FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: CALOOSA MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Dr. Ann F. Cole

SAC Chair: Lori Ramey

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph P. Burke

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 6/4/2013

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Ann F. Cole	BS in Business Administration and Management, MS in School Counseling, and Ph.D. in Leadership Florida Certifications: Educational Leadership (All Levels) and Guidance and Counseling (Pre-K - 12)and School Principal (All Levels)	3	9	Principal of Caloosa Middle School in 2010-11. Grade A. Principal of Caloosa Middle School in 2011-12. Grade B
		BA in Political Science, MS in Educational Leadership, and Ph.D in			

Assis Principal	Dr. Ken Best	Organizational Leadership Florida Certifications: Elementary (1-6), Educational Leadership (All Levels), and School Principal (All Levels)	2	10	Assistant Principal of Skyline Elementary in 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11. Assistant Principal of Caloosa Middle School in 2011-12. Grade B
Assis Principal	Dr. Pamela L. Rader	BA in Elementary Education, MS in Educational Leadership, MS in Curriculum and Instruction,and Ed.D in Leadership and Administration Florida Certifications: Educational Leadership, (all Levels), Elementary Education, (grades K - 6),English, (grades 5 - 9),Reading, Endorsement	1	8	Associate Regional Executive Director (FLDOE) in 2011-2012, Assistant Principal of Lehigh Senior High School 2009-2011, Florida Literacy and Reading Excellence (FLaRE - FLDOE)Region IV Cordinator 2005-2009.Assistant Principal of Caloosa Middle School in 2012. Grade B

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Linda Gobran	Bachelors in Elementary Education	3	6	Analyzed data for student placement. Reading Coach Caloosa Middle School 2010-11 - Grade A and 2011-12 - Grade B

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	Regular meetings of new teacher with administration	Administration	Ongoing	
2	Partnering new teachers or teachers with less than 3 years experience with veteran staff	Administration	Ongoing	
3	Having new teachers participate in the APPLES program	Administration	Ongoing	
4	Professional Development opportunities for all staff which include trainings, coursework, and certification exams to meet district, state and federal requirements	Administration	Ongoing	
5	Professional Learning Communities	Administration, Department Heads, Leadership Team, Department Heads, Team Leaders	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0% (0) instructional staff and paraprofessionals are teaching out-of-field and have recieved less than an effective rating.	N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
59	5.1%(3)	20.3%(12)	37.3%(22)	25.4%(15)	28.8%(17)	93.2%(55)	23.7%(14)	3.4%(2)	32.2%(19)

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
Rita Buschbacher	Amy McCarthy	Differientiation Knowledge	Support teachers with Apples Program requirements. Partner during Professional Development opportunities which include trainings, coursework, and certification exams to meet district, state and federal requirements. Provide feedback/support during observations of classroom work. Keep teachers informed of district and school expectations. Partner for feedback/support during PLC's. department meetings, and content meetings. Provide support/materials/guidance during planned meetings with mentors, mentees, and Administration. Provide support for norms of school, district and state as needed.
			Support teachers with Apples Program requirements. Partner during Professional Development opportunities which include trainings, coursework, and certification exams to meet district, state and federal requirements. Provide feedback/support

Amanda Romero	Kaitlyn Moore	Science Knowledge	during observations of classroom work. Keep teachers informed of district and school expectations. Partner for feedback/support during PLC's. department meetings, and content meetings. Provide support/materials/guidance during planned meetings with mentors, mentees, and Administration. Provide support for norms of school, district and state as needed.
Brandon Drew	Jodi Chilton	Differientiation/Various content Experience	Support teachers with Apples Program requirements. Partner during Professional Development opportunities which include trainings, coursework, and certification exams to meet district, state and federal requirements. Provide feedback/support during observations of classroom work. Keep teachers informed of district and school expectations. Partner for feedback/support during PLC's. department meetings, and content meetings. Provide support/materials/guidance during planned meetings with mentors, mentees, and Administration. Provide support for norms of school, district and state as needed.
Nestor Avila	Katherine Liebl	Counselor	Support teachers with Apples Program requirements. Partner during Professional Development opportunities which include trainings, coursework, and certification exams to meet district, state and federal requirements. Provide feedback/support during observations of classroom work. Keep teachers informed of district and school expectations. Partner for feedback/support during PLC's. department meetings, and content meetings. Provide support/materials/guidance during planned meetings with mentors, mentees, and Administration. Provide support for norms of school, district and state as needed.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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 RtI Problem-Solving Team for Caloosa Middle School consists of the following members: Dr. Ann Cole (Principal), Pamela L. Rader (Assistant Principal), Ken Best (Assistant Principal), Nestor Avila (Counselor), Stevie Spector (Psychologist), Linda Gobran (Reading Coach), Katherine Leibl (Counselor) , classroom and special area teachers. In addition, the following members will participate on an as needed basis; Linda Alway (Speech/Language Pathologist), Jill Books (Nurse), Pat Nelson (Social Worker), Ann Tikka (504/Equity Chairperson), Elizabeth Kozak (ESE-CT), Susan Knox (ESE-CT) Jeanette Rogers (ESE/Staffing Specialist) and Carmen Morales (ESOL/ELL Representative).

