# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: RICHMOND HEIGHTS MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Kristal B. Hickmon

SAC Chair: Lois Seaman

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/29/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Principal | Kristal B. Hickmon | DEGREES BIO/CHEM, B.S. ED. LEADERSHIP, M.S | 4 | 16 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B C B High Standards Rdg. 54 63 60 High Standards Math 43 55 55 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 71 62 64 Lrng Gains-Math 69 65 68 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 71 65 Gains-Math-25% 67 63 69 |
| Assis Principal | Desiree Sardo | DEGREES: DANCE, ED LEADERSHIP | 1 | 1 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B A A A A High Standards Rdg. 47 61 60 59 56 High Standards Math 53 63 69 63 64 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 66 67 69 66 Lrng Gains-Math 75 70 75 74 71 Gains-Rdg-25% 69 71 68 82 72 Gains-Math-25% 74 76 77 81 75 *was a teacher during this time |

| Assis Principal | Reginald J. Fox | DEGREES: MATH & STATISTICS, B.S. MATH ED. M.S. ED LEADERSHIP, SPECIALIST | 4 | 6 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08<br>School Grade B C B A A<br>High Standards Rdg. 54 63 60 85 83<br>High Standards Math 43 55 55 85 80<br>Lrng Gains-Rdg. 71 62 64 74 67<br>Lrng Gains-Math 69 65 68 78 64<br>Gains-Rdg-25% 71 71 65 55 54<br>Gains-Math-25% 67 63 69 68 64 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## 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 Language Arts<br><br>Educational Leadership | Danielle Ellis | DEGREES ENGLISH, B.S. READING AND LEARNING DISABILITIES, M.S. ED. LEADERSHIP, SPECIALIST | 18 | 3 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08<br>School Grade B C B C A<br>High Standards Rdg. 54 63 60 53 59<br>High Standards Math 43 55 55 49 58<br>Lrng Gains-Rdg. 71 62 64 62 67<br>Lrng Gains-Math 69 65 68 65 73<br>Gains-Rdg-25% 71 71 65 76 70<br>Gains-Math-25% 67 63 69 66 75 |

## 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 | The Highly Qualified staff are being directed to participate in the District's tutorial sessions to enable them to successfully pass the subject area certification exams. | Administration | On going | |
| 2 | Encourage faculty to complete Clinical Supervision course so that more interns can be trained and consequently hired at Richmond Middle. | Administration | On going | |
| 3 | Partner new teachers with veteran staff to assist them with the classroom transition. | Administration | On going | |
| 4 | Regular meetings of new teachers with administration. | Administration | 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 |
|---|---|
| 7 Out-of-field<br>0 received less than effective rating | The Non-Highly Qualified staff are being directed to participate in the District's tutorial sessions to enable them to successfully pass the subject are certification exams. |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 36 | 0.0%(0) | 2.8%(1) | 63.9%(23) | 33.3%(12) | 61.1%(22) | 100.0%(36) | 16.7%(6) | 2.8%(1) | 25.0%(9) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| N/A | | | |

# ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities (After school tutorial as well as the computer lab are available along with an Activity bus). The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to the schools, students, and families. School based, Title I funded Community Involvement Specialists (CIS), serve as bridge between the home and school through home visits, telephone calls, school site and community parenting activities. The CIS schedules meetings and activities, encourage parents to support their child's education, provide materials, and encourage parental participation in the decision making processes at the school site. The curriculum AP along with the Reading Coach develops, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Parents participate in the design of their school's Parent Involvement Plan (PIP – which is provided in three languages at all schools), the school improvement process and the life of the school and the annual Title I Annual Parent Meeting at the beginning of the school year. The annual M-DCPS Title I Parent/Family Involvement Survey is intended to be used toward the end of the school year to measure the parent program over the course of the year and to facilitate an evaluation of the parent involvement program to inform planning for the following year. An all out effort is made to inform parents of the importance of this survey via CIS, Title I District and Region meetings, Title I Newsletter for Parents, and Title I Quarterly Parent Bulletins. This survey, available in English, Spanish and Haitian-Creole, will be available online and via hard copy for parents (at schools and at District meetings) to complete. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program; Title I CHESS (as appropriate); Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and delinquent students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.

Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:
•training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
•training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL
training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional

Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols

## Title III

Schools are to review the services provided with Title III funds and select from the items listed below for inclusion in the response. Please select services that are applicable to your school.

Title III funds are used to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learner (ELL) and Recently Arrived Immigrant Children and Youth by providing funds to implement and/or provide:
• tutorial programs (K-12)
• parent outreach activities (K-12) through the Bilingual Parent Outreach Program (The Parent Academy)
• professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers
• coaching and mentoring for ESOL and content area teachers(K-12)
• reading and supplementary instructional materials(K-12)
• cultural supplementary instructional materials (K-12)
• purchase of supplemental hardware and software for the development of language and literacy skills in reading, mathematics and science, as well as, thematic cultural lessons is purchased for selected schools to be used by ELL students and recently arrived immigrant students (K-12, RFP Process)
• Cultural Activities through the Cultural Academy for New Americans for eligible recently arrived, foreign born students

The above services will be provided should funds become available for the 2012-2013 school year and should the FLDOE approve the application(s).

## Title X- Homeless

•Miami-Dade County Public Schools' School Board approved the School Board Policy 5111.01 titled, Homeless Students. The board policy defines the McKinney-Vento Law and ensures homeless students receive all the services they are entitled to.
•The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.
•Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assists schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students. All schools are eligible to receive services and will do so upon identification and classification of a student as homeless.
•The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and are provided with all entitlements.
•Project Upstart provides a homeless sensitivity, awareness campaign to all the schools - each school is provided a video and curriculum manual, and a contest is sponsored by the homeless trust-a community organization.
•Project Upstart provides tutoring and counseling to twelve homeless shelters in the community.
•The District Homeless Student Liaison continues to participate in community organization meetings and task forces as it relates to homeless children and youth.
•Each school will identify a school based homeless coordinator to be trained on the McKinney-Vento Law ensuring appropriate services are provided to the homeless students.

## Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

## Violence Prevention Programs

The safe and drug-free Schools Program addresses violence and drug prevention and intervention services for students through curriculum implemented by classroom teachers. Training and technical assistance for teachers, administrators, and counselors, is also a component of this program. The school partners with the Non-Violence Project USA to offer counseling, group sessions, and peer to peer mediation as a means to reduce violence and crime in and around the school.

## Nutrition Programs

Nutrition Programs
1) Richmond Heights Middle School adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.
3) The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy.

## Housing Programs

N/A

## Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

Health Connect In Our Schools (HCiOS) offers a coordinated level of school-based healthcare which integrates education, medical and/or social and human services on school grounds. HCiOS will reduce or eliminate barriers to care, connect eligible students with health insurance and a medical home, and provide care for students who are not eligible for other services. HCiOS will deliver coordinated social work and mental/behavioral health interventions in a timely manner.
Miami Lighthouse / Heiken Children's Vision Program provides free complete optometric exams conducted at school sites via vision vans and corrective lenses to all failed vision screenings if the parent/guardian cannot afford the exams and or the lenses.

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

1. MTSS leadership is vital, therefore, in building our team we have considered the following:
• Administrator(s) who will ensure commitment and allocate resources;
• Department Chairs and the Reading Coach who share the common goal of improving instruction for all students; and
• Team members who will work to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time.

2. The Richmond Heights Middle School's MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will include the following personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:
• Principal
• Assistant Principals
• Reading Coach
• SPED Chairperson
• Guidance Counselor
• School Psychologist
• Magnet Lead Teachers
• Language Arts Department Chairperson
• Middle School Coordinator
• Science Department Chairperson
• Math Department Chairperson
• Social Studies Department Chairperson

3. MTSS is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. MTSS uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.
• The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.
• The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core additional
instructional and/or behavioral support.
• The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction
and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally. There will be
an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by
benchmark and progress monitoring data.

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 Richmond Heights Middle School MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will:
1. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following important questions:
• What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)

- How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments)
- How will we respond when students have not learned? (response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
- How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (enrichment opportunities)

2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
3. Hold regular team meetings.
4. Maintain communication with the staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

The Richmond Heights Middle School's MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet with the principal, and the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) to help develop the SIP. The team will provide data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

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 Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

## MTSS Implementation

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

Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:
1. Adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students.
2. Adjust the delivery of behavior management system.
3. Adjust the allocation of school-based resources.
4. Drive decisions regarding targeted professional development..
5. Create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions.
Managed data will include:
Academic
FAIR assessment
Interim Assessments
State/Local Math and Science Assessments
FCAT
CELLA
Student Grades
School site specific assessments
Behavior
Student Case Management System
Detentions
Suspensions/expulsions
Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
Office referrals per day per month
Team climate surveys
Attendance
Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Assistant Principal will conduct a refresher on the RtI process at Richmond Heights.
The district professional development and support will include:
1. Training for all administrators in the RtI problem solving, data analysis process
2. Providing support for school staff to understand basic RtI principles and procedures
3. Providing a network of ongoing support for RtI organized through feeder patterns

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS support plan includes:
1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS framework with district and school mission statements and organizational improvements efforts.
2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district and state levels.
3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of problem-solving process to support planning, implementing and evaluating effectiveness of services.
4. Strong, positive and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.
5. Comprehensive, efficient and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to aggregate district level.
6. Sufficient availability of coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.
7. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.
8. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school based Literacy Leadership Team is comprised of the following members:
• Kristal B. Hickmon, Principal
• Reginald J. Fox, assistant principal
• Danielle Ellis, Reading Coach
• Lois Seaman, Language Arts Department Chair
• Brenda Woodson, Mathematics Department Chair
• Barbara King, Social Studies Department Chair
• Ebonie Battle, Science Department Chair
• April Garrett, Counselor

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will meet twice per month. Initial meetings in the summer will focus on the School Improvement Plan and its implications for the upcoming school year with a heavy focus on how to incorporate the CRRP across all disciplines. As the year progresses, the various initiatives will be revisited as data is monitored to determine if adjustments or changes are necessary.

1. Use the Tier 1 Problem Solving process to set Tier 1 goals, monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress at least three times per year by addressing the following important questions:
• What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
• What progress is expected in each core area?
• How will we determine if students have made expected levels of progress towards proficiency? (common assessments)
• How will we respond when grades, subject areas, or class of, or individual students have not learned? (Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
• How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (enrichment opportunities).
2. Gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by group or individual student diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment.
3. Hold regular team meetings. Use the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success.
4. Gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM.
5. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
6. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
7. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
8. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for meeting Annual Measurable Objectives.

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

• Continue the implementation of The Homeroom Academic Plan (The HAPs) as a Literacy Block that will focus on Reading,

Writing, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies as well as character education, and team activities.
• Implement a school-wide vocabulary initiative.
• A before school tutorial program aimed at intensive remediation as well enrichment called the Homeroom Intervention (HIP) and Homeroom Opportunity Plan (HOP) will be implemented. The aim is to provide intervention (HIP) for struggling readers as well as tutoring (HOP) for students that are advancing in the areas of math & science.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/10/2012)

## *Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

## *Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Richmond Heights Middle School will utilize the homeroom period as a Literacy Block period. Alternating weekly Writing, Science, Reading through Social Studies and Mathematics mini-lessons will be completed school wide. The teachers will receive professional development on the lessons and strategies that will be presented to the students. There will be a before school intervention (HIP) program designed to address student deficiencies in reading and the elective courses will focus on reading on a weekly basis.

## *High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

## Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 32% of students made Level 3 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the level 3 proficiency to 34% |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 32% (209) | 34% (224) |

| | 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading results, an area in need of improvement is Reporting category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process. | Students will use Florida Focus with fidelity to improve skills such as locating and verifying details, critically analyzing text, and synthesizing details to draw conclusions. Strategies will include reciprocal teaching, note-taking skills and questioning the author. | Literacy Leadership Team | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessments, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 20% percent of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency b 1 percentage point to 21%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 20% (134) | 21% (139) |

| | 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading results, an area in need of improvement is Reporting category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process. | Language Arts teachers will collaborate with the Social Studies department to ensure that enrichment students read from a wide variety of texts and sources. Additionally, they will collaboratively plan lessons utilizing reading strategies, such as utilizing opinion/proofs, note-taking skills, and questioning the author. Strategies will include reciprocal teaching, note-taking skills and questioning the author. | Literacy Leadership Team | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in enrichment groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

of improvement for the following group:

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 71% of students made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school is to increase student learning gains by 5 percentage points to76%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 71% (420) | 76% (450) |

| 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading results, an area in need of improvement is Reporting category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process. | Students will utilize technology to increase reading proficiency. Achieve 3000 will be used to reinforce mastery of the Sunshine State Standards and Reading Plus will be used to provide individualized and differentiated practice in reading. A computer lab will be available after school 3 times a week for students who do not have computer and/or internet access at home. | Literacy Leadership Team | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that71 % percent of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. |
|---|---|

| | Reading Goal #4: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by5 percentage points to 76%. |
|---|---|---|
| | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | 71% (110) | 76% (118) |

| 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading results, an area in need of improvement is Reporting category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process. | After school tutoring will be offered this school year. Tutors will use data to drive instruction and an incentive plan to increase participation. Strategies will include reciprocal teaching, note-taking skills and questioning the author. | Literacy Leadership Team | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

| 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 # <br> Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. <br><br> 5A : |

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 52% | 57% | 61% | 65% | 70% | |

| 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: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 72% of students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency.  Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 12 percentage points to 84%.  Additionally, 65% of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency to 69%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 72% (33) | 84% (39) |

| 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 |
| | White: According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 results, an area in need of | Reading Plus will be used to provide individualized and differentiated | Literacy Leadership Team | Quarterly data chats that will compare progress as indicated on the FAIR | Formative: Baseline Benchmark |

| | | | | and Benchmark Assessment results | Assessment and Interim Assessments and bi-weekly assessments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | improvement is Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. | practice in reading. A computer lab will be available after school 3 times a week for students who do not have computer and/or internet access at home. Also, an incentive plan will be used to encourage students to complete at least 50 sessions prior to spring assessments. Level 1 & 2 students will be targeted to particpated in the Homeroom Intervention Program (HIP) for remediation in reading. | | | Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5C: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 35% of students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 8 percentage points to 43%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 35% (15) | 43% (18) |

| 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 results, an area in need of improvement is Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. | Reading Plus will be used to provide individualized and differentiated practice in reading. A computer lab will be available after school 3 times a week for students who do not have computer and/or internet access at home. Also, ELL students will utilize Achieve 3000 in a separate computer lab. ESOL Level 1 & 2 students will be targeted to particpated in the Homeroom Intervention Program (HIP) for remediation in reading. | Literacy Leadership Team | Quarterly data chats that will compare progress as indicated on the FAIR and Benchmark Assessment results | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment and Interim Assessments and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5D: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 20% of students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency.<br><br>Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 15 percentage points to 35%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| 20%(19) | 35%(33) |
|---|---|

| 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test results, an area in need of improvement is Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. | SWD have been scheduled in IR or IR+ with a support facilitator from the SPED department. Level 1 & 2 students will be targeted to participate in the Homeroom Intervention Program (HIP) for remediation in reading. | Literacy Leadership Team | Quarterly data chats that will compare progress as indicated on the FAIR and Benchmark Assessment results | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment Interim Assessment  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 50% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency.  Our goal is to improve student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 55%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 50%(277) | 55%(305) |

| 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 results, an area in need of improvement is Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. | ED have been scheduled in IR or IR+ where appropriate. Level 1 & 2 students will be targeted to participate in the Homeroom Intervention Program (HIP) for remediation in reading. | Literacy Leadership Team | Quarterly data chats that will compare progress as indicated on the FAIR and Benchmark Assessment results | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | During PLC | | |

| | | | | meetings on the third Tuesday of each month beginning September 18, 2012 | Utilize the progress monitoring tools in the Reading Plus program. | Reading Coach and Assistant Principal |
| Reading Plus | 6-8/Language Arts | Reading Coach | Language Arts Teachers, 6-8 | | | |
| Reading Across the Curriculum | 6-8/Social Studies | Reading Coach | Social Studies Teachers, 6-8 | During PLC meetings on the third Tuesday of each month beginning September 18, 2012 | Check the score sheets of the timed readings as provided by the teacher. | Reading Coach and Assistant Principal |
| FCAT Explorer | 6-8/ Language Arts | Language Arts Department Chairperson | Language Arts Teachers, 6-8 | During PLC meetings on the third Tuesday of each month beginning September 18, 2012 | Utilize the progress monitoring tools in the FCAT Explorer program | Language Arts Department Chairperson and Assistant Principal |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading Plus implementation | Refresher training on Reading Plus; copies of materials; incentives | School Based Budget | $1,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $1,000.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $1,000.00 |

*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.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | Increase percentage of students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | |
| 45% (19) | |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited opportunities for students to practice listening and speaking | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Listening : Use simple, direct language and teacher led groups  The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Speaking : Cooperative Learning and teacher led groups. | Literacy Leadership Team and ESOL Para | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data, FAIR and Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments  Summative: 2013 CELLA Test |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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: | Increase percentage of students scoring proficient in Reading by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| 38% (16) | |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited opportunities for students to read in class. | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Reading: Use read alouds, choral reading, K-W-L, &task cards  Administration will designate a computer lab for ESOL students to use on a scheduled calendar.  ELLs will complete two Achieve3000 activities on a weekly basis. | Literacy Leadership Team and ESOL Para | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments  Summative: 2013 CELLA Test |

| | |
|---|---|
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. | Increase percentage of students scoring proficient in |

| CELLA Goal #3: | Writing by 5%. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: |
|---|

| 30% (12) |
|---|

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Limited opportunities for students to practice writing | The following instructional strategies will be utilized to support Writing: Use writing prompts, process writing and graphic organizers<br><br>Evaluate and provide feedback for one writing assignment per month. | Literacy Leadership Team and ESOL Para | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 CELLA Test |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics 2.0 Test indicate that 25% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 proficiency by 6 percentage points to 31%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 25% (165) | 31% (204) |

| 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Grade 6 results, an area in need of improvement is Geometry & Measurement | Students will use computer software with fidelity to improve skills such as finding perimeters and areas of two-dimensional figures. Strategies will include providing opportunities for students to determine missing dimensions, area, volume and utilizing graph paper. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test |
| 2 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Grade 7 results, an area in need of improvement is Number: Base 10 | Students will use computer software with fidelity to improve skills such as fluency with multiplying and dividing. Strategies will include providing opportunities for students to add, subtract, multiply & divide integers, fractions and terminating decimals. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test |
| 3 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Grade 8 results, an area in need of improvement is Geometry & Measurement | Students will use computer software with fidelity to improve skills such as using similar triangles to solve problems. Strategies will include providing opportunities for students to increase instruction in testing hypotheses through simulations generating data from real data to make predictions and | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test |

| | | understanding | | and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 17% of students achieved proficiency (Level 4 or 5).  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by2 percentage points to19%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 17% (111) | 19% (125) |

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics, an area in need of improvement is Geometry & Measurement in every grade level. | Students will use computer software with fidelity to improve skills such as using similar triangles to solve problems. Strategies will include providing opportunities for students to determine missing dimensions, area, volume and utilizing graph paper. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers and to impact Differentiated Instruction in small groups. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in | |
|---|---|

mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #2b:

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

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

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | On the2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, 69% percent of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is provide appropriate interventions, remediation in order to increase the percent of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to74%. |
| --- | --- |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| --- | --- |
| 69% (407) | 74% (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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics, an area in need of improvement is Geometry & Measurement in every grade level | Students will use computer software with fidelity to improve skills such as using similar triangles to solve problems. Strategies will include providing opportunities for the increase the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to reinforce mathematical concepts. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers and to impact Differentiated Instruction in small groups. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3b: |  |
| --- | --- |

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

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

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | The results of the 2011-2012 Mathematics 2.0 Test indicate that 67% percent of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by5 percentage points to 72%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 67% (105) | 72% (113) |

| | 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics, an area in need of improvement is Geometry & Measurement in every grade level. | Students will use computer software with fidelity to improve skills such as using similar triangles to solve problems. Strategies will include providing opportunities to utilize manipulatives and hands on activities to reinforce mathematical concepts. Identified students will be targeted for after school tutoring. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers and to impact Differentiated Instruction in small groups. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test |

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 #<br><br>Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.<br><br>5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 47% | 52% | 57% | 61% | 66% | |

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:

| | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 63% of students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 10 |
|---|---|

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | percentage points to 73%.<br><br>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 34% of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points to 43%.<br><br>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 51% of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 6 percentage points to 57%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 63% (29)<br>Black: 34%(117)<br>Hispanic: 51%(129)<br>Asian: N/A<br>American<br>Indian: N/A | White: 73% (34)<br>Black: 43%(147)<br>Hispanic: 57%(144)<br>Asian: N/A<br>American<br>Indian: N/A |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 results, an area in need of improvement is Geometry and Measurement. | Students will use computer software with fidelity to improve skills such as using similar triangles to solve problems. Strategies will include providing opportunities to utilize manipulatives and hands on activities to reinforce mathematical concepts. Identified students will be targeted for after school tutoring. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers and to impact Differentiated Instruction in small groups. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | N/A |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| 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. | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, indicate that 13% of the students in the Students With Disabilities (SWD) Subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase |
|---|---|

| Mathematics Goal #5D: | student proficiency by 20 percentage points to 33 %. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 13%(12) | 33%(31) |

| | 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test results, an area in need of improvement is Geometry and Measurement. | Students will use computer software with fidelity to improve skills such as using similar triangles to solve problems. Strategies will include providing opportunities for the increase the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to reinforce mathematical concepts. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. This information will be utilized to formulate bell ringers and to impact Differentiated Instruction in small groups. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal E: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, indicate that 40% of the students in the Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 50%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 40%(221) | 50%(277) |

| | 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test results, an area in need of improvement is Geometry and Measurement. | Students will use computer software with fidelity to improve skills such as using similar triangles to solve problems. Strategies will include providing opportunities for the increase the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to reinforce mathematical concepts. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. This information will be utilized to formulate bell ringers and to impact Differentiated Instruction in small groups. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test |

*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.<br><br>Algebra Goal #1: | The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC Test indicate that 45% percent of students earned a Level 3.<br><br>Our goal for the 2013school year is to increase the percentage of students earning a Level 3 by 1percentage point to46% |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 45% (24) | 46% (24) |

| 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 | According to the 2012 Algebra I EOC, an area in need of improvement is Polynomials. | Students will be provided practice in solving real-world problems, multi-step problems and provide inductive reasoning strategies. Strategies will include providing opportunities for the increase the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to reinforce mathematical concepts. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment , Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 Algebra I EOC |

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.<br><br>Algebra Goal #2: | The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC Test indicate that 40% percent of students earned a Level 4 or 5.<br><br>Our goal for the 2013school year is to increase the percentage of students earning a Level 4 or 5 by 1percentage point to41%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 40% (21) | 41% (22) |

| 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 |
| | According to the 2012 Algebra I EOC, areas in need of improvement are Polynomials and Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics & Discrete Mathematics. | Students will use computer software with fidelity to improve skills such as solving real-world problems, multi-step problems and provide inductive reasoning strategies. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessments and bi-weekly assessments. |

| 1 | | | | adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in enrichment groups etc. | Summative: 2013 Algebra I EOC |

# 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.<br><br>Geometry Goal #1: | The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC Test indicate that 7% percent of students earned a Level 3.<br><br>Our goal for the 2013school year is to have 7% of the students earn a Level 3. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 7% (1) | 7% (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 | According to the 2012 Geometry EOC, an area in need of improvement is Three-dimensional geometry. | Students will be provided the opportunity to practice utilizing computer-based programs based in solving real-world problems, multi-step problems and provide inductive reasoning strategies. Strategies will include providing opportunities for the increase the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to reinforce mathematical concepts. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment , Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 Geometry EOC |

| 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.<br><br>Geometry Goal #2: | The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC Test indicate that 87% percent of students earned a Level 4 or 5.<br><br>Our goal for the 2013school year is to have 87% of the students earn a Level4 or 53. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | | 87% (13) |
|---|---|---|
| 87% (13) | | |

| 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 | According to the 2012 Geometry EOC, an area in need of improvement is Two & Three-dimensional Geometry. | Students will be provided the opportunity to practice utilizing computer-based programs based in solving real-world problems, multi-step problems and provide inductive reasoning strategies. Strategies will include providing opportunities for the increase the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to reinforce mathematical concepts. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in enrichment groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment and bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 Geometry EOC |

*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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Critical Thinking Workshop | 6-8 | Mathematics Department Chair | Mathematics teachers | During PLC meetings on the third Tuesday of each month beginning September 18, 2012 | Classroom walkthroughs completed by the administration. | Mathematics Department Chair Department Assistant Principal Assistant Principal of Curriculum |
| Differentiated Instruction | 6-8 | Curriculum Support Specialist from Regional Center | Mathematics teachers | During PLC meetings on the third Tuesday of each month beginning September 18, 2012 | Classroom walkthroughs completed by the administration. | Mathematics Department Chair Department Assistant Principal Assistant Principal of Curriculum |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Odyssey implementation | Refresher training on Odyssey; copies of materials | School Based Budget | $300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $300.00 |

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

| Other | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Crosswalk to Common Core workbooks | Workbooks | School Based Budget | $1,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $1,000.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $1,300.00 |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 30% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 proficiency by 4 percentage points to 34%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 30% (72) | 34% (82) |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Grade 8 results, an area in need of improvement is Nature of Science.</td><td>Students will be provided classroom and after-school opportunities to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and discussion of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, models, and various investigative methods scientists use.</td><td>MTSS/RtI</td><td>Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups etc.</td><td>Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment And bi-weekly assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science</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:

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 12% of students achieved Level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the students earning a level 4 or 5 by2 percentage points to 14%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 12% (29) | 14% (33) |

| 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Grade 8 results, an area in need of improvement is Nature of Science. | Students will be provided classroom and after-school opportunities to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and discussion of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, models, and various investigative methods scientists use. | MTSS/RtI | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. The daily instruction will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the needs based on the data. This information will be utilized to formulated bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in enrichment groups etc. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment, Interim Assessment And bi-weekly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 | |
|---|---|

in science.

Science Goal #2b:

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PLC's focusing on technology training (i.e. SMART Board, FCAT explorer, Gizmos, Edusoft management and data analysis). | 6-8/Science | Trainer, District Center for Professional Learning | 6-8 grade Science Teachers | During PLC meetings on the third Tuesday of each month beginning September 18, 2012 | Analysis of program report<br><br>Walkthrough classroom observation | Administrator |
| Pearson Success | 6-8/Science | Science Department chairperson | 6-8 grade Science Teachers | Early Release October 26, 2012 | Observe lesson plans<br><br>Sample of students work | Science Department Chairperson |

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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writes indicates that 69% of students achieved Level 3.0 and above.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 proficiency by 3 percentage points to 72%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 69% (167) | 72% (174) |

| 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 | According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writes results, an area in need of improvement is Language Conventions. | Edit for correct spelling of high frequency and phonetically regular words, using a word bank, dictionary, or other resources as necessary. Incorporate vocabulary lessons, which include prefixes, suffixes, Greek, and Latin root words. | Literacy Leadership Team | Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by monthly writing assessments. This information will be utilized to formulate the writing process to address weaknesses . Holistic scoring on District , State, or teacher-made expository and persuasive writing prompts will be utilized. | Formative: District Pre and post tests and Monthly writing prompts<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writes |

| 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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

---

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Writing Across the Curriculum | 6,7,8-All Subjects | Writing Liaison | School-Wide | During PLC meetings on the third Tuesday of each month beginning September 18, 2012 | Classroom modeling | Assistant Principal of Curriculum |
| FCAT Writes | 6,7,8-LA & SS | Writing Liaison | Language Arts and Social Studies teachers | During PLC meetings on the third Tuesday of each month beginning September 18, 2012 | Individual Assistance/Modeling | Assistant Principal of Curriculum |
| Boot Camp | 6, 7, 8 | Writing Liaison | Grades 6, 7, 8 students | As scheduled during the year | Classroom Modeling | Assistant Principal of Curriculum |

---

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 |
| Writing Across the Curriculum workshop | Copying of workshop materials | School Based Budget | $100.00 |
| Seven Organizational Patterns of Writing | Copying of workshop materials | School Based Budget | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $200.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grading papers using anchor papers and writing rubric | Copying of workshop materials | School Based Budget | $100.00 |
| | | Subtotal: | $100.00 |
| | | **Grand Total:** | **$300.00** |

## Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.<br><br>Civics Goal #1: | The results of the 2012 Baseline Civics Test indicate that 0% of students achieved proficiency. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0) | 10% (16) |

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 may have not been exposed culturally to the various topics & vocabulary covered on the Civics EOC. | Students will be provided classroom activities that will help students develop an understanding of the content specific vocabulary. | Administrative team | Quarterly data chats will be held to examine progress as indicated by interim assessments and teacher made bi-weekly assessments. | Formative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment and bi-weekly assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 Spring Interim 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:

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.<br><br>Civics Goal #2: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Social Science | 6-8 | District | Textbook Training & EOC | September 29, 2012 | Observations & Walkthroughs | Administration |
| Social Science | 7 | District | Civics leaders Institute | Multiple dates | Observations & Walkthroughs | Administration |

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<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | During the 2011-2012 school year, our average daily attendance was 95.14%.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase our average daily attendance percentage to 95.64%.<br><br>Additionally, our second goal is to decrease the number of excessive absences(10 or more) and excessive tardies (10 or more) by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |

| | |
|---|---|
| 95.14% (656) | 95.64% (660) |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 197 | 187 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 161 | 153 |

| 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 | Lack of attention to the attendance procedures by students and staff. | Email the Daily Attendance Bulletin to ensure accuracy with the staff by the end of 2nd block. Recognize the students at a quarterly award celebration with attendance certificates during a parent night & or day time award assembly. Jump for George attendance incentive program. | Administrative Team | Daily attendance logs will be monitored to ensure accurate reporting. Monitor number of students invited to the quarterly attendance celebration | Daily Attendance Bulletin |
| 2 | Lack of attention to the attendance procedures by students and staff. | Recognize the students at a quarterly award celebration with attendance certificates during a parent night & or day time award assembly. | Administrative Team | Daily attendance logs will be monitored to ensure accurate reporting. Monitor number of students invited to the quarterly attendance celebration. An academic project (The HAPs) takes place during homeroom for a grade. Tardy students grades will be negatively affected. | Daily Attendance Bulletin Gradebook with core teachers |

## 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<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to reduce the number of overall suspensions by 5% |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 262 | 236 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 140 | 126 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 241 | 217 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 103 | 93 |

| | 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 | Teachers that did not fully implement the school-wide discipline plan. Teachers wrote referrals for each violation of the discipline code. | Utilize the Team discipline plan thereby truly offering progressive discipline in lieu of immediate referrals for every infraction of the discipline code. Provide additional professional development on the implementation of the school-wide detention system & discipline plan during the school year. | Team Leaders, Middle School Coordinator, Administrators | Monitor the number of referrals written and the consequent number of suspensions issued | Cognos Reports and ISIS screens which will illustrate number of suspensions |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Team Discipline Plan | 6-8 | Middle School Coordinator /Principal | All teachers | Faculty Meeting 8/24/12 | Team Discipline logs | Leadership Team |

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 |
| Quarterly Recognition Ceremonies | Awards for students | School Based Budget | $1,500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $1,500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $1,500.00 |

## 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<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>*\*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | During the 2009-2010 school year, the PTSA was non-existent |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 8% (25) | 9% (28) |
| 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 | | | | | | |

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | **Grand Total: $0.00** |

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. STEM

STEM Goal #1:

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | The student population has declined school-wide and also in the Zoology program for the past 4 years. | The school is aggressively recruiting for the 2013-2014 school year by attending recruitment fairs, hosting recruitment fair, developing recruitment videos, flyers, school site visits, banners, posters, website etc. Also, there are plans to attend elementary school's PTA meetings to inform parents of the program. | Administrative Team & Magnet Lead Teacher | Attendance logs from in-house recruitment fairs, the number of school site visits during the school year and the number of applications submitted. | Formative: Applications received after the Magnet deadline in January 2013

Summative: The amount of students enrolled for the 2013-2014 school 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 | | | | | | |

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 <br><br> CTE Goal #1: | Increase student enrollment in middle school CTE courses by 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 | CTE teacher is not certified with industry certification. | CTE teacher attends Professional Development Institute (PDI) sessions during summer and fall training for instruction in certification skills. | Administrative Team | Administrators monitor the effective implementation of lessons and timely instruction in the CTE classrooms through common planning, review of test data including baseline, practice or readiness | Formative: IPEGS IPDP <br><br> Summative: Certification |

| | | | | tests. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Industry Certification | 6-8 | District | CTE | November 6, 2012 | Monitor Certifications | Administration |
| Industry Certification | 6-8 | District | CTE | February 1, 2013 | Monitor Certifications | Administration |

CTE Budget:

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Reading Plus implementation | Refresher training on Reading Plus; copies of materials; incentives | School Based Budget | $1,000.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $1,000.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Mathematics | Odyssey implementation | Refresher training on Odyssey; copies of materials | School Based Budget | $300.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $300.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Writing | Writing Across the Curriculum workshop | Copying of workshop materials | School Based Budget | $100.00 |
| Writing | Seven Organizational Patterns of Writing | Copying of workshop materials | School Based Budget | $100.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $200.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Mathematics | Crosswalk to Common Core workbooks | Workbooks | School Based Budget | $1,000.00 |
| Writing | Grading papers using anchor papers and writing rubric | Copying of workshop materials | School Based Budget | $100.00 |
| Suspension | Quarterly Recognition Ceremonies | Awards for students | School Based Budget | $1,500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $2,600.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: $4,100.00 |

# Differentiated Accountability

**School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance**

| ☐ Priority | ☐ Focus | ☐ Prevent | ☐ NA |
|---|---|---|---|

Are you a reward school:  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

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

No Attachment

# School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔  Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| Interactive Readers | $1,200.00 |

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

Review the School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Review data continuously to make informed decisions
Review school-wide academic plans such as HIP & HOP implementation

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

| Dade School District<br>RICHMOND HEIGHTS MIDDLE SCHOOL<br>2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 63% | 55% | 74% | 37% | 229 | 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 | 62% | 65% | | | 127 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 71% (YES) | 63% (YES) | | | 134 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 490 | |
| Percent Tested = 99% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Dade School District<br>RICHMOND HEIGHTS MIDDLE SCHOOL<br>2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 60% | 55% | 83% | 33% | 231 | 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 | 64% | 68% | | | 132 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 65% (YES) | 69% (YES) | | | 134 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 497 | |
| Percent Tested = 99% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | B | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |