FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: DEANE BOZEMAN SCHOOL

District Name: Bay

Principal: Josh Balkom

SAC Chair: Tabitha Kirke

Superintendent: William V. Husfelt

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 11/12/2012

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	Josh Balkom	B.S. Social Science Education M.S. Educational Leadership. Certifications: Social Science 6-12. ESE K-12	1	6	2011-2012 Principal of Deane Bozeman School. Grade:Pending, 2010-2011 Assistant Principal of Bay High School. Grade: B . Reading Mastery 49%, Math Mastery: 77%, Writing Master: 75%, Science Mastery: 48%, Learning Gains: Reading 45% and Math 73%. Lowest 25%: Reading 38% and Math 58%. AYP: 82%. None of the subgroups made AYP in Reading. Blacks and ED did not make AYP in Math. 2009-2010 Administrative Assistant Mosley High School. Grade: . Reading Mastery: 63%, Math Mastery: 90%, Science Mastery: 58%. Learning Gains: Reading: 57% and Math: 74%. Learning Gains in Lowest 25%: Reading 43% and Math 74%. AYP: 92%, Whites and Economically Disadvantated did not make AYP in Reading or Math. 2008-2009 Assistant Principal Emerald Bay Academy. Alternative School Grade: Maintaining. 2007-2008: Educational Specialist Emerald

Position	Name	Education			Record
					Bay Academy. Grade: Maintaining.
Assis Principal	Ivan Beach	B.S. Interdisciplinary Social Science M.S. Psychology and Counseling Ed.S. Edcuational Leadership Educational Leadership, Guidance and Counseling	1	4	2011-1012 Assistant Principal of Deane Bozeman School. Grade:Pending. Reading Mastery 49%, Math Mastery: 77%, Writing Mastery: 75%, Science Mastery: 48%, Learning Gains: Reading 45% and Math 73%. Lowest 25%: Reading 38% and Math 58%. AYP: 82%. None of the subgroups made AYP in Reading. Blacks and ED did not make AYP in Math. 2011-2012 Assistant Principal of Tyndall Elementary. Grade: A. 2009-2011 Administrative Assistant at Springfield Elementary. Grade: C. 2005-2009 Guidance Counselor at Surfside Middle School. Grade: A
Assis Principal	Aaron York	Physical Education K-12 Middle Grades Integrated B.A. Health and Physical Education M.S. Health and Human Performance	7	17	2011-2012 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: Pending 2010-2011 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: B 2009-2010 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: B Reading Learning Gains 57%. Math Learning Gains 65%. Lowest 25% had 53% Learning Gains in Reading and 57% in Math. AYP was not met. 2008-2009 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: B Reading Learning Gains 55%. Math Learning Gains 63%. Lowest 25% had 49% Learning Gains in Reading and 60% in Math. 2007-2008 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: A Reading Learning Gains 61%. Math Learning Gains 72%. Lowest 25% had 57% Learning Gains in Reading and 71% in Math. 2005-2006 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: A Reading Learning Gains 60%. Math Learning Gains 75%. Lowest 25% had 60% Learning Gains in Reading. No data available for Math. 2004-2005 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: B Reading Learning Gains 54%. Math Learning Gains 67%. Lowest 25% had 61% Learning Gains in Reading. No data available for Math.
Assis Principal	Claudia Comerford	A.A. B.S. Elementary Education M.S. Educational Leadership Ele. Education 1-6 ESOL	3	13	2011-2012 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: Pending 2010-2011 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: B 2009-2010 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: B Reading Learning Gains 57%. Math Learning Gains 65%. Lowest 25% had 53% Learning Gains in Reading and 57% in Math. AYP was not met. 2008-2009 A.D. Harris High School. School was not graded. AYP was not met. 2007-2008 A.D. Harris High School. School was not graded. AYP was not met. 2006-2007 A.D. Harris High School. Grade: P Reading Learning Gains 22%. Math Learning Gains 62%. Lowest 25% had 17% Learning Gains in Reading and 60% in Math. 2005-2006 A.D. Harris High School. Grade: P Reading Learning Gains 32%. Math Learning Gains 62%. Lowest 25% had 43% Learning Gains in Reading. No data available for Math. AYP was not met.
					2011-2012 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: Pending 2010-2011 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: B 2009-2010 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: B Reading Learning Gains 57%. Math Learning Gains 65%. Lowest 25% had 53% Learning Gains in Reading and 57% in Math. AYP was not met. 2008-2009 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: B

| Assis Principal | Kim Timmins | A.A.
B.S. Elementary Education
M.S Educational Leadership
Ele. Education, Primary Education, Educational Leadership, ESOL | 11 | 8 | Reading Learning Gains 55%. Math Learning Gains 63%. Lowest 25% had 49% Learning Gains in Reading and 60% in Math.
2007-2008 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: A
Reading Learning Gains 61%. Math Learning Gains 72%. Lowest 25% had 57% Learning Gains in Reading and 71% in Math.
2005-2006 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: A
Reading Learning Gains 60%. Math Learning Gains 75%. Lowest 25% had 60% Learning Gains in Reading. No data available for Math.
2004-2005 Deane Bozeman School. Grade: B
Reading Learning Gains 54%. Math Learning Gains 67%. Lowest 25% had 61% Learning Gains in Reading. No data available for Math. |

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)
Literacy	Jeannie P. Williams	BS Special Education K12 Emot Handicp/K12 English 6-12 CAR-PD NGCAR-PD	1	1	Year Grade School Data 09-10: B Mosley High 63% Level 3 & above 10th Grade 88% Meeting Writing Standard LA Teacher 57% Making Learning Gains 43% Lowest 25% Making Gains 567 Points Earned (FCAT) 10-11: A Mosley High 66% Level 3 & above 10th Grade 90% Meeting Writing Standard LA Teacher 63% Making Learning Gains 50% Lowest 25% Making Gains 572 Points Earned (FCAT) 11-12: Pending Mosley High 64% Level 3 & above Dept. Head 89 % Meeting Writing Standard 10th Grade 63 Reading Points for Gains LA Teacher 59 % Lowest 25% Making Gains 570 Points Earned (FCAT)

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	Administrator Designee will meet regularly with new teachers.	Administrator/Designee	On-going	
2	New teachers are partnered with highly effective teachers.	Assistant Principal	On-going	
3	New teachers will participate in Bay District New Teacher Induction Program	Assistant Principal	May 2013	
4	ESOL Endorsement and Reading Endorsement opportunities provided to all staff members via Bay District Initiatives	Principal	May 2013	
5	Professional development will be organized by the Literacy Coach for teachers K-12.	Literacy Coach	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
1	

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

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
Amy Griffith	Kristina Malburg Danielle Brennan	Mentees are assigned to Amy Griffith because she is an experienced teacher. Mrs. Griffith's students have shown consistent improvement as reflected by FCAT Learning Gains and scoring high performance levels.	Mrs. Griffith will meet regularly with teachers to discuss evidence-based strategies that are being used in the classroom. She will assist each teacher as needed.

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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Administrators: Claudia Comerford, Kim Timmins
Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS process, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation with regards to school-wide data, and communicate with parents regarding school- wide MTSS plans and activities.

Literacy Coach: Jeannie Williams
Assists in development and communication of a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, models intervention strategies in the classroom.

School Improvement Representatives: Lisa Carter, Jessica Sims, Carmen Riviere
Assist in reviewing student data (academic and/or behavioral); identify trends that may demonstrate areas of concern. Relay the concerns of grade level teachers (Elementary, Middle, High) to the MTSS team.

Guidance Counselors: Pam Rudd (Elementary), Angel Kent (Secondary)
Provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; assist the school and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.

MTSS Coaches: Dana Manis (Elementary), Kelly Chishlom (Secondary)

Develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards and programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum and behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; 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.

Speech Language Pathologist: Bobbie Earp (Elementary), Ashley Daniels (Secondary)
Educate the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assist in the selection of screening measures; help identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

School Psychologist: Angelina Collins
Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation.

ESE Resource Teacher: Rhonda Hooks
Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/material into Tier 3 instruction.

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

The school-based MTSS leadership team focuses on school-wide data to determine weaknesses in standards-based instruction. At these meetings, the chairperson leads discussion to collaborate and determine professional development needs for teachers. An agenda is followed and meeting notes are taken and disseminated after the meeting. Information is shared at department meetings as well as faculty meeting to ensure that all stakeholders are working toward common goals.

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?

Before our school-based inservice in July, school-wide data was presented and analyzed by the MTSS Leadership team. After careful review the team defined weaknesses based on achievement of standards. During school-based inservice, the MTSS Leadership Team presented data to the entire faculty (K-12). Grade Level (Elementary) and subject area (Secondary) teachers reviewed and analyzed data while the MTSS Leadership Team was on hand to assist and answer questions relevant to the data. These same groups brainstormed interventions based on the 2012-13 School Improvement Goals. Strategies were used to develop the School Improvement Plan. The MTSS Leadership Team will monitor and assess the success of these strategies at their weekly meetings.

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.

Tier 1 – School-wide data: FCAT, DEA, EOC, Focus, Behavior, Attendance, Climate Survey, Bucks Read, Bucks Write, Bucks Measure Up, Buck Trails
Tier 2 – Grade-level/subject area data: FCAT, DEA, DEA Probes, Bucks Read, Bucks Write, Bucks Measure Up, Buck Trails
Tier 3 – Individual Child Data: FCAT, DEA, Probe Data, Grades, Focus (Grades, attendance, behavior), Bucks Read, Bucks Write, Bucks Measure Up
MTSS decisions are based on data from assessments that measure student achievement based on instruction on the Common Core Standards (K-1) and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (2-10). The data is the necessary link between assessment and academic interventions and is sensitive to small changes over time. Assessment is used for the purposes of screening, collecting diagnostic information, and monitoring progress. The multi-tiered approach provides services and interventions to students at increasing levels of intensity based on progress monitoring and data analysis. The rate of progress over time assists in making important decisions, including possible determination of eligibility of exceptional education services. Data is reviewed monthly by the MTSS team and weekly by the MTSS Coach and teacher. The student's level of need dictates the level of support. Students receive Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 services depending on the data collected. The three intervention tiers reflect a continuum that is fluid. All documentation is collected and kept in a pink MTSS folder in the student's cumulative record.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> The MTSS Coaches provided an overview of the MTSS process at the school-based inservice. Further professional development opportunities will be provided and MTSS members will review, update, and train staff on the MTSS process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

> School-wide data will be kept in a centralized location for review during meetings. The MTSS Coach will be available to meet with the MTSS team on a weekly basis to analyze data, provide training, and use the problem solving process at each tier to develop appropriate interventions.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

> Principal: Josh Balkom
> Literacy Coach: Jeannie Williams
> Assistant Principal: Kim Timmins
> Administrative Assistant: Claudia Commerford
> Grade Chair Level (K-2): Debbie Parker
> Grade Level Chair (3-5): Janet Davis
> Middle School Chair: Jessica Sims
> Aspire Leader: Peggy Wiggins
> Language Arts Department Chair: Lisa Carter
> ESE Teacher: Mike Memmen
> School Improvement Representative: Carmen Riviere

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

> Chaired by our principal, Josh Balkom, the Literacy Leadership Team will reflect members from all grade levels, disciplines, and specialties who effectively use literacy strategies in their classroom. Both the principal and the literacy coach will have the responsibility of determining agendas and facilitating the Literacy Leadership Team meetings. Both the principal and the literacy coach will be expected to attend all meetings. Meeting monthly, the Literacy Leadership Team will analyze student data, review the Comprehension Instructional Sequence (CIS) model, close reading, and wide reading as well as progress monitor data gathered from school-wide initiatives. This data will be used to develop an appropriate plan for professional development.

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

> After careful study and consideration of our school data and the Comprehensive Reading Plan of Bay District Schools, Bozeman will focus on teaching the skills of analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating passages of informational complex text to aid in comprehension. Professional development will be provided on the CIS model, close reading, and wide reading by the literacy coach. The following initiatives will encourage school-wide use of this model as well as student engagement in the classroom Data collected from these initiatives will be used to drive instruction.
>
> Bucks Read (Infusion of informational text with Article of the Month)
> Bucks Write (Monthly writing in response to text)
> Bucks Measure Up (Monthly writing in response to Math literacy)
> Buck Trails (Student self-reporting of grades)
> Bucks Brag (Showcasing literacy in connection with College and Career Readiness)

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Deane Bozeman will ensure that text complexity, along with colse reading and rereading of texts, is central to all lessons; provide scaffolding that does not prempt or replace text reading by students; develp and ask text dependent questions from a range of question types; emphasize students supporting thier answers with edvidence form the text; and provide extensive research and writing opportunities (claims and evidence). All teachers will create classroom rosters in DEA for the purpose of data analysis to drive their instruction with the use of reseaerch-based reading strategies. All teachers will have 'data chats' with their students to establish the relevance of reading in their subject area based on Common Core Literacy Standards. Bay District Comprehensive Reading Plan will be implemented by all teachers and documented by analysis of FCAT 2.0 and DEA assessments and probes as well as classroom assessments. School-wide intiatives(Bucks Read, Bucks Write, Bucks Measure Up, Buck Trails, and Bucks Brag)are based on the College and Career Readiness Standards in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language as well as in mathematics and will be monitored closely by the School Improvement Team, MTSS Leadership Team, and the Literacy Leadership Team in order to provide support and feedback to administration and teachers.

*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?

Deane Bozeman has carefully analyzed the College and Career Readiness Standards and initiated the TRACCs and Pre-TRACCs programs. These programs are specifically designed to work in tandem to provide college and career readiness for our students. Design of the courses exhibit the rigorous high standards we have set for our TRACCs and Pre-TRACCs' students in order to prepare them for success in college or career programs.
The following courses are specific examples of opportunities afforded to Deane Bozeman students to train for future paths:
AP Language and Composisition
AP Music
AP Art
Dual Enrolled Spanish
Computing for College and Careers
Digital Design
Digital Media
Agriculture Science Foundation
Agriculture Biotech
Teaching Assistant

The Springboard Curricullum will be integrated in 6th and 7th grade this year and be added to 8th grade next year. We believe that all of our students in middle school should be exposed to the higher order thinking and strategies for understanding informational complex text emphasized within the Common Core Standards and the Springboard Curriculum.

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?

Beginning in middle school, all students are encouraged to complete a course request form after College and Career Day. Students are oriented to the different pathways or tracks they may take in order to achieve their goal after graduation. These pathways or tracks are flexible and can be altered with the assistance of the guidance counselors. Student credit checks are completed in the fall for all juniors and seniors to ensure that academic and career choices are in line with the courses completed and planned for post graduation success. Representatives from various colleges meet with studnets and parents throughout the school year. Field trips to local colleges and universities as well as techincal programs encourage students to continue to follow their educational goals. Military installations in the area also offer information to explore career

opportunities.

Postsecondary Transition

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

Based on the analysis of the High School Feedback Report, Bozeman will implement the following strategies to foster student readiness for post-secondary transition:
TRACCs/Pre-TRACCs Program
College and Career Day
Field Trips and visits to include universities, colleges, technical centers,military installations, and chambers of commerce
Advanced Placement Classes
Dual-enrolled Classes
Career Training in the fields of Science, Technology, and Education
Before and After school tutoring
ACT and SAT waivers for economically disadvantaged students
ASVAB Testing

Postsecondary Transition

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Number of Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading will increase by at least 3% above current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
3rd 25% (14) 4th 38% (21) 5th 29% (15) 6th 21% (22) 7th 31% (39) 8th 32% (38) 9th 30% (44) 10th 32% (38) All 28% (222)	3rd 28% 4th 41% 5th 33% 6th 24% 7th 34% 8th 35% 9th 33% 10th 35% All 31%

<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>1.1 Decreased number of minutes dedicated to Reading instruction in grades 6-12 as compared with elementary grades</td>
<td>1.1 Students who have been identified as Level 1 and Disfluent Level 2 students will recieve intensive reading intervention for 90 minutes within a Language Arts and Intensive Reading class. In addition middle school students will also have a reading elective class focusing on critical thinkins skills as well as higher order questioning skills for informational complex text. These classes with continue throughout the entire school year.</td>
<td>1.1 Assistant Principal, guidance Literacy Coach, and classroom teachers</td>
<td>1.1 Evaluations of DEA data(base line, midyear and end of year) and FCAT 2.0 achievement data along with progress monitoring of probes, and school-wide initiatives</td>
<td>1.1 FCAT 2.0 achievement data, DEA data (baseline, midyear, and end of year) along with data from probes and school-wide initiatieve data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2 Outside influences more prevelant with students in higher grade levels</td>
<td>1.s Provide haigh interest, relevant reading material with a focus on informational text and engaging learning strategies (CIS, Kagan, CRISS) as well as school-wide initiatives to encourage studnet attendance and participation in class</td>
<td>1.2 Literacy coach and classroom teachers</td>
<td>1.2 Evaluations of DEA data(base line, midyear and end of year) and FCAT 2.0 achievement data along with progress monitoring of probes, and school-wide initiatives.</td>
<td>1.2 FCAT 2.0 achievement data, DEA data (baseline, midyear, and end of year) along with data from probes and school-wide initiatieve data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Antiquated textbooks and lack of support matereials in the ELA classrooms where the majority of reading instruction takes place</td>
<td>1.3 Identify and procure informational complex text as appropriate for grade level instruction such as weekly publications of Time for</td>
<td>1.3 Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, classroom teachers</td>
<td>1.3 Evaluations of DEA data(base line, midyear and end of year) and FCAT 2.0 achievement data along with progress monitoring of probes, and</td>
<td>1.3 FCAT 2.0 achievement data, DEA data (baseline, midyear, and end of year) along with data</td>
</tr>
</table>

3	Kids, National Geographic Explorer, Time, newspapers, that can be used in the classroom. Also, improve integration of ELA with Science/Social Studies teachers to increase a common vocabulary among the specific disciplines	school-wide initiatives.	from probes and school-wide initiatieve data

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Students scoring at achievement levels 4 and 5 in reading will increase by at least 3% above current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3rd 48% [26] 4th 39% [22] 5th 31% [16] 6th 30% [32] 7th 24% [30] 8th 18% [21] 9th 15% [22] 10th 23% [32] All 25% [203]	3rd 51% 4th 42% 5th 34% 6th 33% 7th 27% 8th 21% 9th 18% 10th 26% All 28%

<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 reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Number of Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading will increase by at 3% above current level of performance.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3rd 48% [26] 4th 39% [22] 5th 31% [16] 6th 30% [32] 7th 24% [30] 8th 18% [21] 9th 15% [22] 10th 23% [32] All 25% [203]	3rd 51% 4th 42% 5th 34% 6th 33% 7th 27% 8th 21% 9th 18% 10th 23% All 28%

<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
	2.1 Increased complexity of text in higher grade	2.1 The Comprehension Instructional Sequence	2.1 Administrators, ELA/Writng Coach,	2.1.Student data (Grades on Focus, DEA	2.1 Lesson plans,Standards-

1	levels	(CIS) will be employed to help students build stamina and capacity in comprehension and vocabulary	Literacy Coach, Guidance, Department Heads, Grade Level Chairs, and classroom teachers	and DEA probes), lesson plan reviews, assessment reviews, Literacy Coach's Log	based assessments to include achievement levels on Focus Grades and DEA
2	2.2 Past focus on bottom three question strategies in Blooms' Revised Taxonomy as well as teacher directed questions vs. student generated questions	2.2 Teacher and student development of higher order text dependent questions with an increased focus on the top three levels of Blooms' Revised Taxomony for discussion and assessment	2.2 Adiministrators, ELA/Writing Coach, LiteracyCoach, Guidance,Department Heads, Grade Level Chairs, and classroom teachers	2.2 Student data (Grades on Focus, DEA and DEA probes), lesson plan reviews, assessment reviews, Literacy Coach's Log	2.2 Lesson plans,Standards-based assessments to include achievement levels on Focus Grades and DEA
3					
4	2.3 Past focus on matching and multiple choice questions for assessments	2.3 Provide extensive research and writing opportunities (claims and evidence)as related to text	2.3 Administrators, ELA/Writing Coach, LiteracyCoach, Guidance, Department Heads, Grade Level Chairs, and Classroom Teachers	2.3 Student data (Grades on Focus, DEA and DEA probes), lesson plan reviews, assessment reviews, Literacy Coach's Log	2.3 Lesson plans,Standards-based assessments to include achievement levels on Focus Grades and DEA

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

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

Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.

Reading Goal #3a:	Percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase by at least 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4th 52% [27 5th 62% [31] 6th 50% [49] 7th 44% [76] 8th 56% [65]	4th 55% 5th 65% 6th 53% 7th 47% 8th 59%

9th 52% [69] 10th 41% [56] All 53% [373]	9th 55% 10th 44% All 56%

	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	3.1 Teacher knowledge of literacy strategies across the disciplines	3.1 Provide support in the form of inservices, model lessons, and lesson study in applying the Common Core Literacy Standards for History,Social Studies, Science, and Technical subjects in grades 6-12	3.1 Administrators, ELA/Wrtiting Coach, Literacy Coach,Department Heads, Grade Level Chairs, classroom teachers	3.1 Analysis of Lesson Study success, Lesson Plan review, inservice records,classroom walk-throughs, Department or Grade level meetings	3.1 Lesson Plans, inservice records, Agenda/minutes from Department/Grade Level meetings
2	3.2 Percentage of teachers who have NOT been through NGCARPD or Reading Endorsement training	3.2 Level 1 and 2 students will receive intensive instruction from NGCARPD,Reading Endorsed or Reading Certified teachers based on Bay District Schools contract with the State of Florida for providing intensive reading instruction to these students	3.2 Administrators, Literacy Coach, Guidance, NGCARPD, Reading Endorsed, or Reading Certified Teachers	3.2 Analysis of teachers who have not been through NGCARPD or Reading Endorsement	3.2 Inservice Records, Surveys, DEA Data to assess the success of students placed in NGCARPD and Intensive Reading Classes
3	3.3 Time allowed for planning and implementation of literacy strategy collaboration across the content areas	3.3 Provide common planning before (secondary) and after (elementary)school for teachers to share strategies for engaging students with a focus on literacy	3.3 Administrators, Guidance, classroom teachers	3.3 Analysis of scheduled to ensure implementation of common planning	3.3 DEA assessment data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

	4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase by at least 3%.
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	4th 31% [5] 5th 28% [3] 6th 15% [4] 7th 29% [10] 8th 39% [11] 9th 14% [5] 10th 14% [5]	4th 34% 5th 31% 6th 18% 7th 32% 8th 42% 9th 17% 10th 17% All 27% 10th 14% All 2

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	4.1 Transportation disadvantages within a remote rual area	4.1 Increase student attendance by identifying those studnets with attendance problems and increasing communication	4.1 Administrators, Guidance, Attendance Clerks, classroom teachers	4.1 Monitor attendance reports for improvement in tose students identified with patterns of non-attendance or poor attendance, provide intervention for MTSS meetings	4.1 Attendance Records, Intervention Record
2	4.2 Number of teaching units and student scheduling	4.2 Implementation of ASPIRE model in grades 6-8 to provide intensive, differentiated instruction	4.2 Assistant Principal, ASPIRE Instructional Specialist, ASPIRE teachers, and Guidance	4.2 Analysis of FCAT and DEA data, DEA probes, Springboard embedded assesments, grades	4.2 FCAT 2.0, DEA data (baseline, mid-year and end-of-year), grades on Focus
3	4.3 Lack of knowledge on standards-based assesments	4.3 Train teachers on upacking the standards used to assess students	4.3 Administrator, Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Grade Level Chairs, classroom teachers	4.3 Analysis of teachers understanding of standards-based assessments	4.3 Lesson plans and assessments used in classrooms

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Student subgroup by ethnicity (white) not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by at least 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

White: 48% (325)
Black: NA
Hispanic: NA
Asian: NA
American Indian: NA

White: 51%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1 Background knowledge of students from rual area	5B.1 School-wide Article of the Month to increase global knowledge	5B.1 Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	5B.1 Students will produce higher order questions about the article and answer them using evidence form the text	5B.1 Higher order question foldable
2	5B.2 Lack of exposure to research materials	5B.2 Partnership with Bay County Public Library, Bay County Reading Association, and increased access to Deane Bozeman Media Center	5B.2 Media Specialist, Literacy Coach, and classroom teachers	5B.2 Analysis of materials and time allocated for media center use with research materials and check out system with Bay County Public Library	5B.2 Class sign in sheet for media center use and book check out records
3	5B.3 Lack of transportation for tutoring services needed	5B.3 Increase parent communication and form parent support groups as well as initiate a tutoring program run by TRACCs students	5B.3 Adminstrators, Guidance, Classroom teachers	5B.3 Intiate Bucks Brag to provide open communication with faculty, parents and students	5B.3 Parent sign in sheets, Tutoring sign in sheets.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by at least 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| | | | 52% (65) | 49% |

| 52% (65) | | | | 49% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1 Limited faculty and staff	5D.1 Provide a continuum of services and accommodations as determined necessary by the IEP committee	5D.1 Assistant Principal, ESE Department Head,Speech pathologist, Psychologist, Counselors, ESE teachers, teachers,ESE resource teacher	5CD1 A yearly (at the very least) evaluation by the IEP team to include participation from all members providing services	5D.1 IEP Guidelines, classroom documentation, and team determination
2	5D.2 Unwillingness of student to be exluded from traditional classroom setting	5D.2 Whenever possible, provide intensive and relevant instruction in an inclusive environment through such sources as ESE Inclusion, ESE Resource and ESE tutoring labs	5D.2 Principal, ESE Department Head, ESE Team members, classroom teacher	5D.2 Lesson plan analysis, parent, studentt and teacher feedback, and lab attendance records	5D.2 FCAT and DEA data,re-valuation data, lesson plans,and lab attendance sheet
3	5D.3 Access to materials	5D.3 Provide explicit relevant and rigorous standards-based instruction that is data driven with appropriate scaffolding for students with disabilities	5D.3 Administration, ESE teachers, ESE Department Head, and Literacy Coach	5D.3 Lesson plan analysis, observations, FCAT 2.0, DEA, and research based assessments to determine level of achievement in standards pre, during and after instruction	5D.3 FCAT 2.0, DEA data, embedded assessments, probes, research based assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Number of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfacory progreass in reading will decrease by at least 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% (192)	46%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1 Transportation and Attendance	5E.1 Increase student attendance by identifying those students with attendance problems and increasing parent communication in order to establish and set goals with parents and students	5E.1 Guidance, Attendance Clerk, and classroom teacher	5E.1 Montor attendance and review goals with parents and students on a regular basis	5E.1 Attendance reports
	5E.2 Limited background knowledge and global experiences	SE.2 Increase students' background knowledge by incorporating	5E.2 Administration and classroom teacher	E.2 Monitor DEA data and probes especially in the reporting category of	5E.2 Classroom Walk-throughs, lesson plans, DEA

| 2 | | informational text daily in the classroom in the form of articles or news media telecasts to increase vocabulary | | vocabulary | | data, |

| 3 | 5E.3 Funding for field trips | 5E.3 Increase student exposure to cultural events and new experiences through actual field trips and virtual field trips | 5E.3 Administration and classroom teachers | E.3 Lesson plan analysis for strategies to incorporate virtual field trip with the use of Smart Technology | 5E.3 Lesson plans, and walk throughs |

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
Lesson Study	K12	PLC Leaders	Elementary, Middle and High	Quartlerly	Strategy review, emails	District Instructional Specialist, Literacy Coach, PLC Leaders, Classroom Teachers
Kagan	6-12	Kagan Coach	Grade Level (Secondary)	Monthly	Agenda, meeting notes, strategies review, model lessons	Kagan PIC
DEA Assessment Training	K12	LA Department Chair, Literacy Coach,	School-wide	Pre-school inservice and embedded professional development	Review data and monitor lesson plans	Administrators, Literacy Coach, classroom teachers
Teacher Appraisal System Training	K12	Administrator/Literacy Coach	School-wide	Inservice will be provided in advance of deadlindes on the Teacher Appraisal Continum	Department and Grade Level Meetings, Faculty Meetings	Administrators, Literacy Coach
Text Complexity	3. K12	3. Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Grade Level Chairs	3. School-wide	Monthly and embedded professional development	Lesson plans, materials check,	Aministrators, Literacy Coach, Department Heads, Grade level Chairs
Unpacking the Common Core Standards	K12	Literacy Coach	Subject areas (secondary) and grade levels (elementary)	Monthly and embedded professional develpment throughout the year	Lesson plans, observations, modle lessons, emails	Administrators, Department Heads, Grade Level Chairs, Classroom teacher,Literacy Coach
Higher Order Questioning	K12	Literacy Coach	School-wide	Monthly	Lesson plans, observations, model lessons,small group and individual consultation	Administrators,Department Heads, Grade Level Chairs, Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach
Comprehension Instructional Sequence (CIS) Model	K12	Literacy Coach	School-wide	Monthly	Lesson plans, observations, model lessons, small group/individual consultation,	Administrators,Deparment Heads, Grade Level Chairs, Literacy Coach, classroom teachers

			email			
MTSS	K12	MTSS Coach	Subject Area (Secondary), Grade Level (Elementary)	Preschool overview,Monthly	Agenda, meeting notes	MTSS Leadership Team,Classroom teachers

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	N/A				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	

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

CELLA Budget:

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics at grade levels 3 – 5 will increase by at least 3% above current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3rd – 25% [14] 4th – 32% [18] 5th – 31% [16] Elementary Total 29% [48	3rd - 28% 4th - 35% 5th - 34%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Lack of readily available multi-level, hands on materials, and real world activities and problem situations 1A.2. Student learning gaps 1A.3. Time involved to collect and analyze data 1A.4 Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement 1A.5 Implementation of Common Core Standards 1A.6 Teacher training for available technology.	1A.1. Teachers will share resources with each other including physical and digital resources. 1A.2. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction and bridging learning gaps. 1A.3. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 1A.4 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards 1A.5. Teachers will attend Common Core trainings Teachers will use their PlayBook to review Common Core Standards as needed 1A.6 Teachers will request technology training to best utilize new technology available	1A.1. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 1A.2.Teachers Administration 1A.3. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 1A.4 Teachers Administration 1A.5 Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 1A.6 Teachers Technology TOSA Literacy Coach	1A.2. Discovery Education assessments given at beginning, middle, and end of the school year. Teachers may keep student portfolios to show individual student work on bridging gaps. 1A.3.	1A.2. Discovery Education Student Portfolios 1A.3. Buck Trails Discovery Education

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics in grade levels 3-5 will increase by at least 3% above current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3rd – 60% [33] 4th – 40% [22] 5th – 23% [12] Elementary Total 41% [67	3rd - 63% 4th - 43% 5th - 26%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. Lack of readily available multi-level, hands on materials, and real world activities and problem situations 2A.2. Student learning gaps 2A.3. Time involved to collect and analyze data 2A.4 Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement 2A.5 Implementation of Common Core Standards 2A.6 Teacher training for available technology.	2A.1. Teachers will share resources with each other including physical and digital resources 2A.2. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction and bridging learning gaps. 2A.3. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 2A.4 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards 2A.5. Teachers will attend Common Core trainings Teachers will use their PlayBook to review Common Core Standards as needed 2A.6 Teachers will request technology training to best utilize new technology available	2A.1. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 2A.2.Teachers Administration 2A.3. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 2A.4 Teachers Administration 2A.5 Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 2A.6 Teachers Technology TOSA Literacy Coach	2A.2. Discovery Education assessments given at beginning, middle, and end of the school year. Teachers may keep student portfolios to show individual student work on bridging gaps. 2A.3.	2A.2. Discovery Education assessments given at beginning, middle, and end of the school year. Teachers may keep student portfolios to show individual student work on bridging gaps. 2A.3.

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

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:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Students making learning gains in mathematics in grades 3 – 5 will increase by 3% above current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4th – 44% [23] 5th – 52% [26] Elementary Total 48% [49]	4th - 47% 5th - 55% Elementary Total

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>3A.1. Time involved to collect and analyze data

3A.2. Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement
3A.3. Teacher training for available technology.</td><td>3A.1. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data.

Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring.

3A.2 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards
3A.3 Teachers will request technology training to best utilize new technology available</td><td>3A.1. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach

3A.2 Teachers Administration
3A.3 Teachers Technology TOSA Literacy Coach</td><td></td><td>3A.1. Buck Trails Discovery Education</td></tr>
</table>

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

of improvement for the following group:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics in grades 3 – 5 will increase by at least 3% above current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4th – 0% [0] 5th 14% [2] Elementary Total 8% [2]	4th - 3% 5th - 17% Elementary Total

<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	4A.1. Lack or mastery of basic math skills and understanding of operations and number sense by students. 4A.2. Time involved to collect and analyze data 4A.3. Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement	4A.1. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction to all students. Students may be placed into MTSS if needed. 4A.2. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 4A.3 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards	4A.1. Teachers Administration MTSS Team 4A.2. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 4A.3 Teachers Administration	4A.1. Progress Monitoring. 4A.2. Evaluation of Discovery Education reports.	4A.1. Progress Monitoring and classroom assessments. 4.A.2.Discovery Education Reports

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%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	White students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 3% from the current level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 53% [51]	White: 50%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Lack or mastery of basic math skills and understanding of operations and number sense by students. 5B.2. Time involved to collect and analyze data 5B.3. Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement	5B.1. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction to all students. Students may be placed into MTSS if needed. Provide tutoring 5B.2. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 5B.3 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards	5B.1. Teachers Administration MTSS Team 5B.2. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 5B.3 Teachers Administration	5B.1. Progress Monitoring 5B.2. Data reports. 5B.3. Parent Contact Logs.	5B.1. Progress Monitoring. 5B.2. Buck Trails Discovery Education

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 3% from the current level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% [17]	74%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Lack or mastery of basic math skills and understanding of operations and number sense by students.

5D.2. Time involved to collect and analyze data 5D.3. Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement | 5D.1. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction to all students.

Students may be placed into MTSS if needed.

Provide tutoring

5D.2. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data.

Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 5D.3 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards | 5D.1. Teachers Administration MTSS Team

5D.2. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 5D.3 Teachers Administration | | 5D.2. Buck Trails Discovery Education |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 3%from the current level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47% [29]	44%

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Lack or mastery of basic math skills and understanding of operations and number sense by students. 5E.2. Time involved to collect and analyze data 5E.3. Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement	5E.1. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction to all students. Students may be placed into MTSS if needed. Provide tutoring 5E.2. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 5E.3 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards	5E.1. Teachers Administration MTSS Team 5E.2. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 5E.3 Teachers Administration	5E.1. Progress Monitoring. 5E.2. Monitoring of Discovery Education Reports.	5E.1. Progress Monitoring Reports. 5E.2. Buck Trails Data. Discovery Education Reports.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Students achieving proficiency in mathematics at grade levels 6 – 8 will increase by 3% above current levels
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6th – 29% [31] 7th – 29% [37] 8th – 28% [34] Middle School Total 29% [102]	6th - 32% 7th - 32% 8th - 31% Middle School Total 32%

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1A.1. Lack of readily available multi-level and hands on materials 1A.2. . Student learning gaps 1A.3. Time involved to collect and analyze data 1A.4 Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement 1A.5 Insufficient interest, motivation, and application from students	1A.1. Teachers will share resources with each other including physical and digital resources. 1A.2. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction and bridging learning gaps. 1A.3. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data.	1A.1. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 1A.2.Teachers Administration 1A.3. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 1A.4 Teachers Administration 1A.5 Teachers Administration Literacy Coach	1A.1. Professional Learning Communities will discuss shared resources. 1A.2. Discovery Education assessments given at beginning, middle, and end of the school year. Teachers may keep student portfolios to show individual student	1A.1. Student portfolios/grades. 1A.2. Discovery Education Student Portfolios 1A.3. Buck Trails Discovery Education 1A.4 1A.5 Student Portfolios/Grades 1A.6 Student evaluations.

1	to real world problem solving 1A.6 Teacher training for available technology.	Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 1A.4 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards 1A.5. Teachers will attend Common Core trainings Teachers will use their PlayBook to review Common Core Standards as needed 1A.6 Teachers will request technology training to best utilize new technology available	1A.6 Teachers Technology TOSA Literacy Coach	work on bridging gaps. 1A.3. Discovery Education Reports. 1A.4 1A.5 Student Grades 1A.6 Teacher evaluation of technology implemented.	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics in grade levels 6 – 8 will increase by at least 3% above current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6th – 29% [31] 7th – 20% [25] 8th – 14% [17] Middle School Total 21% [73	6th - 32% 7th - 23% 8th - 17% Middle School Total

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
2A.1. Lack of readily available multi-level and hands on materials	2A.1. Teachers will share resources with each other including physical	2A.1. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach	2A.1. Professional Learning Communities. 2A.2. Teachers will	2A.1. Student Portfolios/Grades

1	2A.2. Student learning gaps 2A.3. Time involved to collect and analyze data 2A.4 Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement 2A.5 Insufficient interest, motivation, and application from students to real world problem solving 2A.6 Tteacher training for available technology.	and digital resources 2A.2. Teachers will differentiate instruction and bridging learning gaps. 2A.3. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 2A.4 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards 2A.5. Teachers will attend Common Core trainings Teachers will use their PlayBook to review Common Core Standards as needed 2A.6 Teachers will request technology training to best utilize new technology available	2A.2.Teachers Administration 2A.3. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 2A.4 Teachers Administration 2A.5 Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 2A.6 Teachers Technology TOSA Literacy Coach	differentiate instruction and bridge learning gaps. 2A.3. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use Discovery Education Reports for progress monitoring. 2A.4. Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards. 2A.5. Teachers will attend Common Core trainings. Teachers will use their PlayBook to review Common Core Standards as needed. 2A.6. Teachers will request technology training to best utilize new technology available.	2A.2. Discovery Education Student Portfolios 2A.3. Buck Trails Discovery Education 2A.4 Sign-in rosters. 2A.5 Inservice Training Attendance Verification. 2A.6. Technology training sign-in rosters.

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:

<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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics in grades 6 –8 will increase by at least 3% above current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6th – 57% [56] 7th – 55% [67]	6th - 60% 7th - 58%

8th – 47% [52]	8th - 50%
Middle School Total 53% [175	Middle School Total

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3A.1. Time involved to collect and analyze data 3A.2. Attendance and lack of parent/guardian involvement 3A.3. Teacher training for available technology	3A.1. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 3A.2 Parental Contact 3A.3 Teachers will request technology training to best utilize new technology available	3A.1. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 3A.2 Teachers Administration 3A.3 Teachers Technology TOSA Literacy Coach	3A.1. Progress Monitoring. 3A.2. Documentation of Parent contacts. 3A.3. Documentation of teachers participation in technology training.	3A.1. Buck Trails Discovery Education 3A.2. Parent Contact Logs. 3A.3. Inservice and Training participation logs.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics in grades 6 – 8 will increase by 3% above current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6th – 15% [4] 7th – 34% [11] 8th – 24% [7] Middle School Total 25% [22]	6th - 18% 7th - 37% 8th - 27% Total - 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
1	4A.1. Lack or mastery of basic math skills and understanding of operations and number sense by students.	4A.1. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction to all students.

Students may be placed into MTSS if needed. | 4A.1. Teachers Administration MTSS Team | 4A.1. Progress Monitoring. | 4A.1. Students' grades/progress. |
| 2 | 4A.2. Time involved to collect and analyze data | 4A.2. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data.

Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. | 4A.2. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach | 4A.2. Progress Monitoring, evaluation of Discovery Education Reports. | 4A.2. Buck Trails Discovery Education |
| 3 | 4A.3. Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement | 4A.3 Parental Contact | 4A.3 Teachers Administration | 4A.3. Analysis of Parent Participation. | 4A.3. Parent Contact Logs. |

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Middle School Mathematics Goal #

5A : |
|---|---|

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

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5B:	White students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 3% from the current level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 46% [150]	White: 49%

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
	5B.1. Lack of mastery of basic math skills and understanding of operations and number sense by students

5B.2. Time involved to collect and analyze data | 5B.1. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction to all students.

Students may be placed into MTSS if needed.

Provide tutoring | 5B.1. Teachers Administration MTSS Team

5B.2. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 5B.3 Teachers | 5B.1. Progress Monitoring. 5B.2. Monitoring of Discovery Education Reports. 5B.3. Analysis of parent participation. | 5B.1. Discovery Education Reports.

5B.2. Buck Trails Discovery Education 5B.3.Copies of parent contact |

1	5B.3. Attendance and lack of parent/guardian involvement	5B.2. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 5B.3 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards	Administration		logs.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><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 colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 3% from the current level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% [40]	64%

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5D.1. Lack of mastery of basic math skills and understanding of operations and number sense by students 5D.2. Time involved to collect and analyze data 5D.3. Attendance and	5D.1. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction to all students. Students may be placed into MTSS if needed. Provide tutoring	5D.1. Teachers Administration MTSS Team 5D.2. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 5D.3 Teachers Administration	5D.1. Progress Monitoring. 5D.2. Discovery Education Reports. 5D.3. Analysis of parent participation.	5D.1.Discovery Education Reports. 5D.2. Buck Trails Discovery Education 5D.3. Parent contact/participation logs.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

1	lack of parent/guardian involvement	5D.2. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 5D.3 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards			

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 3% from the current level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% [96]	55%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Lack of mastery of basic math skills and understanding of operations and number sense by students 5E.2. Time involved to collect and analyze data 5E.3. Attendance and lack of parent/guardian involvement	5E.1. Teachers will use Guided Math to differentiate instruction to all students. Students may be placed into MTSS if needed. Provide tutoring 5E.2. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring. 5E.3 Parental Contact Perfect Attendance Awards	5E.1. Teachers Administration MTSS Team 5E.2. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach 5E.3 Teachers Administration	5E.1. Progress Monitoring. 5E.2. Discovery Education Reports. 5E.3. Parent Contact Sign-in logs.	5E.1.Discovery Education Reports. 5E.2. Buck Trails Discovery Education 5E.3.Parent Contact Logs.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #1:

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

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

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	
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				

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

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%.	Mathematics Goal # 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	Students achieving proficiency in Algebra 1 will increase by 3% above current levels
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8th – 42% 9th – 37% All – 36%	8th - 45% 9th - 40% All - 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
1	1A.1. Lack of readily available multi-level, hands on materials, and real world activities and problem situations	1A.1. Teachers will share resources with each other including physical and digital resources.	1A.1. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach	1A.1. Professional Learning Communities/Department Meetings.	1A.1. Students' grades/progress monitoring.
2	1A.2. Student learning gaps	1A.2. Teachers will differentiate instruction and bridging learning gaps.	1A.2.Teachers Administration	1A.2. Discovery Education assessments given at beginning, middle, and end of the school year. Teachers may keep student portfolios to show individual student work on bridging gaps	1A.2. Discovery Education
3	1A.3. Time involved to collect and analyze data	1A.3. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring.	1A.3. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach	1A.3. Discovery Education Report scores.	1A.3. Buck Trails Discovery Education
4	1A.4 Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement	1A.4 Parental Contact Perfect	1A.4 Teachers Administration	Analysis of parent contacts.	1A.4. Parent contact logs.
5	1A.5 Implementation of Common Core Standards	1A.5. Teachers will attend Common Core trainings Teachers will use their PlayBook to review Common Core Standards as needed	1A.5 Teachers Administration Literacy Coach	1.A.5. Discovery Education Report scores analysis.	1A.5. Discovery Education Reports.
6	1A.6 Teacher training for available technology.	1A.6 Teachers will request technology training to best utilize new technology available	1A.6 Teachers Technology TOSA Literacy Coach	1A.6. Professional Learning Communities/Department Level Meetings.	1A.6. Students' grades/progress monitoring.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Students achieving above proficient in Algebra 1 will increase by 3% above current levels

	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	8th – 52% 9th – 3% All – 10%		8th - 55% 9th - 6% All - 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	2A.1. Lack of readily available multi-level, hands on materials, and real world activities and problem situations	2A.1. Teachers will share resources with each other including physical and digital resources	2A.1. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach	2A.1. Professional Learning Communities/Department Meetings.	2A.1. Students grades/portfolios.
2	2A.2. Student learning gaps	2A.2. Teachers will differentiate instruction and bridging learning gaps.	2A.2.Teachers Administration	2A.2. Discovery Education assessments given at beginning, middle, and end of the school year. Teachers may keep student portfolios to show individual student work on bridging gaps	2A.2. Discovery Education Student Portfolios
3	2A.3. Time involved to collect and analyze data	2A.3. Teachers will use Buck Trails for looking at incoming student data. Teachers will use discovery education reports for progress monitoring.	2A.3. Teachers Administration Literacy Coach	2A.3. Discovery Reports analysis.	2A.3. Buck Trails Discovery Education
4	2A.4 Attendance and lack of parental/guardian involvement	2A.4 Parental Contact	2A.4 Teachers Administration	2A.4. Parent Contact participation analysis.	2A.4. Parent Contact Logs.
5	2A.5 Implementation of Common Core Standards	2A.5. Teachers will attend Common Core trainings Teachers will use their PlayBook to review Common Core Standards as needed	2A.5 Teachers Administration Literacy Coach	2A.5 Analysis of Common Core implementation.	2A.5. Inservice sign-in logs.
6	2A.6 Teacher training for available technology.	2A.6 Teachers will request technology training to best utilize new technology available	2A.6 Teachers Technology TOSA Literacy Coach	2A.6. Analysis of technology implementation.	2A.6. Inservice sign-in logs.

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><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 colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><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 colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards	K - 12 Math	Debbie Parker Janet Davis Jessica Sims Jared Smith Jeannie Williams	Math Teachers K-12	May 2013	Review Lesson Plans	Grade Group/Department Chair Administration
		Debbie				

Strategy	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
8 Mathematical Practices	K - 12 Math	Parker Janet Davis Jessica Sims Jared Smith Jeannie Williams	Math Teachers K-12	May 2013	Review Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs	Grade Group/Department Chair Administration
Math Literacy	K-12 Math	Jeannie Williams Debbie Parker Janet Davis Jessica Sims Jared Smith	Math Teachers K - 12	May 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs	Grade Group/Department Chair Administration
College and Career Ready in Mathematics	6 - 12 Math	Ivan Beach Jessica Sims Jared Smith	Math Teachers 6-12	May 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs Review Lesson Plans	Grade Group/Department Chair Administration

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	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	1a.1 Students lack knowledge of scientific terminology.	1a.1 Integrate scientific terminology across the disciplines.	1a.1 Assistant Principal, Science Chair, Middle School Chair,Grade Level Chair, and teachers	1a.1 FCAT Explorer, DEA, Classroom Walkthroughs, Department Meetings, Lesson Plan Review	1a.1DEA Reports,Grades on Focus, lesson plans, student lab folders
2	1a.2 Students lack higher order questioning and critical thinking skills	1a.2 Utilize higher order questions and steps of scientific method (both teacher and student generated)	1a.2 Administrators, Grade Level Chair, Middle School Chair, Science Chair, and teachers	1a.2. FCAT Explorer, DEA, Classroom walkthroughs, Department meeting, Science Fair Projects,Lesson Plan Review	1a.2 DEA Reports,Grades on Focus, lesson plans, student lab folders
3	1a.3 Students lack knowledge of real-world scientific applications	1a.3 Conduct labs using every step of the scientific method (teacher/student generated)	1a.3 Administration,Grade Level Chair, Middle School Chair, Science Chair, and teachers	1a.3 FCAT Explorer, DEA, Classroom Walkthroughs,Lab assignments, Science Fair Projects	1a.3DEA Reports,Grades on Focus, lesson plans, student lab folders

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	Students achieving above proficient in science will increase by 3% above current levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
5th - 10% [5] 8th - 2% [2]	5th - 13% 8th - 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	1a.1 Students lack knowledge of scientific terminology.	1a.1 Integrate scientific terminology across the disciplines.	1a.1 Administrators, Science Chair, Middle School Chair,Grade Level Chair, and teachers	1a.1 FCAT Explorer, DEA, Classroom Walkthroughs, Department Meetings, Lesson Plan Review	1a.1 DEA Reports,Grades on Focus, lesson plans, student lab folders
2	1a.2 Students lack higher order questioning and critical thinking skills	1a.2 Utilize higher order questions and steps of scientific method (both teacher and student generated)	1a.2 Administrators, Grade Level Chair, Middle School Chair, Science Chair, and teachers	1a.2 FCAT Explorer, DEA, Classroom Walkthroughs, Department Meetings, Lesson Plan Review	1a.2 Grades on Focus, lesson plans, student lab folders
3	1a.3 Students lack knowledge of real-world scientific applications	1a.3 Conduct labs following the scientific method (teacher/student generated)	1a.3 Administration,Grade Level Chair, Middle School Chair, Science Chair, and teachers	1a.3FCAT Explorer, DEA, Classroom Walkthroughs,Lab assignments, Science Fair Projects	1a.3 Grades on Focus, lesson plans, student lab folders
4	1a.4 Computer access	1a.4 Using digital resources to produce technical reports (ex. using Excel to display data)	1a.4Administration,Grade Level Chair, Middle School Chair, Science Chair, and teachers	1a.4FCAT Explorer, DEA, Classroom Walkthroughs,Lab assignments, Science Fair Projects	1a.4Grades on Focus, lesson plans, student lab folders

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

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				

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A	N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science 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				

Biology 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 Biology. Biology Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

			Subtotal: $0.00

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing will increase by at least 3%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4th Grade 80%(45) 8th Grade 52%(64) 10th Grade 82%(118)	4th Grade 83% 8th Grade 52% 10th Grade 82%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1 New rigorous scoring guidelines must be accepted and implemented school-wide	1a.1 Training will be provided for scoring writing based on the rigorous standards	1a.1 Administration, Literacy Coach, Department Heads,Grade Level Chairs	1a.1 Bucks Write	1a.1 FCAT Writing Rubric
2	1a.2 Willingness of teachers to incorporate literacy strategies for writing in the classroom	1a.2 Training will be provided on the Common Core Literacy Strategies in Science, History/Social Studies and Technical Subjects 6-12	1a.2 Administration, ELA/Writing Coach, Literacy Coach	1a.2 Bucks Write	1a.1 Bozeman Writing Rubric for extended and short response
3	1a.3 Background knowledge needed for narrative, expository, persuasive writing	1a.3 Students will write providing supporting details from an informational text passage	1a.3 Literacy Coach, Grade Level Chairs, Department Heads, and classroom teachers	1a.3 Bucks Write, formative classroom writng, extended and short response questions on content area assessments	1a.3 FCAT Writing Rubric, Bozeman Writing Rubric for extended and short response

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

Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
ELA Common Core/Writing	K-12	ELA/Writing Coach	School-wide LA arts teachers	ongoing	Lesson-plan reviews, professional learning communities	Administrators, LA Department Head
Six Traits of Writing	K12	Literacy Coach	LA Teachers	September	Lesson plan reviews, observations, model lessons	Literacy Coach
Anchor Set Training	4th, 8th, 10th grade LA teachers	Literacy Coach	4th, 8th, and 10th grade language arts teachers	October	Lesson plan reviews	Literacy Coach

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Cource (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 U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

U.S. History 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 U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Decrease the number of excessive absences and tardies, and increase the attendance rate by at least 3% overall.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
92.3%	95.3%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
Elementary - 152 Middle - 114 High - 248 Total - 514	Elementary - 147 Middle - 111 High - 241 Total - 499
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
Elementary - 17 Middle - 150 High- 300 Total - 467	Elementary - 16 Middle - 145 High - 291 Total - 452

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Transportation issues in rural area	1.2 Increase communication with parents to encourage use of bus system for transportation	Administration, Guidance, and classroom teachers	Interventions documented by MTSS Team	Attendance Reports from Focus
2	1.2 Students assisting with familial duties	1.2 Increase awareness of available county agencies and assistance	1.2 Aministration,Guidance Counselors, classroom teachers, MTSS Leadership Team	Documentations of material(s) provided to parents/guardians	Attendance reports from focus

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Decrease the number of students in OSS/ISS by at least 3%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
Elementary - 0 Middle - 337 High School - 339 Total - 676	Elementary - NA Middle School - 327 High School - 329 Total- 656
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

Elementary - NA Middle School -75 High School - 121 Total - 195	Elementary - NA Middle School - 73 High School - 117 Total School - 189
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
Elementary - 31 Middle School - 37 High School - 51 Total - 95	Elementary - 30 Middle School - 36 High School - 49
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
Elementary - 7 Middle - 37 High - 51 Total - 88	Elementary - 6 Middle - 36 High - 49 Total - 83

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Lack of student engagement.	1.1 Implementation of positive interactions among teacher-to-student as well as student-to-students while engaged in learning (Kagan)	1.1 Admistrators and classroom teachers	1.1 Discipline data reports from attendance clerk	1.1 ISS and OSS reports, discipline Referrals in Focus
2	1.2 Isolation	1.2 Increased participation in classroom, school, and extra curricular activities to promote a sense of community	1.2 Administrators, Guidance, Classroom teachers, school support personnel	1.2 Discipline data reports from attendance clerk	1.2 ISS and OSS reports, discipline referrals in Focus
3	1.3 Peer Pressure	1.3 Use Bullyproofing Curriculum K12 which includes Teen Dating Curriculum	1.3 Administrators, Guidance, Classroom teachers, shcool support personnel	1.3 Discipline data reports from attendance clerk	1.3 ISS and OSS reports, discipline referrals in Focus

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
Bullyproofing Your School	School-wide	Assistant Principal over Guidance	All teachers	August, 2012	Grade Level and Department Meetings	Administration, Guidance, classroom teachers
Kagan Training	Middle school, 9th grade students	National, state, and district coordinators	Middle school, Aspire, and 9th grade teachers	August, 2012 October, 2012	Monthly meetings with Kagan PLC led by Kagan Coach	Kagan Coach, Literacy Coach,classroom teachers

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School - F.S., Sec. 1003.53

* 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. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	Decrease the number of dropouts by 3%
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
5%	2%%
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
5%	2%

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	/1Low GPA	Classroom visits on career choices	1.1 Assistant Principal	1.1 Student/teacher surveys.	1.1 Students' grades.
2		Individual student conferences (Buck Trails)	1.1 Administrators, teachers and guidance counselors.	1.1 Conferences with all stakeholders.	1.1 Students' grades/ progress.

3		Parent conferences (Bucks Brag)	1.1 Administrators, guidance counselors.	1.1 Conferences with all stakeholders.	1.1 Students' grades/progress.

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention 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 Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who*	Parent participation will increase by 3%.

participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
12%	15%1.3

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1.Parent time restraints with Jobs, family obligations, transportation	1.1 Rotate meeting schedules.	1.1 PTO Board Members and Administration	1.1 Sign in rosters for meetings and activities.	1.1 PTO membership Roster
2	1.2 Lack of technology and knowledge.	1.2 Provide alternative means of communication to parents (School/Classroom newsletter,Teacher/School Websites, Iris Alerts, community news/radio channels	1.2 Administration/teachers	1.2 Climate Survey, PTO/SAC feedback	1.2 Climate Survey Results, PTO/SAC results

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

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

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

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

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:	Increase the number of students who are successful in STEM classes throughout the school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Lack trained teachers	1.1 Provide training for teachers in STEM areas	1.1 Administrators	1.1 Lesson Study, Application of feedback to future lessons	1.1 Final Report of Lesson Study, Lesson Plans
2	1.2 Activities/resources/ideas	1.2 Coordinate a STEM challenge one day a month or 3 days a quarter (if days run consecutively)	1.2 Adminstrators, Department Heads, District Science STS, and teachers	1.2 Project-specific, student-generated assessment	1.2 School-wide Math and Science Scores

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	Increase the number of students prepared to enter the workforce upon completion of high school.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Teacher certification	1.1 Recruit teachers of various grade levels to become certified in CTE specialized fields	1.1 Administrators	1.1 Balanced ratio of teachers to student applicants enrolled in the CTE program	1.1 Certification Tests
2	1.2 Student awareness	1.2 Market CTE programs to students early	1.2 Administrators, Guidance, teachers	1.1 Student/teacher/parent surveys.	1.1 High School Feedback Report

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

j͏ Priority	j͏ Focus	j͏ Prevent	j͏ NA

Are you a reward school: j͏ Yes j͏ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 8/29/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Bay School District
DEANE BOZEMAN SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	67%	74%	74%	36%	251	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	55%	66%			121	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	51% (YES)	61% (YES)			112	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					484	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Bay School District
DEANE BOZEMAN SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	69%	73%	80%	43%	265	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	57%	65%			122	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	53% (YES)	57% (YES)			110	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