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

Classroom Teachers

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

Reading Coach:
• Attend RtI Meetings
• Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
• Implement supplemental and intensive interventions
• Keep progress monitoring notes and anecdotes of interventions implemented
• Administer screenings
• Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students

Principal/ Assistant Principal
• Facilitate implementation of the RtI problem-solving process at Caloosa
• Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
• Assign Para-professionals to support RtI implementations when possible
• Attend RtI Team Meetings to be active in the RtI change process
• Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity.

Guidance Counselor
• Often RtI Team Facilitators
• Schedule and attend RtI meetings
• Maintain log of all students involved in the RtI process
• Send parent invites
Complete necessay RTi forms

School Psychologist
• Attend RtI Meetings on some students receiving supplemental supports and on all students receiving intensive supports
• Monitor data collection process for fidelity
• Review and interpret progress monitoring data
• Collaborate with RtI Team on effective instruction and specific interventions
• Incorporate RtI data when guiding a possible ESE referral and when making eligibility decisions.

Speech /Language Pathologist
• Attend RtI meetings for specific Tier 2 & 3 students
• Completes Communication Skills screening for students unsuccessful with Tier 2 interventions.
• Assist with Tier 2&3 interventions through collaboration, training, and or direct student contact
• Incorporate RtI data when guiding a possible Speech/Language referral & when making eligibility decisions.

ESE/Staffing Specialist
• Consult with RtI Team regarding intensive interventions
• Incorporate RtI data when making eligibility decisions

Social Worker
• Attend RtI meetings when requested
• Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with RtI Team

ESOL/ELL Representative
• Attend all RtI meetings for identified ESOL/ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
• Conduct language screenings and assessments
• Provide ELL interventions at all tiers

School Nurse
• Attend RtI Meetings when requested (medical and/or health issues)
• Serve as a liaison regarding Medical/Health information and /or issues.

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

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

MTSS Implementation

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

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The LLT will be comprised of administration, reading teachers, reading coach, department heads and any other individual that chooses to participate.

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

The LLT will meet at least once a month. The LLT will help support school, department, and individual teacher/student goals. The LLT will collect and analyze data to help with obtaining a school grade of A and making AYP.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT will be: integrating technology into all classrooms, reading across the curriculum, math across the curriculum, science across the curriculum, writing across the curriculum, making AYP, and increasing parent involvement.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Professional development will be made available to teach literacy strategies to all teachers. Individuals will share strategies at faculty meetings, department meetings, and/or leadership meetings. Common Planning time will be used for teachers to work together to build lesson plans, common assessments, and strategic activities based on strategies learned.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Increase the proficiency of Students scoring Achievement Level 3 in reading from 29% (249/859) in 2011-12 to 39% (355/911) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (249)	39% (355)

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 are not provided ample opportunities to respond to reading and writing to help them accumulate and extend their thinking	- Classroom discussions - guided practice - independent practice - reading, re-reading, and responding to rigerous text - ongoing feedback - new curriculum (Springboard) - CIS Lessons - Ability Grouping - Higher comlexity texts - Teaching reading in the content area - Higher Order Questions	Classroom teachers, Assistant Principals, Principal and Reading Coach	Teachers create lesson plans which include questions of increasing complexity using Webb's Depth of Knowledge Teachers monitor student understanding through higherlevel questioning during classroom discussions and reflection through writing. Higher-level questioning in students' writing observed during classroom walkthroughs. Teachers review FAIR data (Lv1-3) to monitor progress	Lesson plans Classroom walk-through data. FAIR (Lv1-3)

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Increase the proficiency of Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in Florida Alternate Assessment of reading from 42% (6/14) in 2011-12 to 45% (5/11) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (6)	45% (3)

	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	Past data shows that students with significant cognitive disabilities have difficulty acquiring new knowledge	Include a variety of assessments and checks for understanding Think Alouds, guided practice, assistance as needed one on one	Classroom teacher (s), Assistant Principals, Principal and Reading Coach	Teachers monitor student understanding through differentiated questioning during classroom discussions. Questioning techniques observed during classroom walk-throughs.	Observation and Classroom walkthroughs Lesson plans Alternative 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Increase the proficiency of Students scoring at Level 4 in reading from 30% (192) in 2011-12 to 35% (318) in 2012-13 as measured by the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (192)	35% (318)

	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	Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading strategies aligned with tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive complexity	- Classroom discussions - guided practice - independent practice - reading, re-reading, and responding to rigerous text - ongoing feedback - new curriculum (Springboard) - CIS Lessons - Ability Grouping - Higher comlexity texts - Teaching reading in the content area (Tools Training) - Higher Order Questions	Reading teachers, content area teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Teachers monitor students' ability to make meaning from text through classroom discussions, guided practice, independent practice Classroom instruction will include Guided practice with rigorous text. Teacher lesson plans will reflect use of Webb's Depth of knowledge Progress monitoring of students reading growth.	FCAT Explorer FAIR OPM Classroom walkthroughs/instructional review Review of lesson plans

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Maintain the proficiency of Students scoring at or above Level 7 on the Florida ALternate Assessment at 15% (2/14) in 2011-12 to 15% (3/11) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

15% (2)			15% (2)	

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td align="center">Anticipated Barrier</td><td align="center">Strategy</td><td align="center">Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td align="center">Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td align="center">Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Past data shows that students with significant cognitive disabilities have difficulty acquiring new knowledge</td><td>Include a variety of assessments and checks for understanding Think Alouds, guided practice, assistance as needed one on one</td><td>Classroom teachers, content area teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach</td><td>Teachers monitor students' ability to make meaning from text through classroom discussions, guided practice, independent practice Classroom instruction will include Guided practice with a variety of text. Teacher lesson plans will reflect use of Webb's Depth of knowledge</td><td>FCAT Explorer FAIR OPM Classroom walkthroughs/instructional review Review of lesson plans</td></tr>
</table>

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Increase the number of students making learning gains in reading from 59%(515/859) to 70% (637/911).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (515)	70% (637)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td align="center">Anticipated Barrier</td><td align="center">Strategy</td><td align="center">Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td align="center">Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td align="center">Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading strategies aligned with tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive complexity.</td><td>- Classroom discussions
- guided practice
- independent practice
- reading, re-reading, and responding to rigerous text
- ongoing feedback
- new curriculum (Springboard)
- CIS Lessons
- Ability Grouping
- Higher comlexity texts
- Teaching reading in the content area (Tools Training)
- Higher Order Questions</td><td>Reading Teachers, Content Area Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach</td><td>Level 1 & 2 students are appropriately placed in a reading intervention class Reading teachers maintain fidelity with real reading, real writing, real thinking. Teachers share FAIR/FCAT/ formative assessments with students. Teachers monitor students' ability to make meaning from text through classroom discussions, guided practice, independent practice</td><td>FAIR OPM Classroom assessments FCAT Classroom walkthroughs/instructional review data Lesson Plans</td></tr>
</table>

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	Maintain the proficiency percentage of Students making learning gains in reading at 64% (9/14) in 2011-12 to 64% (7/11) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (9)	64% (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	Past data shows that students with significant cognitive disabilities have difficulty acquiring new knowledge	Include a variety of assessments and checks for understanding Think Alouds, guided practice, assistance as needed one on one	Classroom Teachers, Content Area Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Classroom teachers maintain fidelity with real reading, real writing, real thinking, Teachers share formative assessments with appropriate supports/care-givers	Classroom assessments Alternative Assessments Classroom walkthroughs/ instructional review data Data Chats

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:	Increase the proficiency of Students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading from 57% (490/859) in 2011-12 to 62% (565/911) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (472)	62% (565)

	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	Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading strategies aligned with tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive complexity.	- Classroom discussions - guided practice - independent practice - reading, re-reading, and responding to rigerous text - ongoing feedback - new curriculum (Springboard) - CIS Lessons - Ability Grouping - Higher comlexity texts - Teaching reading in the content area (Tools Training) - Higher Order Questions -Data chats	Reading Teachers, Content Area Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Level 1 & 2 students are appropriately placed in a reading intervention class Reading teachers maintain fidelity with real reading, real writing, real thinking, Teachers share FAIR/FCAT/ formative assessments with students	FAIR OPM Classroom assessments FCAT Classroom walkthroughs/ instructional Data Lesson Plans

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 #
	The percentage of students scoring at level three and above will increase by 10% each year over the next five years.
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	65	68	72	75	78	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2011-12 70%(371/531) of students in the White subgroup were proficient and in 2012-13 we will increase to 76% (395/520)as measured by the state assessment. In 2011-12 62% (149/241) of students in the Hispanic subgroup were proficient and in 2012-13 we will increase to 65% (168/259) as measured by the state assessment. In 2011-12 48% (34/71) of students in the Black subgroup were proficient and in 2012-13 we will increase to 67% (49) as measured by the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 70% (371) Hispanic 62% (149)	White 76% (395) Hispanic 65% (168)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Need for differentiated instruction in basic reading skills for struggling learners	- ESOL Strategies - Intensive Classes - Classroom discussions - guided practice - independent practice - reading, re-reading, and responding to rigerous text - ongoing feedback - new curriculum (Springboard) - CIS Lessons - Ability Grouping - Higher comlexity texts - Teaching reading in the content area (Tools Training) - Higher Order Questions -Data chats	Assistant Principal and Reading Coach Content/Reading Teachers	Review of FAIR testing and other classroom assessments including AR	FAIR scores and FCAT 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 subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Population is less than 10 studetns per grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A	N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Increase the number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) making satisfactory progress in reading from 30% (45/150) in 2011-12 to 30% (54/183) in 2012-13 as measured by the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (45)	30% (54)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Need for differentiated instruction in basic reading skills for struggling learners	- Classroom discussions - guided practice - independent practice - reading, re-reading, and responding to rigerous text - ongoing feedback - new curriculum (Springboard) - CIS Lessons - Ability Grouping - Higher comlexity texts - Teaching reading in the content area (Tools Training) - Higher Order Questions -Data chats	Administration Reading Coach Reading and Content Teachers	Review of FAIR testing and other classroom assessments	FAIR data FCAT Reading Progress monitoring 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 reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Increase the proficiency of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading from 63%(329) in 2011-12 to 67% (425) in 2012-13 as measured by the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (329)	67% (425)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Need for differentiated instruction in basic reading skills for struggling learners	-intensive or developmental reading classes - Classroom discussions - guided practice - independent practice - reading, re-reading, and responding to rigerous text - ongoing feedback - new curriculum (Springboard) - CIS Lessons - Ability Grouping - Higher comlexity texts - Teaching reading in the content area (Tools Training) - Higher Order Questions -Data chats	Assistant Principal Reading Coach Reading and Content Teachers	Review of FAIR testing and other classroom assessments	FAIR scores and FCAT Reading

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core - unpacking benchmarks, resources, rigor.	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Complex Text	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Preschool and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Classroom Culture and Environment	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads	School Wide	Preschool and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Instructional Delivery	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Content Area Literacy	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Florida's Continuous						

Improvement Model (FCIM) and Multi-Tiered System of Student Supports (MTSSS	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach

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
Title II Funds will be used for Differentiated Instruction, Instructional Methods & Strategies,and Curriculum & Subject Area PD	State, District, and School based personel will be utilized for support/PD. Funds will be used to purchase research based materials, time for PD, and Off site traiings.	Title II Funds	$5,389.00
			Subtotal: $5,389.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $5,389.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	In 2011-12, 44% (12/27) of students were proficient on the listening/speaking portion of the CELLA. In 2012-13, CMS will maintain the amount of proficient students at 44% (13/31) as measured by the CELLA Report on Pinnacle Analytics.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
44% (12)	

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	Students lack proficiency in the English language.	Teachers will use ESOL accommodations for each lesson.	Teachers ESOL Cordinator Administration	ESOL accommodations documented on lesson plans.	Lesson plans Administrative observation Evaluation

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	In 2011-12, 15%(4/27) of students were proficient on the reading portion of the CELLA. In 2012-13, CMS will maintain the amount of proficient students at 15% (5/31) as measured by the CELLA Report on Pinnacle Analytics.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

15% (4)

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 lack proficiency in the English language.	Teachers will use ESOL accommodations for each lesson.	Teachers ESOL Cordinator Administration	ESOL accommodations documented on lesson plans.	Lesson plans Administrative observation Evaluation

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	In 2011-12, 37%(10/27) of students were proficient on the writing portion of the CELLA. In 2012-13, CMS will maintain the amount of proficient students at 37% (12/31) as measured by the CELLA Report on Pinnacle Analytics.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

37% (10)

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 lack proficiency in the English language.	Teachers will use ESOL accommodations for each lesson.	Teachers ESOL Cordinator Administration	ESOL accommodations documented on lesson plans.	Lesson plans Administrative observation Evaluation

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:	Increase the proficiency of Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics from 31% (266) in 2011-12 to 35% (281) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (266)	35% (281)

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	Differentiated instruction driven by data is not occuring across all grade levels.	- Include a variety of assessments and checks for understanding - new district benchmark assessments - Differentiated instruction - Utilize specific skill-based strategies for identified students based on data for tutoring and small group instruction	Mathematics Teachers Administration	Ongoing monitoring of alignment of instruction and assessments with FCAT 2.0 items.	Increased achievement between assessments. Common Corse Exams FCAT Mathematics Assessment

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	Increase the proficiency of Students scoring at Achievement Level 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics from 50%(7/14) in 2011-12 to 54% (6/11) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (7)	54% (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	Past data shows that students with significant cognitive disabilities have difficulty acquiring new knowledge	Include a variety of assessments and checks for understanding Think Alouds, guided practice, assistance as needed one on one	Mathematic Teacher(s) Administration	Ongoing monitoring of alignment of instruction and assessments with Alternative Assessment items.	Increased achievement between 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Increase the proficiency of Students scoring at Achievement Level 4 in mathematics from 28% (241/859) in 2011-12 to 33% (300/911) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (241)	33% (300)

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	Differentiated instruction driven by data is not occuring across all grade levels.	- variety of assessments - checks for understanding - use of the new district benchmark assessments - district developed curriculum guides - Core Content - NGSSS - differentiated instruction - higher order questions	Mathematic Teachers Administration	Ongoing monitoring of alignment of instruction and assessments with FCAT 2.0./Common Core items.	Increased achievement between 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Maintain the proficiency of Students scoring at Achievement Level 7 in mathematics from 1%(1/14) in 2011-12 to 1% (1/11) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
1% (1)	1% (1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Past data shows that students with significant cognitive disabilities have difficulty acquiring new knowledge	Include a variety of assessments and checks for understanding Think Alouds, guided practice, assistance as needed one on one	Mathematic Teacher(s) Administration	Ongoing monitoring of alignment of instruction and assessments with Alternative Assessment items.	Increased achievement between 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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning

gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #3a:

| Increase the proficiency of Students making learning gains in mathematics from 67% (575/859) in 2011-12 to 72% (656/911) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment. |

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (575)	72% (656)

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	Differentiated instruction driven by data is not occuring across all grade levels.	- variety of assessments - checks for understanding - use of the new district benchmark assessments - district developed curriculum guides - Core Content - NGSSS - differentiated instruction will be facilitated through large group, small skill groups and individual conferring	Mathematics teachers Administration	Ongoing monitoring of using curriculum guides, the NGSSS, and Core Content when planning and delivering instruction.	Increased achievement between 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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Increase the proficiency of Students making learning gains in mathematics from 43% (6/14) in 2011-12 to 45% (5/11) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (6)	45% (5)

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	Past data shows that students with significant cognitive disabilities have difficulty acquiring new knowledge	Include a variety of assessments and checks for understanding Think Alouds, guided practice, assistance as needed one on one	Mathematic teacher(s) Administration	Ongoing monitoring of students performance and progress to determine necessary stops to meet goals.	Increased achievement between 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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	Increase the proficiency of Students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics from 67% (576/859) in 2011-12

Mathematics Goal #4:	to 72% (656/911) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (609)	72% (656)

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	Differentiated instruction driven by data is not occuring across all grade levels.	- variety of assessments - checks for understanding - use of the new district benchmark assessments - district developed curriculum guides - Core Content - NGSSS - differentiated instruction - Intensive Mathematics	Mathematics Teachers, Guidance Counselor Administration	Ongoing monitoring of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of the students. Level 1 students are placed in Intensive Mathematics	Increased achievement between assessments including District assessments.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # The percentage of students scoring at level three and above will increase by 10% each year over the next five years. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	65	68	72	75	78	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In 2011-12 64% (371/531) of students in the White subgroup were proficient and in 2012-13 we will increase to 70% (322/520)as measured by the state assessment. In 2011-12 50% (120/241) of students in the Hispanic subgroup were proficient and in 2012-13 we will increase to 62% (161/259) as measured by the state assessment. In 2011-12 41% (29/71) of students in the Black subgroup were proficient and in 2012-13 we will increase to 51% (37/73)as measured by the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 64% (371) Hispanic 50% (120) Black 41% (29)	White 70% (322) Hispanic 62% (161) Black 51% (37)

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 enter mathematics courses not having achieved previous grade level proficiency or retention of previous curriculum.	- variety of assessments - checks for understanding - use of the new district benchmark assessments - district developed curriculum guides - Core Content - NGSSS - differentiated instruction	Matematics teachers Administration	Ongoing monitoring of student understanding, mastery, and retention of benchmarks District curriculum, Core Content, and NGSSS and using differentiated instruction.	Increased achievement between assessments including District assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Population is less than 10 studetns per grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students enter math courses not having achieved previous grade level proficiency or retention of previous curriculum.	Include a variety of assessments and checks for understanding to determine student mastery of goals, including use of the district benchmark assessments.	Mathematics Teachers Administration Guidance Counselors	Ongoing monitoring of use of the district developed curriculum guides, Comomon Core, and NGSSS. Use of differentiated instruction as documented in Lesson Plans and Classroom Walkthrough data.	Increased achievement between assessments including District assessments Walkthrough Data Lesson Plans
2	Differentiated instruction driven by data is not occuring across all grade levels.	Use district developed curriculum guides, Core Content, and the NGSSS to plan and deliver instruction. Students receive in class differentiated instruction to help students meet math deficiencies.	Mathematics Teachers Administration Guidance Counselors	Ongoing monitoring of use of the district developed curriculum guides, Core Content, and NGSSS Documenttion of the use of differentiated instruction	Increased achievement between assessments including District assessments Walkthrough Data Lesson Plans

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Increase the proficiency of Students with Disabilities (SWD) making learning gains in mathematics from 54% (81/150) in 2011-12 to 57% (110/194) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| 54% (81) | 57% (110) |

	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	Differentiated instruction driven by data is not occuring across all grade levels.	- variety of assessments - checks for understanding - use of the new district benchmark assessments - district developed curriculum guides - Core Content - NGSSS - differentiated instruction	Mathematics Teachers Administration	Ongoing monitoring of use of district developed curriculum guides, Common Core, and NGSSS Utilization of differentiated instruction for students individual needs	Increased achievement between assessments including District 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:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	Increase the proficiency of Economically Disadvantaged students making learning gains in mathematics from 67% (582/869) in 2011-12 to 69% (637/911) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (582)	70% (637)

	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	Differentiated instruction driven by data is not occuring across all grade levels.	- variety of assessments - checks for understanding - use of the new district benchmark assessments - district developed curriculum guides - Core Content - NGSSS - differentiated instruction	Mathemaitcs Teachers STEM Teachers Administration	Ongoing monitoring use of district developed curriculum guides, Common Core, and NGSSS and use of differentiated instruction	Increased achievement between assessments including District assessments

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:

Increase the number of students scoring Achievement Level 3 in Algebra from 100% (33/33) in 2011-12 to 90% (65/72) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (33)	90% (65)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Core instruction and assessments are not aligned to summative assessments/Common Core (FCAT 2.0)	- variety of assessments - checks for understanding - use of the new district benchmark assessments - district developed curriculum guides - Core Content - NGSSS - differentiated instruction .	Algebra I Teachers Administration	Ongoing monitoring use of district developed curriculum guides, Common Core, and NGSSS and use of differentiated instruction	Increased achievement between assessments including District 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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Increase the number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Algebra from 100% (33/33) in 2011-12 to 50% (36/72) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (33)	50% (36)

	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	Core instruction and assessments are not aligned to summative assessments/Common Core (FCAT 2.0)	- variety of assessments - checks for understanding - use of the new district benchmark assessments - district developed curriculum guides - Core Content - NGSSS - differentiated instruction	Mathematics Teachers Administration	Ongoing monitoring use of district developed curriculum guides, Common Core, and NGSSS and use of differentiated instruction	Increased achievement between assessments including District assessments

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Common Core - unpacking benchmarks, resources, rigor.	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Pre-school and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Classroom Culture and Environment	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Pre-school and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Instructional Delivery	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Content Area Literacy	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and Multi-Tiered System of Student Supports (MTSSS)	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In 2010-11 50% (141) scored a level 3 or higher in FCAT science. In 2011-12 we will improve to 55% (155) as measured by the school grade report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (141)	55% (155)

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	- On-going assessment of students - Reading difficulties in Content Area classrooms (Science).	- Baseline testing - common testing throughout school year - Science Literacy Night	Administration Teachers Literacy Coach	Review of assessment data Attendance data for Science Literacy Night	District tests Sign-In sheets

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:	In 2010-11 63% (5/8) scored a level 4, 5, or 6 in FCAT science on the ALternative Assessment. In 2011-12 we will maintain the rate 50% (2/4) as measured by the school grade report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (5)	50% (4)

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	Past data shows that students with significant cognitive disabilities have difficulty acquiring new knowledge	Include a variety of assessments and checks for understanding Think Alouds, guided practice, assistance as needed one on one	Science Teachers Administration Literacy Coach	Lesson Plans Walk Through Observations	Student progress monitoring 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Baseline data will be colected this year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	The numbers do not reflect this data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core - unpacking benchmarks, resources, rigor.	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Pre-School and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Complex Text	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Pre-School and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
		Administration will			Observation/	

		collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.				
Classroom Culture and Environment	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Instructional Delivery	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Content Area Literacy	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and Multi-Tiered System of Student Supports (MTSSS	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders

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:	Maintain the proficiency of students scoring at Achievement Level 3.5 and higher in writing from 48% (412/859) in 2011-12 to 48% (437/911) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (412)	48% (437)

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	On-going assessment of students	Baseline testing and common testing throughout school year	Principals, Language Arts Department Head, Language Arts teachers	Review of assessment data	District tests
2	Students do not independently use writing strategies	Language Arts teachers provide students with explicit instruction in the use of writing strategies (e.g. planning, revising, and editing strategies All teachers support students' use of writing strategies	Principals. Department Head Principals, Language Arts Department Head, Language Arts teachers (on teams)	Individual teacher review of student work, PLC discussions of student work, lesson plans, writing samples PLC meetings, Collaborative lesson planning, SBLT discussions, Instructional Review walkthrough data	Student work, assessment data (FL Writes, mock FL Writes, post writing piece), student surveys Student portfolios, lesson plans
3	Instruction across all content areas does not provide ample opportunities to write short and extended responses	All teachers plan for and implement appropriate subject-specific writing assignments and activities Language Arts teachers provide students with ondemand writing instruction, assignments, and activities	Principals, Language Arts Teachers Department Head Principals, Language Arts Teachers Department Head	PLC meetings, Collaborative lesson planning, SBLT discussions Walkthroughs, PLC discussions, Collaborative lesson planning	Common writing rubric, lesson plans Student work, lesson plans, pre- and post tests

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	Maintain the proficiency of students scoring at Achievement Level 4.0 and higher in writing from 36% (5/14) in 2011-12 to 36% (4/11) in 2012-13 as measured the state assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (5)	36% (4)

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	Past data shows that students with significant cognitive disabilities have difficulty acquiring new	Include a variety of assessments and checks for understanding Think Alouds, guided	Administration and Language Arts Teacher(s),	PLC Meetings, SBLT discussions, Walkthrough Data	Student portfolios, lesson plans, mock assessments, Florida Alternative

| | knowledge | practice, assistance as needed one on one | | | | Assessment in writing |

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
Complex Text	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Classroom Culture and Environment	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Common Core - unpacking benchmarks, resources, rigor.	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Instructional Delivery	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Content Area Literacy	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and Multi-Tiered System of Student Supports (MTSS)	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach

Writing Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	This is the year to establish Baseline Data for Civics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Struggling readers who may have difficulty reading, responding, and discussing complex/ informational text	Teachers will provide opportunities to read, re-read and respond to content text while supporting the individual needs of all students	Civic Teachers Administration	PLC Meetings, Collaborative lesson planning, SBLT discussions, Walkthrough Data	Lesson Plans Walkthrough Data Department Meeting notes documenting the discussion/collaborative methods for supporting all learners

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:	This will be the year to set baseline data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who may have difficulty reading, responding, and discussing complex/ informational text	Teachers will provide opportunities to read, re-read and respond to content text while supporting the individual needs of all students	Civic Teachers Administration	PLC Meetings, Collaborative lesson planning, SBLT discussions, Walkthrough Data	Lesson Plans Walkthrough Data Department Meeting notes documenting the discussion/collaborative methods for supporting all learners

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core - unpacking benchmarks, resources, rigor.	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Pre-school and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Complex Text	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Pre-school and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Classroom Culture and Environment	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Pre-school and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Instructional Delivery	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Pre-school and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Content Area Literacy	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Pre-school and Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and Multi-Tiered System of Student Supports (MTSSS)	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders

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:	N/A
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
N/A	N/A
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
N/A	N/A
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
N/A	N/A

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

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

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

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

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:	N/A
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
N/A	N/A

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
N/A	N/A
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
N/A	N/A
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
N/A	N/A

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

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

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

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

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: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	In 2012-13 we will increase parent involvement data by increasing the number of visits to the school website from an average of 1200 visits per month to an average of 1300 visits per month as measured by tracking the total number of visits to our website.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Averaged around 1200 visits per month on website.	Will average around 1300 visits per month on website.

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	Keeping the website updated and current	Monitoring website on a monthly basis	Principal and Technology Specialist	Parent Involvement increasing	Visits tracked on website
2	Parental attendance at events	Inviting parents to workshops, literacy nights, and special programs using the newsletter, marque, and parent link	Administration and Staff	Attendance at events	Attendance tracking and feedback forms
3	Volunteers	Working on the 5 star award to increase volunteers	Administration and Staff	Number of volunteers	Tracking attendance of volunteeers

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.

				Target Dates		

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)	(e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Love and Logic	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads	School Wide/School Family/Community	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings SAC Meetings Parent Nights	SAC/Parent Night agenda Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders SAC Members
Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and Multi-Tiered System of Student Supports (MTSSS	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads	School Wide/School Family/Community	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings SAC Meetings Parent Nights	SAC/Parent Night agenda Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders SAC Members

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:	N/A
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

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:	The number of students participating in CTE courses will increase by 5% from 46% (400) to 51% (464) during the 2012-13 school year.

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 will be provided the opportunity to interact with technology that supports what they are learning	Teachers will use SMART Boards, SMART Lessons, and/or Computer Labs to enhance and enrich learning.	Administration CTE teachers Guidance	Grade level teams will review results of common assessment data Review of Lesson Plans/ Walkthrough data	Number of students participating successfully in STEM courses Lesson Plans Walkthrough Data
2	Opportunities for acceleration and enrichment activities are not offered for all students.	Master schedule will be developed in order to meet the needs of all students	Administration CTE teachers Guidance	Grade level teams will review results of common assessment data Review of Lesson Plans/ Walkthrough data	Number of students participating successfully in CTE courses Walkthrough Data Lesson Plans Department Meetings
3	There are a limited number of computers/classes to meet the needs of all students.	Set up labs to meet the needs of all students.	Tech Specialist Administration	Lab usage by all content teachers. Students taking certifications. Teachers taking certifications.	Number of students participating successfully in CTE courses Walkthrough Data Lesson Plans Department Meetings

---

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core - unpacking benchmarks, resources, rigor.	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders Literacy Coach
Development of Coursework to support Microsoft Certifications	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	Administration will collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	Observation/ Walkthrough data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings Before/After School support	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders
		Administration will			Observation/ Walkthrough	

Classroom Culture and Environment	6th-8th grade core content/support teachers	collaborate to formulate the plan for support with input from team leaders, reading coach, and department heads.	School Wide	Extended day during Wednesday PD meetings	data Lesson plans Department/ Content meetings Before/After School support	Administration Department Heads Team Leaders

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)

Community Involvement Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Community Involvement Goal Community Involvement Goal #1:	Caloosa Middle School will develop partnerships with community leaders in order to support teaching and learning at a rigorous level.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
N/A	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Caloosa Middle School students do not make connection between content knowledge and real world applications	Business partners sign annual, joint-developed plan of activities.	Administration STEM teachers	Business partners sign annual, joint-developed plan of activities. School business partnership coordinator has been designated. School provides training, orientation and recognition.	Signed plan of activities Sign in for activities
2	Caloosa Middle School Administration does not have partnerships with key Community Partners in order to support teaching and learning for staff and students	School business partnership coordinator will be designated.	Administration School Business Partnership Coordinator	School business partnership coordinator has been designated.	Lesson Plans Professional Development/sign in sheets Guest Speakers Volunteers during varied activities
3	Professional development does not utilize community resources to support teaching and learning	Professional development will be developed/implemented	Administration School Business Parnership Cordinator	School provides training, orientation and recognition.	Professional Development/sign in sheets

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Community Involvement Goal(s)

Anti Bullying Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Anti Bullying Goal Anti Bullying Goal #1:	In 2011-12 Caloosa Middle had 0 referrals for bullying during the school year. In 2012-13 CMS will maintain the number of referrals for bullying as reported on the end of year discipline report.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
0% (0)	0% (0)

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	Technology and social media sites allow students to bully others almost anonymously	- Positive Behavior Support strategies - Love and Logic strategies	Administration Team Leaders Guidance	Discipline Reports	Final Discipline Report for the Year

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Anti Bullying Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Title II Funds will be used for Differentiated Instruction, Instructional Methods & Strategies,and Curriculum & Subject Area PD	State, District, and School based personel will be utilized for support/PD. Funds will be used to purchase research based materials, time for PD, and Off site trailings.	Title II Funds	$5,389.00
				Subtotal: $5,389.00
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: $5,389.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	j̇n NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes j̇n No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/19/2012)

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

Review and approve SIP
Review school data
Review progress toward school goals

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Lee School District
CALOOSA MIDDLE SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	74%	77%	96%	50%	297	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	56%	72%			128	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	55% (YES)	71% (YES)			126	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					551	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District
CALOOSA MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	76%	97%	55%	307	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	71%			137	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	73% (YES)	71% (YES)			144	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					588	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested