meeting identified academic targets. The identified students will be referred to the school based RtI Leadership Team.

The team will use the Problem Solving Model* to conduct all meetings. Based on data and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive). An intervention plan will be developed (PBCSD Form 2284) which identifies a student's specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team will ensure the necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented with fidelity. Each case will be assigned a case liaison to support the interventionist (e.g., teacher, RtI/Inclusion Facilitator, guidance counselor) and report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings.

* Problem Solving Model

The four steps of the Problem Solving Model are:

Problem Identification entails identifying the problem and the desired behavior for the student.

Problem Analysis involves analyzing why the problem is occurring by collecting data to determine possible causes of the identified problem.

Intervention Design & Implementation involves selecting or developing evidence based interventions based upon data previously collected. These interventions are then implemented.

Evaluating is also termed Response to Intervention. In this step, the effectiveness of a student's or group of students' response to the implemented intervention is evaluated and measured.

The problem solving process is self correcting, and, if necessary, recycles in order to achieve the best outcomes for all students. This process is strongly supported by both IDEA and NCLB. Specifically, both legislative actions support all students achieving benchmarks for all students regardless of their status in general or special education.

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?

Members of the school based RtI Leadership Team will meet with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and will help develop the SY12 SIP. Utilizing the previous year's data, information on Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 targets and focus attention on deficient areas will be discussed.

Topics for discussion include, but are not limited to, the following:

FCAT scores and the lowest 25%

AYP and subgroups

strengthens and weaknesses of intensive programs

mentoring, tutoring, and other services.

The RtI/Inclusion Facilitator will provide professional development for the SAC members on the RtI process.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data:

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Curriculum Based Measurement

Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

Palm Beach County Fall Diagnostics

Palm Beach Writes

Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

Office Discipline Referrals

Retentions

Absences

Midyear data:

Palm Beach County Winter Diagnostics

Palm Beach Writes

Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)

End of year data:

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

FCAT Writes

Frequency of required Data Analysis and Action Planning Days:

Once within a cycle of instruction (refer to appropriate focus calendar)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be offered to RtI/Inclusion Facilitators by district staff. The school-based RtI/Inclusion Facilitator will provide in-service to the faculty on designated professional development days (PDD). These in service opportunities will include, but are not limited to, the following:

- problem Solving Model
- consensus building
- schoolwide Positive Behavioral Support(SwPBS)
- data based decision making to drive instruction
- progress monitoring
- selection and availability of research based interventions
- tools utilized to identify specific discrepancies in reading.

Individual professional development will be provided to classroom teachers, as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal- Dr. Stephanie Nance
Assistant Principal-Martin Pasquariello
Assistant Principal-Terri Livingston
Reading Coach/Reading Department Head-Debbie Still

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) creates capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focuses on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal, reading coach, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees serve on the team. The LLT meets at least once a month. The principal meets with the LLT at least once a month. Agenda topics include the discussion of the team's goals and progress, as well as identification of new strategies and activities to implement. As additional needs and concerns arise, the LLT investigates the concern, studies and plans a course of action, implements the action, analyzes its effectiveness, and reflects on the process. This is a continuous process throughout the entire school year.

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

The LLT plays an integral role in fostering a rich literacy environment at the school for all students and staff. The team builds professional conversations; promotes collegiality, collaboration, and a literacy culture. Initiatives are based on literacy-related data and needs assessments related to the school, including literacy achievement, motivation, and building a community of readers, both at school and home on the process. This is a continuous process throughout the entire school year. Describe the plan to ensure all teachers incorporate reading instruction in all classes.

Reading & Social Studies

The goal of content area instruction is to teach the ideas, concepts, and principles of a specific subject. Content area textbooks are challenging in that they contain subject-specific vocabulary, dense, information and unfamiliar concepts. Students in content area classes receive instruction in learning strategies in order to meet the unique requirements of the individual subject area. Students learn to read and understand expository text and to gain information from pictures, maps, charts, diagrams, and other texts. Students learn to:

- understand the organization of their textbooks, including bold-faced type, icons, italics, etc.;
- recognize organizational patterns in text;
- understand how pictures and other graphic representations contain information that is important to understanding the text;
- understand that reading is a process and utilize appropriate reading strategies before, during, and after reading;
- know which reading strategies are appropriate to use with a particular text;
- use a variety of study and note-taking skills; and
- understand vocabulary context clues provided by the author; and use word attack skills.

To support students' efforts, content area teachers are trained to use and to teach learning strategies that are effective for their subject areas. Reading coaches model lessons in the classroom to demonstrate the infusion of reading in the content areas. Our school created an instructional flow chart with specific emphasis on reading benchmarks across the curriculum.

Teachers received CRISS, Search and Destroy, Content Enhancement and Tiered Learning Centers professional development to provide engaging learning strategies for all subject areas across the curriculum. These learning strategies are designed to develop critical thinking, independent readers and learners. These professional developments support subject area classroom explicit instruction and ways to actively engage students in discussion and questioning the text. Through assigned discovery-learning projects, specific content-area leveled books are required to be checked out from the media center or classroom library to be utilized in supporting and deepening the students' understanding of the content.

8

Search & Destroy is a strategic reading routine, developed by our district, which maximizes students' performance on FCAT, as well as, with any reading task; however, this is not a "teaching-to-the-test" method. The Search & Destroy routine enables students to reach increased levels of comprehension through the combining of four highly effective reading strategies (Preview, Focus Questions, Chunking, and Mark up the Text).

The following research supports the systematic delivery of explicit instruction in the use of strategies, such as, the Search & Destroy routine:

- Strategy instruction improves comprehension of texts (The Report of the National Reading Panel, 2006).
- Struggling readers benefit from explicit instruction in the use of strategies. (RAND Report on Reading Comprehension, 2002)
- The explicit teaching of strategies improves comprehension. (Pressley, 2002)
- Students need to be taught a set of strategies that they can use on their own when they read text, especially when they encounter difficulties. (Dole, 2000)

Math & Science

Teachers attend CRISS Science and/or CRISS Mathematics trainings and incorporate strategies into their instructional delivery methods. Teachers incorporate read alouds into the curriculum from a variety of content area text (both fiction and nonfiction). Teachers incorporate science notebooks, journals, or writing prompts as a tool to improve literacy skills.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

n/a

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Each content area teacher is required to integrate reading strategies into the content area they teach. Professional Development will be provided to each content area teacher on integrating reading strategies within the regular lesson.

*High Schools Only

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

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

n/a

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

n/a

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading will maintain proficiency and experience learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 31% of students achieved a level 3 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading.	In grades 6-8, 41% of students will achieve high standards on the 2013 administration of the FCAT.

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	Implementing across all classrooms.	An Instructional Focus Calendar will be developed for reading, math and science teachers	Administration, Dept.Chairs, LTF's	Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and monitor the IFC	Diagnostic Tests will be used to evaluate progress
2	Using higher order questions on a regular basis	Lesson plans in all core subjects will include higher order questions LTF's will guide teachers in creating higher order questioning in their planned instruction	Administration, reading coach, dept. chairs, LTF's	Higher order questions included in lesson plans and on student assignments Administration will conduct walk throughs, informal and formal evaluations in teacher classrooms	Lesson plan check Classroom walkthrough log, informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of higher order questions
3	Data review with students	Teachers will review SAL-P reports with all students Teachers and students will be taught how to interpret the SAL-P report	Classroom teachers, Reading Coach	Administrators will review log kept by teachers indicating when they met with each individual student	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if individual goals have been met
4	Reading outside the classroom	Media Specialist will implement and monitor the Reading Counts program	Media Specialist and classroom teachers	Fall and winter diagnostic test scores	Measure through diagnostic tests, SRI and Reading Counts results
5	Insufficient number of reading courses to supply reading instruction in reading classes to all students	More reading strategies lessons will be delivered via Science, Social Studies, Language Arts and selected elective teachers after receiving a modeled lesson from the Reading Coach	Principal, AP in charge of Reading Dept., all teachers, reading coach	Diagnostic Data as well as school-based mini assessments will be reviewed to track overall proficiency trends	Diagnostic tests, FAIR, mini assessments
6	Students need improved reading skills and are not responding to traditional instruction	Differentiated instruction for students needing tier 2 and 3 interventions and direct instruction in	Administrators, Tutorial director, teachers	Assessments given to students to determine improvement in targeted skill	Diagnostics and common assessments, FAIR

		reading through READ 180 and the tutoring program			
7	Teachers need continued support in how to utilize data to make instruction more effective	<p>Contine to provide PD to all teachers in the use and application of data</p> <p>Conduct LTM's that link planning, instruction and data to student achievement</p>	LTF's department chairpersons, administration	During LTM's teachers will review data to ensure it is used appropriately to increase student achievement	LTM logs, agendas, and minutes

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	In SY13, CMS will increase its percentage of students who achieve a level 4,5, or 6 and participate in the FAA for reading by 2%. All FAA students will achieve proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In SY12, 0%(1)of students who participated in the FAA for reading achieved a level 4,5,or 6.	In SY13, 100% of students who participate in the FAA for reading will achieve a level 4,5, or 6.

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	Meeting all students individual needs	<p>Small group/individualized instruction to students to ensure delivery of instruction.</p> <p>Continue to monitor IEP goals and strategies.</p>	Administration, ESE Coordinator, ESE faculty	<p>Practice FAA materials, individual class assessment</p> <p>Monitor IEP goal implementation</p>	FAA for reading

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 & 5) in reading will maintain proficiency and experience learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 33% of the students performed above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grades 6-8, 43% of the students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) on the 2013 administration of the FCAT test.

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	Level 4 & 5 students need to be provided enriching instruction that meets their academic needs	<p>Students scoring a level 4 & 5 will receive enrichment through differentiated instruction</p> <p>Professional Development for staff in applying differentiated instruction</p>	Administration, teachers, LTF coordinator, ESE Stratigists, ELL Facilitator	Administration will look for teacher use of differentiated instruction during classroom walkthroughs	Informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of differentiated instruction during classroom walk throughs

2	Level 4 & 5 students may maintain proficiency but not make sufficient learning gains	SAL-P data chats will be held with all students for the purpose of goal setting	Administration, Reading Coach and classroom teachers	Administration will follow up with students and classroom teachers to ensure that data chats are held	Fall and winter diagnostics, 2011 FCAT Reading test, FAIR
3	Time for providing enrichment	Students scoring a level 4 & 5 will receive enrichment through differentiated instruction	Administration, Reading Coach, All Classroom Teachers	Administrators will review student achievement during classroom walkthroughs During classroom walkthroughs, the Administration will focus on specific reading strategies utilized during instruction	Reading Diagnostic Results, FCAT Reading Results
4	Professional development time to assist content area teachers with reading strategies	Continued focus and ongoing reading strategy instruction will be delivered through science, social studies, language arts, and selected elective courses to ensure that our proficient and above proficient students' skills remain sharp	Principal, AP in charge of Reading, Reading Coach	Continuous monitoring of student performance through diagnostic testing and school based mini-assessments	Diagnostic testing and mini 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:	All students taking the FAA will perform at level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In SY12, 0% of students who participated in the FAA for reading achieved a level 7.	In SY13, 100% of students who participate in the FAA for reading will achieve a level 7.

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	Meeting all students individual needs	Small group/individualized instruction to students to ensure delivery of instruction. Continue to monitor IEP goals and strategies.	Administration, ESE Coordinator, ESE faculty	Practice FAA materials, individual class assessment Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA for reading

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:	The number of students that make learning gains in reading will increase during the 2013 administration of the FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 64% (670) of the students made learning	In grades 6-8, 74% of the students will make learning gains

gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.			on the 2013 administration fo the FCAT Reading Test.		
Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Reading outside the classroom	Media Specialist will implement and monitor the Reading Counts program	Media Specialist and classroom teacher	Fall and winter diagnostic test scores	Measure through diagnostic tests, SRI, FAIR and Reading Counts results
2	Need longer block for reading instruction	Level 1 and disfluent level 2 students in all subgroups will be enrolled in a 90 minute intensive reading class. Read 180, Scholastic's researched based reading program, will be used	Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselors Teacher, Reading Coach	Terms reports and EDW reports Results of all Diagnostic Tests, Tutorial attendance sheets	Measure through diagnostic tests, SRI, FAIR and Reading Counts results

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	In SY13, CMS will increase its percentage of students who made learning gains on the FAA for reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In SY12, 0%(2)of students who participated in the FAA for reading made learning gains on the FAA for reading.	In SY13, 100% of students who participated in the FAA for reading will make learning gains on the FAA for reading.

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Meeting all students individual needs	Small group/individualized instruction to students to ensure delivery of instruction. Practice FAA materials, individual class assessment	Administration, ESE Coordinator, ESE faculty	Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA for reading

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:	Students in the lowest 25% will increase in learning gains on the 2013 FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 64% of the students in the lowest 25% made gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grades 6-8, 74% of the students in the lowest 25% will make gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.

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	Many students in the Lowest 25% will not have the time needed during the regular school day to remediate and support their individual reading weaknesses	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary reading supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school	Principal, AP in charge of Reading instruction, Reading Coach, Reading teachers	Student progress is assessed through district diagnostic reports, SRI reports and Read 180 student assessment reports	Progress towards benchmark mastery utilizing diagnostic data, as well as FAIR, and READ 180 data
2	Students who are Level One FCAT Reading will need intensive reading strategies to reach proficiency	Level 1 & level 2 students will receive intensive reading instruction (90 minutes per day) through the use of Read 180 and other supplemental materials	Principal, AP in charge of Reading and Reading Coach	Student progress is assessed through district diagnostic reports, SRI reports and Read 180 student assessment reports.	Progress towards benchmark mastery utilizing diagnostic data, as well as FAIR, and READ 180 data

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By June 2013, each of the ethnicity subgroups will make gains towards overall proficiency on the 2013 Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 73% (288) White, 45% (140) Black and 68% (184) Hispanic students were proficient and met state requirements on the 2012 Reading FCAT Test.	In grades 6-8, 83% White, 55% Black and 78% Hispanic students will demonstrate proficiency and meet state requirements on the 2013 Reading FCAT Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher and student awareness of all combined student assessment data that may be utilized to assess a students performance and set targets for student performance.	Students not meeting proficiency will be identified through the use of FCAT, SRI, diagnostics and other assessments compiled on the SAL-P Report. This compiled data will be reviewed by the teacher to drive individual instruction of students. This data will be reviewed by the student with the assistance of a	Reading Coach Reading Teachers	Student progress will be monitored through the use of FORF, SRI, diagnostics and Read 180 assessment data	FCAT Reading Diagnostics, SRI results, Read 180 assessment data reports, SAL-P will determine if targeted students are making adequate progress on benchmarks

		video describing the rational and procedures for reading the SAL-P as well as teacher lead discussion.			
2	Many students in the Lowest 25% will not have the time needed during the regular school day to remediate and support their individual reading weaknesses.	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary reading supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school	Principal, AP in charge of Reading instruction, Reading Coach, Reading teachers	Student progress is assessed through district diagnostic reports, SRI reports and Read 180 student assessment reports	Progress towards benchmark mastery utilizing diagnostic data, as well as READ180 data

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:	ELL students will achieve proficiency as shown by FY13 CELLA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% of students demonstrated proficiency on the reading as shown by the FY12 CELLA.	30% of ELL students in grades 6-8 will be proficient as measured by the 2013 administration of the CELLA.

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	ELL students not making significant progress in reading.	Level 1 and level 2 students will receive intensive reading instruction (90 minutes per day) through the use of Read 180 and other supplemental materials	Reading Coach, ELL Reading Teacher, LA Dept. Chair	Percent of students making progress toward benchmark will be assessed through reading diagnostic assessments. Continuous monitoring of student performance through diagnostic testing and school based mini-assessments	Diagnostic testing, SRI, Fluency Probes, FAIR, Read 180 assessment data, and mini 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:	Students with disabilities will achieve proficiency as measured by the FY13 FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% students demonstrated proficiency in reading as shown by the FY12 FCAT reading test.	50% of all SWD students will demonstrate proficiency as shown by the FY13 FCAT reading test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Limited time for teacher Professional Development. Teachers	First priority Teacher PD in RTI instruction differentiated instruction	Administration, Reading Coach	Continuous monitoring of student performance through diagnostic	Diagnostic testing, SRI, Fluency Probes, FAIR, Read

1	are not familiar with RtI strategies.	for students needing tier 2 and 3 interventions and continued direct instruction in reading through READ 180.		testing and school based mini-assessments	180 assessment data, and mini assessments.
2	Students with disabilities subgroup is not making AYP.	Level 1 and level 2 students will receive intensive reading instruction (90 minutes per day) through the use of Read 180 and other supplemental materials	Reading Coach, Reading Teachers, ESE Teachers	Percent of students making progress toward benchmark will be assessed through reading diagnostic assessments	Diagnostic testing, SRI, Fluency Probes, FAIR, Read 180 assessment data, and mini assessments.
3	Students with disabilities subgroup is not making AYP.	Plan supplemental instructional intervention for students not responding to core instruction	Reading Coach, Reading Teachers, ESE Teachers	Student progress will be measured by Read 180 reports, SRI reports, EDW reports	Diagnostic testing, SRI, Fluency Probes, FAIR, Read 180 assessment data, and mini 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:	The number of economically disadvantaged students meeting Adequate Yearly Progress will increase on the 2013 FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 53% (279)of our economically disadvantaged students made proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2012 Reading FCAT Test.	In grades 6-8, 63% of our economically disadvantaged students will meet proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 Reading FCAT Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited resources for morning and afternoon tutorial by certified reading teacher	Students not meeting proficiency will be identified through the use of multiple assessments Provide afternoon tutorial services for identified students above	Administration, Reading Coach Reading Teachers	Administration will monitor the performance of targeted students through monthly meetings Assessment data will determine if students are progressing towards proficiency on benchmarks	FCAT Reading Diagnostics, SRI results, Read 180 assessment data reports, and FAIR will determine if targeted students are making adequate progress on benchmarks

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
Spring Board	6-8	AP-Terry Livingston	All Math and All Reading teachers in grades 6-8	PDD days	Student Diagnostics EOC SRI Spring Board Assessments	Administration

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		ELL students will achieve proficiency as demonstrated by the FY13 CELLA test results.		
CELLA Goal # 1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
39% students demonstrated proficiency in listening/speaking as shown by the FY12 administration of the CELLA				
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.	ELL students will achieve proficiency as shown by the

CELLA Goal #2:		FY13 CELLA			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
22% students demonstrated proficiency in reading as shown by the FY13 CELLA.					
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	Insufficient number of reading courses to supply reading instruction in reading classes to all students	More reading strategies lessons will be delivered via Science, Social Studies, Language Arts and selected elective teachers after receiving a modeled lesson from the Reading Coach	Diagnostic Data as well as school-based mini assessments will be reviewed to track overall proficiency trends	Principal, AP in charge of Reading Dept., all teachers, reading coach	Diagnostic tests, FAIR, mini assessments
2	Student assessment data not being understood by all students	Teachers and students will be taught how to interpret the SAL-P report	Classroom teachers, Reading Coach	Administrators will review log kept by teachers indicating when they met with each individual student	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if individual goals have been met

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	ELL students will achieve proficiency as shown by FY13 CELLA
CELLA Goal #3:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

27% students demonstrated proficiency in reading as shown by the FY13 CELLA

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	Working with teachers in all content areas to implement writing	Students will use the writing process weekly during Writing Wednesday; all writing will be dated, and recorded in a portfolio or work folder for monitoring of growth across time	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, ELL Teacher	During Writing Wednesday, students will place their writing portfolios, open to their last entry, on top of their desks for the principal to walk through to monitor	Progress between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-year Prompt

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:	Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3 and above) in math will increase on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 28% (305) of students achieved a level 3 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	In grades 6-8, 38% of students will achieve high standards on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics test.

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	Implementing across all classrooms.	An Instructional Focus Calendar will be developed for reading, math and science teachers	Administration, Dept.Chairs, LTF's	Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and monitor the IFC	Diagnostic Tests will be used to evaluate progress
2	Using higher order questions on a regular basis	Lesson plans in all core subjects will include higher order questions LTF's will guide teachers in creating higher order questioning in their planned instruction	Administration, reading coach, dept. chairs, LTF's	Higher order questions included in lesson plans and on student assignments Administration will conduct walk throughs, informal and formal evaluations in teacher classrooms	Lesson plan check Classroom walkthrough log, informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of higher order questions
3	Data review with students	Teachers will review SAL-P reports with all students Teachers and students will be taught how to interpret the SAL-P report	Classroom teachers, Reading Coach	Administrators will review log kept by teachers indicating when they met with each individual student	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if individual goals have been met
4	Moving students up in performance to meet expectation	Math teachers will follow the instructional frameworks including the scope and sequence and pacing chart for math with fidelity Teachers will identify those students in need of intervention or enrichment Learning Team Meetings, developing rigorous and relevant assignments, examining and unpacking standards Math department will utilize common planning to identify and target less than proficient	Administration, Math Department Chair, Math Teachers	Focused classroom walkthroughs by administration to determine if instructional frameworks are being followed	Results of Math Diagnostic Reports, FCAT Math Scores

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	In SY13, CMS will increase its percentage of students who achieve a level 4,5, or 6 and participate in the FAA for math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In SY12, 50%(2)of students who participated in the FAA for math achieved a level 4,5,or 6.	In SY13, 100% of students who participated in the FAA for Math will achieve a level 4,5,or 6.

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	Meeting all students individual needs	Practice FAA materials, individual class assessment. Small group/individualized instruction to students to ensure delivery of instruction.	Administration, ESE Coordinator, ESE faculty	Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA for math

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:	Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 & 5) on will maintain or increase their proficiency and experience learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 33% (360)of the students performed above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	In grades 6-8, 43% of the students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test.

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	Level 4 & 5 students need to be provided enriching instruction that meets their academic needs	Students scoring a level 4 & 5 will receive enrichment through differentiated instruction Professional Development for staff in applying differentiated instruction	Administration , teachers, LTF coordinator, ESE Stratigists, ELL Facilitator	Administration will look for teacher use of differentiated instruction during classroom walkthroughs	Informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of differentiated instruction during classroom walk throughs
2	Level 4 & 5 students will not receive additional instruction through intensive mathematics classes to maintain proficiency	Teachers to include higher-order questions in lessons Students scoring a level 4 & 5 will receive enrichment through differentiated instruction	Administration , Reading Coach, Intensive teachers and Mathematics Teachers	Administration will review log for student achievement discussions during classroom walkthroughs	Mathematics Diagnostic Results, Math FCAT Results

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	All students taking the FAA will perform at level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In SY12, 0% of students who participated in the FAA for math recieved a level 7.	In SY13, 100% of students who participate in the FAA for reading will achieve a level 7.

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	Meeting all students individual needs	Practice FAA materials, individual class assessment. Small group/individualized instruction to students to ensure delivery of instruction.	Administration, ESE Coordinator, ESE faculty	Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA for math

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:	The number of students that make learning gains in mathematics will increase during the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 68% (701)of the students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	In grades 6-8, 78% of the students will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not all students will be eligible for intensive mathematics classes	SAL-P chats will be held with all students for the purpose of goal setting	Administration, classroom teachers	Administration will follow up with students and classroom teachers to ensure that data chats are held	Fall and Winter Diagnostics, 2012 FCAT Mathematics test and comprehension check assessment data
2	Level 1 and Level 2 FCAT math students will need additional math support and remediation to close the gap towards proficiency	Intensive Math class will be offered to all students who score level 1 or low level 2 on 2012 FCAT math	Administration, classroom teacher	Student progress is assessed through district diagnostic reports	Fall and Winter Diagnostics, 2013 FCAT Mathematics test and comprehension check assessment data

3	Many math students may need additional remediation and practice beyond what can be offered during the regular school day	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary math supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school, based on individual student needs	Administration, classroom teachers	Student progress is assessed through comprehension check assessments, district diagnostic reports	Progress towards benchmark mastery utilizing diagnostic and comprehension check assessment data
---	--	--	------------------------------------	---	---

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:	In SY13, CMS will increase its percentage of students who make learning gains on the FAA for math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In SY12, 0%(2)of students who participated in the FAA for math made learning gains on the FAA for math.	In SY13, 100% of students who participate in the FAA for math will make learning gains.

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	Meeting all students individual needs	Practice FAA materials, individual class assessment. Small group/individualized instruction to students to ensure delivery of instruction.	Administration, ESE Coordinator, ESE faculty	Monitor IEP goal implementation	FAA for math

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:	Students in the lowest 25% will experience learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 58% (151) of the students in the lowest 25% made gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	In grades 6-8, 68% of the students in the lowest 25% will make gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.

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	Level 1 and 2 performance	Increased use of manipulatives	Mathematics teachers	Student progress is assessed through comprehension check assessments, district diagnostic reports	Fall and Winter Diagnostics, 2013 FCAT Mathematics test and comprehension check assessment data
	Many math students may need additional	Targeted interventions for students not	Principal, math teachers	Student progress is assessed through	Fall and Winter Diagnostics,

2	remediation and practice beyond what can be offered during the regular school day	responding to core plus supplementary math supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school, based on individual student needs		comprehension check assessments, district diagnostic reports	2013 FCAT Mathematics test
3	Level 1 and level 2 FCAT math students will need additional math support and remediation to close the gap towards proficiency	Intensive Math class will be offered to students who scored level 1 or low level 2 on 2012 FCAT math	Math teachers	Student progress is assessed through district diagnostic reports, and intensive math student assessment reports	Fall and Winter Diagnostics, 2013 FCAT Mathematics test and comprehension check assessment data

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 :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	By June 2013, each of the ethnicity subgroups will make gains towards overall proficiency on the 2013 Math FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 72% (284) White, 42% (131) Black and 64% (173) Hispanic students were proficient and met state requirements on the 2012 Math FCAT.	In grades 6-8, 82% White, 52% Black and 74% Hispanic students will demonstrate proficiency and meet state requirements on the 2013 Math FCAT.

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	Many students in the Lowest 25% will not have the time needed during the regular school day to remediate and support their individual math weaknesses	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary math supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school	Administration, math teachers, tutorial sponsor	Program attendance Assessment results	Results of Math Diagnostic Reports, FCAT Math Scores

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	In grades 6-8, ELL students will increase their proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In grades 6-8, 31% (24) of our ELL students scored at proficiency on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.

In grades 6-8, 41% of our ELL students will score at proficiency on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.

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	Many students in the Lowest 25% will not have the time needed during the regular school day to remediate and support their individual math weaknesses	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary math supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school	Administration, math teachers, tutorial sponsor	Program attendance Assessment results	Results of Math Diagnostic Reports, FCAT Math Scores

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

In grades 6-8, students with disabilities will increase their proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test.

Mathematics Goal #5D:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In grades 6-8, 24% (34) of our students with disabilities scored at proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test.

In grades 6-8, 34% of our students with disabilities will meet proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test.

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	Level 1 and Level 2 FCAT math students will need additional math support and remediation to close the gap towards proficiency	Intensive Math class will be offered to all students who scored level 1 or level 2 on 2012 FCAT math.	Mathematics teachers.	Student progress is assessed through district diagnostic reports.	Progress towards benchmark mastery utilizing diagnostic data.
2	Many math students may need additional remediation and practice beyond what can be offered during the regular school day.	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary math supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school, based on individual student needs.	Principal, math teachers	Student progress is assessed through comprehension check assessments, district diagnostic reports	Progress towards benchmark mastery utilizing diagnostic and comprehension check assessment data

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.

In grades 6-8, economically disadvantaged students will increase their proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test.

Mathematics Goal #5E:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In grades 6-8, 51% of our economically disadvantaged

In grades 6-8, 61% of our economically disadvantaged

students scored at proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test.			students will meet proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test.		
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	Level 1 and Level 2 FCAT math students will need additional math support and remediation to close the gap towards proficiency.	Intensive Math classes will be offered to all students who scored L1 or L2 on 2012 FCAT math.	Mathematics teachers Math Chair Assistant Principal	Student progress is assessed through district diagnostic reports.	Progress towards benchmark mastery utilizing diagnostic data.
2	Many math students may need additional remediation and practice beyond what can be offered during the regular school day.	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary math supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school, based on individual student needs.	Principal, math teachers	Student progress is assessed through comprehension check assessments, district diagnostic reports	Progress towards benchmark mastery utilizing diagnostic and comprehension check assessment data

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:			Students will perform proficiently on the Algebra 1 EOC in 2013.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
48% of students performed a level 3 on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC.			58% of students will perform at a level 3 on the 2013 Algebra 1 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	Using higher order questions on a regular basis	Lesson plans in all core subjects will include higher order questions LTF's will guide teachers in creating higher order questioning in their planned instruction	Administration, reading coach, dept. chairs, LTF's	Higher order questions included in lesson plans and on student assignments Administration will conduct walk throughs, informal and formal evaluations in teacher classrooms	Lesson plan check Classroom walkthrough log, informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of higher order questions
2	Data review with students	Teachers will review SAL-P reports with all students Teachers and students will be taught how to interpret the SAL-P report	Classroom teachers, Reading Coach	Administrators will review log kept by teachers indicating when they met with each individual student	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if individual goals have been met
	Students will struggle	Students will take online	Algebra Teachers	Monitoring of assessment	Practice EOC

3	with taking the EOC assessment as testing math online is new to our students	practice assessments	Administration	outcomes	EOC
4	Using higher order questions on a regular basis Lesson plans in all core subjects will include higher order questions	LTF's will guide teachers in creating higher order questioning in their planned instruction	Administration Reading Coach Dept. chairs LTF's	Administration will conduct walk throughs, informal and formal evaluations in teacher classrooms Lesson plan check	Classroom walkthrough log, informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of higher order questions

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:	Students achieving above proficiency (EOC Level 4 & 5) will maintain or increase their proficiency and experience learning gains on the 2013 EOC assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 7-8, 44% (83) students performed above proficiency (EOC levels 4 and 5) on the 2012 administration of the EOC assessment.	In grades 7-8, 54% of the students will achieve above proficiency (EOC levels 4 and 5) on the 2013 EOC assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scoring a level 4 & 5 will receive enrichment through differentiated instruction	Professional Development for staff in applying differentiated instruction	Administration , teachers, LTF coordinator, ESE Stratigists, ELL Facilitator	Administration will look for teacher use of differentiated instruction during classroom walkthroughs	Informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of differentiated instruction during classroom walk throughs
2	Students will struggle with taking the EOC assessment as testing math online is new to our students	Students will take online practice assessments	Algebra Teachers Administration	Monitoring of assessment outcomes	Practice EOC EOC

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal #					
	3A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	By June 2013, each of the ethnicity subgroups will make gains towards overall proficiency on the 2013 EOC assessment.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 7-8, 92% (65) White, 84% (26) Black and 94% (46) Hispanic students were proficient on the 2012 EOC assessment.	In grades 7-8, 97% White, 94% Black and 97% Hispanic students will demonstrate proficiency on the 2012 EOC assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students in the Lowest 25% will not have the time needed during the regular school day to remediate and support their individual math weaknesses attendance	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary math supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school	Administration math teachers tutorial sponsor	Assessment results	Results of Math Diagnostic Reports EOC Math Assessment Scores

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	In grades 7-8, ELL students will maintain proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 EOC assessment.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 7-8, 100% (4) ELL scored at proficiency on the 2012 EOC Assessment.	In grades 7-8, 100% of our ELL meet proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 EOC Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students needing remediation in Alg. I will not have the time needed during the regular school day to remediate and support their individual math weaknesses	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary math supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school	Administration, math teachers, tutorial sponsor Program attendance	Assessment results	Results of Math Diagnostic Report EOC Assessment Math Scores

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	In grades 7-8, SWD will increase their proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 EOC Assessment.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 7-8, 83% (5) SWD students scored at proficiency on the 2012 EOC Assessment.	In grades 7-8, 93% of our SWD will meet proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 EOC Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students needing remediation in Alg. I will not have the time needed during the regular school day to remediate and support their individual math weaknesses	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary math supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school	administration math teachers tutorial sponsor program attendance	Assessment results	Results of Math Diagnostic Report EOC Assessment Math Scores

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	In grades 7-8, Economically Disadvantaged Students will increase proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 EOC assessment.
---	---

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

In grades 7-8, 90% (65) Economically Disadvantaged Students scored at proficiency on the 2012 EOC Assessment.	In grades 7-8, 100% of our Economically Disadvantaged Students will meet proficiency and/or meet state requirements on the 2013 EOC Assessment.
---	---

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students needing remediation in Alg. I will not have the time needed during the regular school day to remediate and support their individual math weaknesses	Targeted interventions for students not responding to core plus supplementary math supports, utilizing small group tutorials before or after school	Administration, math teachers, tutorial sponsor Program attendance	Assessment results	Results of Math Diagnostic Report EOC Assessment Math Scores

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	no data
--	---------

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

no data	no data
---------	---------

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Using higher order questions on a regular basis	Lesson plans in all core subjects will include higher order questions LTF's will guide teachers in creating higher order questioning in their planned instruction	Administration, reading coach, dept. chairs, LTF's	Higher order questions included in lesson plans and on student assignments Administration will conduct walk throughs, informal and formal evaluations in teacher classrooms	Lesson plan check Classroom walkthrough log, informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of higher order questions
2	Data review with students	Teachers will review SAL-P reports with all students Teachers and students will be taught how to interpret the SAL-P report	Classroom teachers, Reading Coach	Administrators will review log kept by teachers indicating when they met with each individual student	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if individual goals have been met

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

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

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

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	
---	--

Geometry Goal #3B:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.				
Geometry Goal #3C:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.				
Geometry Goal #3D:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

No Data Submitted

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g. , frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Spring Board	6-8 math Teachers	AP-Terry Livingston	All math teachers in grades 6-8	PDD	Diagnostics Spring Board Assessments EOC	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

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

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science will maintain proficiency and experience learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Science Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012, FCAT Science data, 45% (170) of the 8th grade students achieved level 3.	In grade 8, 55% of students will achieve high standards on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Test.

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	Implementing across all classrooms.	An Instructional Focus Calendar will be developed for reading, math and science teachers	Administration, Dept.Chairs, LTF's	Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and monitor the IFC	Diagnostic Tests will be used to evaluate progress
2	Using higher order questions on a regular basis	Lesson plans in all core subjects will include higher order questions LTF's will guide teachers in creating higher order questioning in their planned instruction	Administration, reading coach, dept. chairs, LTF's	Higher order questions included in lesson plans and on student assignments Administration will conduct walk throughs, informal and formal evaluations in teacher classrooms	Lesson plan check Classroom walkthrough log, informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of higher order questions
3	Data review with students	Teachers will review SAL-P reports with all students Teachers and students will be taught how to interpret the SAL-P report	Classroom teachers, Reading Coach	Administrators will review log kept by teachers indicating when they met with each individual student	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if individual goals have been met
4	Access to hands-on materials	Utilize hands-on /essential lab experiments weekly to reinforce concepts.	Administration, Science Dept. Chairs, Science Teachers	Department meetings will occur to analyze student progress and to ensure that SSS frameworks are being implemented effectively.	Improvement on science assessments, Diagnostic results, common assessments
	Students lack a	Provide real-world	Administration,	Analyze student	Lab reports;

5	correlation between science topics and real world applications	science experiments, essential labs and engaging activities. Identify students based on previous years' diagnostic data for monitoring by teachers.	Science Dept. Chairs, Science Teachers	progress during dept. mtgs. Ensure that SSS frameworks are being implemented effectively.	common assessments
---	--	---	--	---	--------------------

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	All students taking the FAA will perform at a level 3 or above on the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 & 5) in science will maintain proficiency and experience learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Science Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 8, 16% (63) of the students performed above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test.	In grade 8, 26% of the students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Test.

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	Level 4 & 5 students need to be provided enriching instruction that meets their academic needs	Students scoring a level 4 & 5 will receive enrichment through differentiated instruction Professional Development for staff in applying differentiated instruction	Administration, teachers, LTF coordinator, ESE Strategists, ELL Facilitator	Administration will look for teacher use of differentiated instruction during classroom walkthroughs	Informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of differentiated instruction during classroom walk throughs
2	Level 4 & 5 students may maintain proficiency but not make sufficient learning gains.	SAL-P, diagnostic, data chats will be held with all students for the purpose of goal setting.	Administration, and classroom teachers.	Administration will follow up with students and classroom teachers to ensure that data chats are	Fall and winter diagnostics. 2013 FCAT Science test.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	All students taking the FAA will perform at a level 3 or above on the FAA.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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						

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in writing will maintain proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 8, 90% (342) of students achieved high standards on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test.	In grade 8, 100% of students will achieve high standards on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Writing Test.

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	Working with teachers in all content areas to implement writing	Students will use the writing process weekly during Writing Wednesday; all writing will be dated, and recorded in a portfolio or work folder for monitoring of growth across time	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Teams will determine a consistent method of saving student work. During Writing Wednesday, students will place their writing portfolios, open to their last entry, on top of their desks for the principal to walk through to monitor	Progress between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-year Prompt
2	Time constraints for writing instruction	The revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and seen in student writing drafts.	Administration Reading Coach Language Arts Teachers Reading Coach Language Arts Teachers	Student writing samples Palm Beach Writes scores, writing samples will be reviewed by teachers and discussed/analyzed	Progress between Palm Beach Writes writing prompts, FCAT writing results

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	Students taking the FAA will perform at the proficient level on the writing portion of the FY13 FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 8, 0% (2) of students achieved high standards on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test.	In grade 8, 100% of students will achieve high standards on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time constraints for writing instruction	Student writing samples Palm Beach Writes scores, writing samples will be reviewed by teachers and discussed/analyzed	Administration Math Teachers	The revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and seen in student writing drafts.	Progress between Palm Beach Writes writing prompts, FCAT writing results

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

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
1	Implementing across all classrooms.	An Instructional Focus Calendar will be developed for reading, math and science teachers	Administration, Dept.Chairs, LTF's	Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and monitor the IFC	Diagnostic Tests will be used to evaluate progress
2	Using higher order questions on a regular basis	Lesson plans in all core subjects will include higher order questions LTF's will guide teachers in creating higher order questioning in their planned instruction	Administration, reading coach, dept. chairs, LTF's	Higher order questions included in lesson plans and on student assignments Administration will conduct walk throughs, informal and formal evaluations in teacher classrooms	Lesson plan check Classroom walkthrough log, informal and formal data collection tools to determine frequency of higher order questions
3	Data review with students	Teachers will review SAL-P reports with all students Teachers and students will be taught how to interpret the SAL-P report	Classroom teachers, Reading Coach	Administrators will review log kept by teachers indicating when they met with each individual student	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if individual goals have been met

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:	Based on the FY12 attendance report, Crestwood Middle School will improve its attendance rate by 5% in FY13.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
79%	91%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
262	150
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
354	150

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	Time constraints	Absent students will meet with a guidance counselor after 5 absences in a grading period to discuss attendance.	Attendance clerk, guidance counselors	Measurable decline in excessive absences on Attendance reports	TERMS attendance report.
2	Teacher records need to match school attendance records.	Gradequick attendance training for instructional staff.	Administration, attendance clerk	Administrations will review attendance discrepancy report weekly; teachers will provide paper attendance at request of administration for review	Attendance discrepancy reports; attendance
3	Parents are not aware of middle grades attendance policies.	Utilize mass media including school website, newsletters, one voice, etc. to inform parents. Plan informative parent meetings	Administration Guidance Program Coordinators	After mass media communication is complete, compare attendance records from before communication and after communication	VIPS log Mainframe

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	Crestwood Middle will decrease suspension rates by 5% for the FY13 school year
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
284	200
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
125	100
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
269	150
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

135					100
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students missing academic time due to suspensions	Implement alternative disciplinary measures for student referrals including administrative detentions, saturday school, ISS, and ATOSS Implement preventative measures before student referrals are generated Guidance counselors will assist with prevention measures	Administration Teachers, guidance counselors	Suspension Rate Reports	Suspension reports

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		Crestwood Middle school will increase parent involvement by 10% for the FY13 school year.			
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
40% of parents participated in school events and activities in FY12.			45% of parents will participate in school events and activities in FY13.		
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	Curriculum based involvement for lowest 25%	Parents are invited to meet with grade level assistant principal and interpreter when necessary, to review students SALP. Parents will be given an introduction to the FCAT Explorer for parental/home support of skills	Assistant Principal and Reading Coach	Keep a log of those students who access FCAT explorer	FCAT Explorer Assessments will be used to evaluate progress
2	Finding parent volunteers to assist	Parent Volunteers will tutor students using FCAT Explorer	Assistant Principal and Reading Coach	Keep a log of those students who access FCAT explorer	FCAT Explorer Assessments will be used to evaluate progress

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/14/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The School Advisory Council will meet monthly to review the School Improvement Plan, along with available data (i.e. diagnostic tests) to determine if goals and objectives of the plan are being addressed. The professional development committee aligns staff development trainings with the School Improvement Plan in an effort to provide teachers with research-based programs that focus

on students' academic needs and train teachers on how to effectively analyze student data. Students' FCAT scores are analyzed by the Instructional Innovative Team and School Advisory Council. Based on student data, goals and objectives for the following year are discussed and prepared. In addition, an FCAT presentation is prepared by the Principal and shown to School Advisory Council members, which show comparisons of students' mean scores to that of district and state scores.

The School Advisory Councils function is to develop a school improvement plan that will serve as a framework for school improvement, and to oversee and implement a systematic evaluation of the plan. In addition, the SAC is to provide all the school's shareholders an opportunity to be active participants in the assessment of needs, the development of priorities, and the identification and use of resources. The SAC seeks to enlist, promote and support greater interaction between school and community, provide input in matters concerning the disbursement of school improvement funds and other monies related to school improvement, and to ensure that such expenditures are consistent with the school improvement plan. The SAC membership is to be representative of the community served by the school, with appropriately balanced numbers of teachers, parents, support employees, business leaders and community members

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

Palm Beach School District CRESTWOOD COMMUNITY MIDDLE 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	75%	93%	69%	314	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	60%	65%			125	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	60% (YES)	63% (YES)			123	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					562	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Palm Beach School District CRESTWOOD COMMUNITY MIDDLE 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	80%	95%	62%	315	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	72%	78%			150	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	72% (YES)	74% (YES)			146	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					611	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested