

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: LAKE SHORE MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Shundra Dowers

SAC Chair: Sandra Stewart

Superintendent: Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval: 12/2012

Last Modified on: 1/14/2013

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Shundra Dowers	BS-Economics Minor-Business, Florida A&M University Master of Science- Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University; Principal and Business Education		15	<p>Current Principal of Lake Shore Middle and former Principal of Rosenwald Elementary School for past three years.</p> <p>(2010-2011) State grade of C and not meeting AYP standards. High Standards in Reading: 51%, High Standards in Math: 61%, High Standards in Science: 16%, High Standards in Writing: 96%. Learning Gains: Reading: 60%, Math: 61% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading: 57%, Math: 53%</p> <p>(2009-2010) State grade of D and not meeting AYP standards. In 09-10, High Standards in Reading: 48% High Standards in Math: 56% High Standards in Writing: 60% High Standards in Science: 18% Learning Gains: Reading: 62% Math: 51% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading: 53% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math: 55% 2008-2009: Grade D, Reading Mastery:</p>

Certification-
State of Florida

32%, Math Mastery: 48%, Science
Mastery: 13%. AYP: 82% made AYP in
Reading and Math. Assistant Principal at
Glade View Elementary School 2007-2008:
Grade B
Reading Mastery: 66%, Math Mastery:
70%, Science Mastery: 19%. AYP: 100%,
Made AYP in Reading and Math.

2007-2006
Reading Mastery: 66%, Math Mastery:
82%, Science Mastery: 49%. AYP:100%,
Made AYP in Reading and Math.

Assistant Principal at Lake Shore Middle
School for previous eight years.

2011-2012:
Grade:D
AYP: 74%
Reading:
Prof. 23%; Learning Gains 57%; LG of
lowest 25% 65%; Prof. per grade level: 6th
30%, 7th 36%, 8th 30%.
Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not
make AYP in Reading.
Math:
Prof. 31%; Learning gains 60%; LG of
lowest 25% 66%; Prof. per grade level 6th
34%, 7th 42%, 8th 70%.
Black, ED,Hispanic, ELL, SWD did not make
AYP in Math.
Writing: 76%
Science: 14%

2010-2011:
Grade: C
AYP: 74%
Reading:
Prof. 32%; Learning Gains 50%; LG of
lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level: 6th
30%, 7th 36%, 8th 30%.
Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not
make AYP in Reading.
Math:
Prof. 50%; Learning gains 63%; LG of
lowest 25% 73%; Prof. per grade level 6th
34%, 7th 42%, 8th 70%.
Black, ED,Hispanic, ELL, SWD did not make
AYP in Math.
Writing:80%
Science: 21%

2009-2010:
Grade: C
AYP: 74%
Reading:
Prof. 39%; Learning Gains 54%; LG of
lowest 25% 61%; Prof. per grade level: 6th
25%, 7th 39%, 8th 29%.
Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not
make AYP in Reading.
Math:
Prof. 52%; Learning gains 68%; LG of
lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level 6th
29%, 7th 49%, 8th 50%.
Black, ED, SWD did not make AYP in Math.
Hispanic and ELL made AYP in math.
Writing:84%
Science: 24%

2008-2009:
Grade: C
AYP: 69%
Reading: Prof. 36%; Learning Gains 55%;
LG of lowest 25% 74%; Prof. per grade
level - 6th 27%, 7th 34%, 8th 22%.
Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups
did not make AYP in reading.
Math:
Prof. 50%; Learning Gains 62%; LG of
lowest 25% 70%; Prof. per grade level -
6th 31%, 7th 42%, 8th 45%.
Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups
did not make AYP in math.
Writing: 98%
Science: 23%

2007-2008:
Grade: C
AYP: 90%
Reading: Prof. 38%; Learning Gains 56%;
LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade
level - 6th 31%, 7th 36%, 8th 24%.
Black, ED, SWD sub-groups did not make

Assis Principal

Mrs. Shanda
Garvin-Shaw

Tuskegee
University,
Alabama
Psychology Major

Barry University,
Miami, FL
Masters Degree
– Educational
Leadership

9

8

					<p>AYP in reading. Math: Prof. 54%; Learning Gains 70%; LG of lowest 25% 71%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 30%, 7th 51%, 8th 51%. All sub-groups met AYP in math. Writing: 96% Science: 16%</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade: D AYP: 67% Reading: Prof. 34%; Learning Gains 57%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 28%, 7th 37%, 8th 20%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in reading. Math: Prof. 44%; Learning Gains 66%; LG of lowest 25% 66%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 29%, 7th 40%, 8th 39%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in math. Writing: 84% Science: 9%</p>
Assis Principal	Dr. Kevin Kovacs	<p>BA – Theatre Arts, UMASS/ BOSTON; MFA/Education, UMASS/ BOSTON Ed.D. – Curriculum/Ed. Leadership Certification, Nova Southeastern U</p>	7	7	<p>Assistant Principal at Lake Shore Middle School for previous six years.</p> <p>2011-2012: Grade: D AYP: 74% Reading: Prof. 23%; Learning Gains 57%; LG of lowest 25% 65%; Prof. per grade level: 6th 30%, 7th 36%, 8th 30%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Math: Prof. 31%; Learning gains 60%; LG of lowest 25% 66%; Prof. per grade level 6th 34%, 7th 42%, 8th 70%. Black, ED, Hispanic, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math. Writing: 76% Science: 14%</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade: C AYP: 74% Reading: Prof. 32%; Learning Gains 50%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level: 6th 30%, 7th 36%, 8th 30%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Math: Prof. 50%; Learning gains 63%; LG of lowest 25% 73%; Prof. per grade level 6th 34%, 7th 42%, 8th 70%. Black, ED, Hispanic, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math. Writing: 80% Science: 21%</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade: C AYP: 74% Reading: Prof. 39%; Learning Gains 54%; LG of lowest 25% 61%; Prof. per grade level: 6th 25%, 7th 39%, 8th 29%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Math: Prof. 52%; Learning gains 68%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level 6th 29%, 7th 49%, 8th 50%. Black, ED, SWD did not make AYP in Math. Hispanic and ELL made AYP in math. Writing: 84% Science: 24%</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade: C AYP: 69% Reading: Prof. 36%; Learning Gains 55%; LG of lowest 25% 74%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 27%, 7th 34%, 8th 22%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in reading. Math: Prof. 50%; Learning Gains 62%; LG of lowest 25% 70%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 31%, 7th 42%, 8th 45%.</p>

					<p>Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in math. Writing: 98% Science: 23%</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: C AYP: 90% Reading: Prof. 38%; Learning Gains 56%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 31%, 7th 36%, 8th 24%. Black, ED, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in reading. Math: Prof. 54%; Learning Gains 70%; LG of lowest 25% 71%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 30%, 7th 51%, 8th 51%. All sub-groups met AYP in math. Writing: 96% Science: 16%</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade: D AYP: 67% Reading: Prof. 34%; Learning Gains 57%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 28%, 7th 37%, 8th 20%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in reading. Math: Prof. 44%; Learning Gains 66%; LG of lowest 25% 66%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 29%, 7th 40%, 8th 39%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in math. Writing: 84% Science: 9%</p>
Assis Principal	Randy Burden	<p>BS Sports Management University of Florida MA Ed Leadership Nova Univ. EdD Ed Leadership (currently enrolled in program) Areas of Certification: ESE K-12 Ed Leadership ESOL Endorsement</p>	4	<p>2011 – 2012 Assistant Principal, Turning Points Academy</p> <p>SIR – Maintaining, Reading – Improving, Math - Maintaining</p> <p>SY 10-11 AP @ TPA Improvement status in Math; Declined in Reading; Overall declining status</p> <p>SY 09-10 AP @ TPA Improvement status in Math; Declined in Reading; Overall declining status</p> <p>SY 2008-2009 Glade View Elem. Grade A and met AYP; Prior year school grade was a B; ESE Contact Math Resource Teacher</p> <p>SY 2004-2008 Odyssey Grade A all four years. ESE Teacher / TOSA</p>	

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)
					<p>Math Coach at Lake Shore Middle School for previous six years.</p> <p>2011-2012: Grade: D AYP: 74% Reading: Prof. 23%; Learning Gains 57%; LG of lowest 25% 65%; Prof. per grade level: 6th 30%, 7th 36%, 8th 30%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Math: Prof. 31%; Learning gains 60%; LG of lowest 25% 66%; Prof. per grade level 6th 34%, 7th 42%, 8th 70%.</p>

Math	Ms. Cosha Jackson	Bachelors of Science degree and Masters of Science in Mathematics.	16	7	<p>Black, ED,Hispanic, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math. Writing: 76% Science: 14%</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade: C AYP: 74% Reading: Prof. 32%; Learning Gains 50%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level: 6th 30%, 7th 36%, 8th 30%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Math: Prof. 50%; Learning gains 63%; LG of lowest 25% 73%; Prof. per grade level 6th 34%, 7th 42%, 8th 70%. Black, ED,Hispanic, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math. Writing:80% Science:21%</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade: C AYP: 74% Reading: Prof. 39%; Learning Gains 54%; LG of lowest 25% 61%; Prof. per grade level: 6th 25%, 7th 39%, 8th 29%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Math: Prof. 52%; Learning gains 68%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level 6th 29%, 7th 49%, 8th 50%. Black, ED, SWD did not make AYP in Math. Hispanic and ELL made AYP in math. Writing:84% Science: 24%</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade: C AYP: 69% Reading: Prof. 36%; Learning Gains 55%; LG of lowest 25% 74%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 27%, 7th 34%, 8th 22%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in reading. Math: Prof. 50%; Learning Gains 62%; LG of lowest 25% 70%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 31%, 7th 42%, 8th 45%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in math. Writing: 98% Science: 23%</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: C AYP: 90% Reading: Prof. 38%; Learning Gains 56%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 31%, 7th 36%, 8th 24%. Black, ED, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in reading. Math: Prof. 54%; Learning Gains 70%; LG of lowest 25% 71%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 30%, 7th 51%, 8th 51%. All sub-groups met AYP in math. Writing: 96% Science: 16%</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade: D AYP: 67% Reading: Prof. 34%; Learning Gains 57%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 28%, 7th 37%, 8th 20%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in reading. Math: Prof. 44%; Learning Gains 66%; LG of lowest 25% 66%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 29%, 7th 40%, 8th 39%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in math. Writing: 84% Science: 9%</p>
		Bachelors of Arts in Speech from			

Reading	Chimere Brown	Albany State University and Masters in Arts in Mass Communications from University of Central Florida	7		
Science	Ms. Valarie Hoskins-Young	Reading Endorsed Bachelor's of Science degree in Biology from Florida Agriculture and Mechanical University	12	4	<p>Science Coach at Lake Shore Middle School for previous four years.</p> <p>2011-2012: Grade: D AYP: 74% Reading: Prof. 23%; Learning Gains 57%; LG of lowest 25% 65%; Prof. per grade level: 6th 30%, 7th 36%, 8th 30%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Math: Prof. 31%; Learning gains 60%; LG of lowest 25% 66%; Prof. per grade level 6th 34%, 7th 42%, 8th 70%. Black, ED,Hispanic, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math. Writing: 76% Science: 14%</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade: C AYP: 74% Reading: Prof. 32%; Learning Gains 50%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level: 6th 30%, 7th 36%, 8th 30%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Math: Prof. 50%; Learning gains 63%; LG of lowest 25% 73%; Prof. per grade level 6th 34%, 7th 42%, 8th 70%. Black, ED,Hispanic, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math. Writing: 80% Science: 21%</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade: C AYP: 74% Reading: Prof. 39%; Learning Gains 54%; LG of lowest 25% 61%; Prof. per grade level: 6th 25%, 7th 39%, 8th 29%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL & SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Math: Prof. 52%; Learning gains 68%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level 6th 29%, 7th 49%, 8th 50%. Black, ED, SWD did not make AYP in Math. Hispanic and ELL made AYP in math. Writing: 84% Science: 24%</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade: C AYP: 69% Reading: Prof. 36%; Learning Gains 55%; LG of lowest 25% 74%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 27%, 7th 34%, 8th 22%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in reading. Math: Prof. 50%; Learning Gains 62%; LG of lowest 25% 70%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 31%, 7th 42%, 8th 45%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in math. Writing: 98% Science: 23%</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: C AYP: 90% Reading: Prof. 38%; Learning Gains 56%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 31%, 7th 36%, 8th 24%. Black, ED, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in reading.</p>

					<p>Math: Prof. 54%; Learning Gains 70%; LG of lowest 25% 71%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 30%, 7th 51%, 8th 51%. All sub-groups met AYP in math. Writing: 96% Science: 16%</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade: D AYP: 67% Reading: Prof. 34%; Learning Gains 57%; LG of lowest 25% 69%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 28%, 7th 37%, 8th 20%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in reading. Math: Prof. 44%; Learning Gains 66%; LG of lowest 25% 66%; Prof. per grade level - 6th 29%, 7th 40%, 8th 39%. Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in math. Writing: 84% Science: 9%</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

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	<p>Regular meetings of new teachers with principal/Discussions include learning gains, differentiated instruction, classroom management, etc.</p> <p>Partner new teachers with veteran staff/ESP program for new teachers/CHAMPS training</p> <p>Soliciting referrals from current employees</p> <p>Provide ongoing professional development</p>	<p>Principal/Assistant Principals</p> <p>PD Team</p>	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
8	All teachers are Highly Qualified, these are in need of ESOL certification and we are in the process of addressing their individual needs.

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
48	6.3%(3)	20.8%(10)	27.1%(13)	45.8%(22)	47.9%(23)	100.0%(48)	20.8%(10)	0.0%(0)	27.1%(13)

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
Les Tina Rumph	Terrance Ford	Experienced Reading support; Long-term knowledge of school and district functions	Guide the mentee through the required Educator Accomplished Practices (EAP), and support the teacher in developing an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP). Attend bi-weekly LTM's, participate in a book study using Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching.
Duane Isles	Michael Martinez	Experienced Reading support; Long-term knowledge of school and district functions	Guide the mentee through the required Educator Accomplished Practices (EAP), and support the teacher in developing an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP). Attend bi-weekly LTM's, participate in a book study using Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching.
Wilhelmenia Jacobs	Tamisha Everett	Experienced Reading support; Long-term knowledge of school and district functions	Guide the mentee through the required Educator Accomplished Practices (EAP), and support the teacher in developing an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP). Attend bi-weekly LTM's, participate in a book study using Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after school programs and the Compass/Pass program. Language Arts and Reading teachers attended the Readers Workshop to help increase reading proficiency rates. Parents will have the opportunity to attend various workshops that will assist them with their child's education. Academic coaches will be utilized to offer PD for teachers and parents. Stipends have been set aside to offer teachers PD opportunities after school hours.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

A migrant liaison provides services and support for students and their parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure that qualifying students' needs are met.

Title I, Part D

The Parent Center provides services and support to parents of our students. The liaison coordinates with the Title I coordinator to ensure that programs meet the needs of both parents and students.

Title II

Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

The District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students

identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SES tutoring-Title I stimulus SAI funds are allocated to the school in the form of an additional instructional unit. The teacher unit is used to provide additional instructional support to students experiencing academic difficulty in Reading and Math.

Violence Prevention Programs

Safe and Drug Free Schools: District receives funds for programs (Red Ribbons Week, Mentors in Middle School, etc.) that support prevention of violence in and around the school. These programs help to prevent the use of alcohol, tobacco, drugs, and foster a safe, drug free learning environment supporting student achievement. At Lake Shore Middle School, the Communities In Schools program conducts weekly classes with approximately 100 students. The program, Communities in School, teaches students about career choices and helps students to develop leadership skills through a unit called, Teen Leadership.

District-wide implementation of Single School Culture as well as Appreciation of Multicultural Diversity.

Nutrition Programs

School nurses provide support and nutrition information for those students who have been diagnosed with diabetes.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Lake Shore Middle School offers a Pre-Medical choice program for students that will help them prepare for this specific program at the high school level.

Job Training

N/A

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based MTSS Leadership Team is comprised of the following members: principal, assistant principal, ESE contact, ELL contact, school psychologist, classroom teacher, RtI/Inclusion Facilitator, Learning Team Facilitator (LTF), and guidance staff. The Capacity Development Team will support in the RtI process when such services will lend to the situation. The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making to ensure:

- a sound, effective academic program is in place
- a process to address and monitor subsequent needs is created
- the School Based Team (SBT) is implementing RtI processes
- assessment of RtI skills of school staff is conducted
- fidelity of implementation of intervention support is documented
- adequate professional development to support RtI implementation is provided
- effective communication with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities occurs.

The RtI/Inclusion Facilitator was a new position for SY10. This individual assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, collects and analyze data, contributes to the development of intervention plans, implements Tier 3 interventions, and offers professional development and technical assistance.

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 is comprised of the following members: principal, assistant principal, ESE contact, ELL contact, school psychologist, classroom teacher, RtI/Inclusion Facilitator, Learning Team Facilitator (LTF), and guidance staff. The Area Resource Team will support the RtI process when such services will lend to the situation.

The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making to ensure:

- a sound, effective academic program is in place
- a process to address and monitor subsequent needs is created
- the School Based Team (SBT) is implementing RtI processes
- assessment of RtI skills of school staff is conducted
- fidelity of implementation of intervention support is documented
- adequate professional development to support RtI implementation is provided
- effective communication with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities occurs.

The RtI/Inclusion Facilitator is a new position for SY10. This individual will assist in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, collect and analyze data, contribute to the development of intervention plans, implement Tier 3 interventions, and offer professional development and technical assistance.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team, the School Advisory Council (SAC), and all school stakeholders helped develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Assessment and Information Management System (AIMS web), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT).

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, AIMS web, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation

Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR).

End of year: FAIR, AIMS web, FCAT

Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Monitoring plan will be on-going of strategies that are in place to determine effectiveness and ineffectiveness

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Team is comprised of the following members:

Principal

Assistant Principals

Subject Area Coaches

Instructional Teachers

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

The role of the Literacy Team is to promote a community of readers and improve literacy instruction through staff development and monthly literacy activities for faculty & students.

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

The primary goal of the LLT is to implement Readers Workshop in grades 6th-8th with fidelity.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/4/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*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.

All teachers will engage in discussions related to the reading content in their classrooms. These discussions will take place in Learning Team Meetings, department meetings, and in grade level meetings. The school-wide focus on reading will be reiterated at all faculty meetings and evident in the Instructional Focus Calendars. The Instructional Focus calendars that are used in Social Studies will be aligned with the Reading instructional focus. All Social Studies teachers (as well as Language Arts and Reading teachers) will include a reading/LA benchmark warm-up activity in their instructional lesson planning. Many of the LSMS school-wide initiatives reinforce reading content in every classroom; such as Read Alouds and Lake Shore Writes.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Based on 2012 FCAT data, 17% of students in grades 6th-8th were proficient in reading. By June of 2013, at least 35% of students will score a Level 3 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 17% (104) of students scored a Level 3 on FCAT Reading.	By June 2013, 35% (247) of students students will score a Level 3 or higher in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instruction not differentiated to focus on targeted benchmark improvement	Continue to utilize an IFC that targets benchmark weaknesses	Principal, Assistant Principals, SA Coaches	Administration will be aware of upcoming activities and monitor implementation via CWT.	Data from Benchmark Assessments
2	Poor attendance of students.	Provide after school tutoring for students scoring Level 2 or lower.	After School Director, Administration,	Proficiency scores on Diagnostic Tests, and Bi-Weekly benchmark assessments	Diagnostic Test Scores, FCAT, SRI, FAIR and Benchmark Assessments
3	Lack of classroom libraries.	Implement Readers Workshop in Reading and Language Arts.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plans, LTM's	Diagnostic Test data, and Benchmark Assessments

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Based on 2012 FAA data, 0% of students in grades 6th-8th were proficient in reading. By June of 2013, at least 6% of students will score a Level 4,5,or 6.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 0% (0) of students scored a Level 4,5,or 6 on FAA Reading.	By June 2013, 6% of students students will score a Level 4,5,or 6 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instruction not differentiated to focus on targeted EQUALS curriculum.	Continue to utilize EQUALS curriculum and ensure teachers are using the curriculum with fidelity	Administration, SA Coaches, ESE Contact	Proficiency scores on FAA and benchmark assessments	Data from FAA and benchmark assessments

2	Instruction not differentiated to focus on targeted benchmark improvement	Continue to use ACCESS Curriculum	ESE Coordinator, Administration, Reading Coach	Proficiency scores on FAA, and Bi-Weekly benchmark assessments	FAA Scores, SRI, FAIR and benchmark assessment data
3	Teachers wisely utilizing subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons.	Teachers will receive coaching support from Reading and Math Coach in developing and implementing higher order lessons.	Administration, SA Coaches and Teachers	Administrators will monitor higher order lessons by conducting classroom walkthroughs and reviewing lesson plans	Benchmark Assessments Reading will also use the Fair and SRI tests.

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Based on 2012 FCAT data, 4% of students in grades 6th-8th scored a level 4 or higher in reading. By June of 2013, at least 11% of students will score a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 4% (24) of students scored a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Reading.	By June 2013, 11% (78) of students will score a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Creating effective enrichment activities via IFC to maintain and increase the level of 4 and 5 students	Monitor student time on task and Increase rigor of designed tasks	Principal, Assistant Principals, SA Coaches and Teachers	Administration will be aware of the IFC's upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walk-throughs.	Benchmark Data
2	Time to create and plan engaging enrichment activities.	Provide effective enrichment activities via IFC to maintain and increase the level of 4 and 5 students	Principal, AP Reading, Reading Coach and Teachers	Lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, IFC	Diagnostic Data, FCAT, FAIR, SRI, Biweekly Assessments
3	Variety of text	Implement book clubs	Administration, Reading Coach, Classroom Teacher	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, IFC	Diagnostic Data, FCAT, SRI, FAIR, Biweekly Assessments
4	Consistency of implementation	Provide students with materials to implement Single School Culture	Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, and Teachers	Teacher monitors, organization of binders	Notebooks
5	Teachers need to plan and provide differentiated instruction in a small group setting using the "Gradual Release Model".	Teachers will receive coaching support through the full coaching cycle (co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing).	Administration and SA Coach	Administrators and Reading Coache will monitor differentiated instruction in a small group infusing the "Gradual Release Model" by reviewing data binders, lesson plans, and conducting classroom walkthroughs.	Diagnostics, Benchmark Assessments and the FCAT. Reading will also use the Fair and SRI tests.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.	Based on 2012 FAA data, 94% of students in grades 6th-8th scored a level 7 or higher in reading. By June of 2013, at least 97% of students will score a Level 7 or higher on FAA
---	--

Reading Goal #2b:	Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 94% (17) of students scored a Level 7 or higher on FAA Reading.	By June 2013, 97% (20) of students will score a Level 7 or higher on FAA Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not actively engaged during instructional delivery in class.	Continue to utilize FCIM to implement specific strategies for students performing above mastery to increase engagement	Administration, SA Coach, Teachers	Review of student grouping to ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment data.	Progress of students on assessments and FAA.
2	Creating effective enrichment activities via ACCESS to maintain and increase the level of 7 or higher students.	Monitor student time on task	Administration, SA Coaches and Teachers	Administration will be aware of upcoming ACCESS activities and monitor implementation through classroom walk-throughs	FAA, SRI, FAIR and benchmark assessment data
3	Instruction needs to be differentiated to focus on targeted benchmark improvement.	Use ACCESS Curriculum and manipulatives.	Administration, ESE Coordinator and SA Coach	Proficiency scores on FAA and benchmark assessments	FAA Scores, SRI, FAIR and benchmark 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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Based on 2012 FCAT data, 56% of students in grades 6th-8th made learning gains in reading. By June of 2013, at least 65% of students will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 56% (177) of students made learning gains on FCAT Reading.	By June 2013, 65% (240) of students will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not aware of their individual performance targets	Student achievement chats will be conducted with all students following diagnostic assessments and benchmark assessments and documented in student portfolios	Principal, Assistant Principal, SA Coaches	Review of student portfolios and/or review of teachers data binder	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if data chats are successful and check student portfolios.
2	Time to meet with all students individually	Continue Student Achievement Chats following diagnostic assessments.	Principal, Reading Coach, classroom teachers and Assistant	EDW- Individual Student Reports, Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson	Diagnostic Data, Benchmark Assessments, FAIR, SRI & FCAT

			Principals	Plans	
3	Other Content Areas not fully implementing IF activities for Reading	Social studies and LA teachers will explicitly infuse the reading benchmarks in lesson plans and instructional delivery.	Principal, Reading Coach, Social Studies Teachers and Assistant Principals	When visiting social studies classrooms, administrators will focus their attention to the frequency of explicit teaching to the reading benchmarks in social studies. Lessons Plans will be checked monthly.	Secondary Benchmark Assessment Data will be disaggregated by social studies and LA teachers to determine the effectiveness of reading benchmark instruction in social studies.

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:	Based on 2012 FAA data, 61% of students in grades 6th-8th made learning gains in reading. By June of 2013, at least 66% of students will make learning gains on FAA Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 61% (11) of students made learning gains on FAA Reading.	By June 2013, 66% (18) of students will make learning gains on FAA Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not aware of their individual performance targets	Student achievement chats will be conducted with all students following benchmark assessments	Administration, SA Coaches	Review of student portfolios and/or review of teachers data binder.	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if data chats are successful.
2	Students not aware of their individual performance targets	Student achievement chats will be conducted with all students following benchmark assessments	Administration, SA Coaches	Review of student portfolios and/or review of teachers data binder.	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if data chats are successful.
3	Instruction needs to be differentiated to focus on targeted benchmark improvement.	Use ACCESS Curriculum and manipulatives.	Administration, SA Coaches	Proficiency scores on FAA, and benchmark assessments	FAA Scores, SRI, FAIR and benchmark 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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Based on 2012 FCAT data, 64% of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. By June of 2013, at least 75% of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading on FCAT.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June of 2012 64% (117) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	By June 2013, 75% (137) of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not receiving supplemental support.	Implement a tutorial program whose instruction correlates with the IFC.	Tutorial Monitor, Administration	Conduct CWT in the tutorial programs	Benchmark Assessment data and Diagnostic data
2	Ability to read nonfiction and higher level text.	Provide Strategies for reading nonfiction text.	Administration, Reading Coach, Teachers	Classroom Walkthroughs, LTM"s, Lesson Plans	Diagnostic Data, SRI, FAIR, FCAT, Biweekly Assessments
3	Developing lessons to help student lacking needed reading strategies read enough text to close the achievement gap	FCIM model will be used to monitor students progress while identifying students needing intervention and enrichment. During LTMs teachers will colaberate to develop lessons that will reach the diverse needs of learners in our classrooms.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Learning Team Facilitator and Reading Coach	Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and during LTM.	Diagnostics, Benchmark assessments, FCAT
4	Teachers wisely utilizing subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons	<p>1. Teachers will participate in a demonstration lesson to observe planning and delivering a higher order lesson.</p> <p>2. Teachers will utilize subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons.</p> <p>3. Teachers will receive coaching support from Reading and Math Coach in developing and implementing higher order lessons.</p>	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach	Administrators will monitor higher order lessons by conducting classroom walkthroughs and reviewing lesson plans	Diagnostics, Benchmark Assessments and the FCAT use the Fair and SRI tests.

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 # In six years our school will reduce the achievement gap by 50%. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	29	35	42	48	55	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black,

Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The following subgroups did not meet the 2012 Reading Targets: Black, Hispanic
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 79% and Hispanic 74%	By 2013, 67% of Black and 61% of Hispanic students will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not receiving supplemental support.	Implement a tutorial program whose instruction correlates with the IFC.	Tutorial Monitor, Administration	Conduct CWT in the tutorial programs	Benchmark Assessment data and Diagnostic data
2	Availability of Just Right Text.	Increase amount of time students read independently during school.	Principal, Reading Coach, Assistant Principals and Teachers	Classroom Walkthroughs, LTM's, Lesson Plans, IFC	Diagnostic Data, FAIR, SRI, FCAT, Benchmark Assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	ELL subgroup did not meet the 2012 Reading Targets
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
91% of ELL students did not meet 2012 Reading Target	By 2013 80% of ELL students will not make satisfactory progress.

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	Instruction not differentiated to focus on targeted benchmarks	Ensure teachers are utilizing the Rotational Instructional Model (RIM)	SA Coaches, Administration, Teachers	Conduct CWT to ensure the RIM is being utilized with fidelity.	Data from Benchmark Assessments and Diagnostic tests
2	Available materials to differentiate instruction.	Individualize reading instruction in small groups.	Administration, Reading Coach, ESOL Contact, Classroom Teachers	Classroom Walkthroughs, LTM's, LEP Data, Lesson Plans	Diagnostic Data, FAIR, CELLA, Biweekly Assessments, FCAT

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:	SWD subgroup did not meet the 2012 Reading Targets
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

85% of SWD did not meet 2012 Reading target	By 2013, 70% of SWD will not make satisfactory progress.
---	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not receiving supplemental support.	Implement a tutorial program whose instruction correlates with the IFC.	Tutorial Monitor, Administration	Conduct CWT in the tutorial programs	Benchmark Assessment data and Diagnostic data
2	Ability to individualize instruction.	Provide tutorial activities that are individualized.	Administration, Reading Coach, ESE Contact	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs	Biweekly Assessments, Diagnostic Data, SRI, FAIR, FCAT

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:	EC DIS subgroup did not meet 2012 Reading Targets
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% of EC DIS students did not meet 2012 Reading Target	By 2013, 65% of EC DIS will not make satisfactory progress.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students progress or lack of progress needs to be monitored more frequently.	LSMS will utilize benchmark assessments based on identified areas of need/benchmarks to monitor student progress.	Principal, Assistant Principals, SA Coaches, Teachers, LTF	Regularly review benchmark assessment data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	Benchmark Assessment data.
2	Lack of classroom libraries	Implement Readers Workshop in Reading and Language Arts classes.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plans, LTM's	Diagnostic Test data, and Benchmark Assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
					The LLT and Administration will monitor the	

Readers Workshop	6th - 8th Grades	Reading Coach, TC Staff Developer	Reading & Language Arts Departments	August-June	Implementation of Readers Workshop through walkthroughs, LTM's, Lesson Plans, & collaborative planning notes	Administration, Reading Coach, Staff Developer
Reading Running Record Training	6th-8th Grades	District Personnel, Reading Coach	Reading & Language Arts Departments	September 2012	Walkthroughs, LTM's, LLT, Lesson Plan, Collaborative Planning Notes	Administration, Reading Coach, District Personnel
Collegial Planning	6th -8th grades	LTF, Administration, SAE Coaches	All instructional teachers	Weekly starting November 5th	Planning notes, Lesson Plans	Administration, LTF and SAE Coaches

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementation of Reading Plus to help students with fluency	Online subscription/Software Rental/License	Title I	\$8,500.00
			Subtotal: \$8,500.00
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
Staff development in effective writing strategies for instructional and administrative staff provided by out of state conferences.	Out of State Travel Readers Workshop and IRA	Title I	\$6,000.00
Professional Development opportunities	Provide teachers with stipends for after hours professional development and Saturdays	Title I	\$7,812.00
			Subtotal: \$13,812.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
All classrooms have adequate classroom libraries	Enhance classroom libraries; add more leveled text, books in a series and student requests	Title I	\$1,900.00
All classrooms have materials for student use	Travel drives, easels and CD's	Title I	\$600.00
Increase student achievement scores with additional support	Supplies for Tutoring: consumables, paper, hi-liters, pencils, folders, universal rolling carts, etc.	Title I	\$5,000.00
Increase student achievement with tutorials	Student transportation for tutorials	Title I	\$3,000.00
Resource Teacher to help monitor school-wide Initiaves	Salary for classroom/resource teachers	Title I	\$63,644.00
Increase student achievement with additional support	Part Time In-System	Title I	\$6,000.00
Increase student background knowledge with informational text.	Time for Kids Magazines	Title I	\$1,352.00
			Subtotal: \$81,496.00
			Grand Total: \$103,808.00

End of Reading 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:		Based on the 2012 Cella data, 32% of ESOL student in grades 6-8 were proficient in Listening/Speaking. By June 2013 50% (44) will be proficient in Listening/Speaking.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
In 2012, 32% (22) of ESOL students are proficient in Listening/Speaking.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers do not incorporate enough listening/speaking skill activities in class to enrich and promote the acquisition of a foreign language.	Provide listening/speaking activities in class to facilitate the acquisition of the new language	Administration, ESOL Contact	Teacher Observations, Lesson Studies and Curriculum Planning	Data from CELLA testing and Student-maintained monitoring portfolios SRI, FCAT Diagnostics

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:		Based on the 2012 Cella data, 16% of ESOL students are proficient in Reading. By June 2013, 40% (35) of ESOL students will be proficient in Reading.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
In 2012, 16% (11) of ESOL students are 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
1	Teachers may not understand the language acquisition process	Utilizing the English Language Development Continuum (ELDC)	Administration, ESOL Contact	Teacher Observations Lesson Study Curriculum Planning	CELLA data and Student-maintained monitoring portfolios: SRI FCAT Diagnostics

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:		Based on the 2012 Cella data, 3% of ESOL students are proficient in Writing when compared to non ESOL students. By June 2013, 25% (22) of ESOL students will be proficient in Writing when compared to non ESOL students.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					

In 2012, 3% (2) of ESOL students were proficient in Writing when compared to non ESOL students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers do not incorporate enough listening/speaking skill activities in class to enrich and promote the acquisition of a foreign language.	Provide listening/speaking activities in class to facilitate the acquisition of the new language and this will help with writing skills	Administration, CELLA data	Teacher Observations Lesson Study Curriculum Planning	CELLA data and Student-maintained monitoring portfolios: SRI FCAT Diagnostics

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

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:	Based on 2012 FCAT data, 22% of students in grades 6th-8th were proficient in math. By June of 2013, at least 35% of students will score a Level 3 or higher.
--	---

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

In 2012, 22% (134) of students scored a Level 3 or higher on FCAT math.	By June 2013, 35% (246) of students will score a Level 3 or higher in math.
---	---

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instruction not differentiated to focus on targeted benchmark improvement	Continue to utilize an IFC that targets benchmark weaknesses	Principal, Assistant Principals, SA Coaches	Administration will be aware of upcoming activities and monitor implementation via CWT.	Data from Benchmark Assessments
2	Instructional delivery not addressing the different learning styles of students	Increase the use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematics concepts.	Principal, Math Coach, Assistant Principal for Math, Teachers, and LTM Facilitator	Math Coach will assist teachers in the creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented.	Progress of students on assessments and diagnostics
3	Teachers will implement strategies to build students' foundational mathematical knowledge and skill deficiencies.	Teachers will provide support for Level 1 and Level 2 students, and Algebra EOC.	Principal, Assistant Principals, SA Coaches	Data Feedback Strategies and lesson plans will be monitored and reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and weekly learning team meetings.	Progress of students on assessments and diagnostics
4	Teachers wisely utilizing subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons.	1. Teachers will participate in a demonstration lesson to observe planning and delivering a higher order lesson. 2. Teachers will utilize subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons. 3. Teachers will receive coaching support from Reading and Math Coach in developing and implementing higher order lessons.	Principal, Math Coach, Assistant Principal for Math, Teachers, and LTM Facilitator	Administrators will monitor higher order lessons by conducting classroom walkthroughs and reviewing lesson plans.	Progress of students on assessments and diagnostics

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.	Based on 2012 FAA data, 33% of SWD students in grades 6th-8th were proficient in Math. By June of 2013, at least
--	--

Mathematics Goal #1b:	40% of students will score a Level 4,5,or 6.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 33% (6) of SWD students scored a Level 4,5,or 6 on FAA Math.	By June 2013, 40% (8) of students students will score a Level 4,5,or 6 in Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instruction not differentiated to focus on targeted EQUALS curriculum.	Continue to utilize EQUALS curriculum and ensure teachers are using the curriculum with fidelity	Administration, SA Coaches, ESE Contact	Proficiency scores on FAA and benchmark assessments	Data from FAA and benchmark assessments
2	Instruction not differentiated to focus on targeted EQUALS curriculum.	Continue to utilize EQUALS curriculum and ensure teachers are using the curriculum with fidelity	Administration, SA Coaches, ESE Contact	Proficiency scores on FAA and benchmark assessments	Data from FAA and benchmark assessments
3	Students using prior knowledge in Mathematics to make connections to the real world.	Infusing Higher Order Questioning techniques during daily instruction.	Administration, SA Coaches, ESE Contact	Data Feedback Strategies and lesson plans will be monitored and reviewed during classroom walkthroughs, weekly learning team meetings, to ensure that they are aligned with formative assessment data	Data from FAA and benchmark assessments

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In 2012, 8% of students scored a Level 4 or higher in math. By June 2012, 16% of students will score a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 8% (46) of students scored a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Math.	By June 2013, 16%(112) of students will score a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Creating effective enrichment activities via IFC to maintain and increase the level of 4 and 5 students	Monitor student time on task and Increase rigor of designed tasks	Principal, Assistant Principals, SA Coaches and Teachers	Administration will be aware of the IFC's upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walk-throughs.	Benchmark Data
2	Students not actively engaged during instructional delivery in math class	Continue to utilize the FCIM to implement specific strategies for students performing above mastery to increase engagement	Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers, LTF and Mathematics Coach	Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment.	Progress of all students on diagnostic and benchmark assessments.

3	Teachers need to plan and provide differentiated instruction in a small group setting using the "Gradual Release Model".	<p>1. Teachers will analyze multiple sources of data to group students for small group/differentiated instruction.</p> <p>2. Teachers will meet during common planning to develop lessons for small group/differentiated instruction infusing the "Gradual Release Model".</p> <p>3. Teachers will implement small group/differentiated instruction infusing the "Gradual Release Model".</p> <p>4. Teachers will receive coaching support through the full coaching cycle (co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing).</p>	Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers, LTF and Mathematics Coach	Administrators and Math Coaches will monitor differentiated instruction in a small group infusing the "Gradual Release Model" by reviewing data binders, lesson plans, and conducting classroom walkthroughs.	Progress of all students on diagnostic and benchmark assessments.
---	--	---	---	---	---

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Based on 2012 FAA Math, 61% of SWD students scored a proficiency level of 7 or higher, by June 2013 70% of SWD students will score a proficiency level of 7 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 61% (11) of SWD students scored a proficiency score of 7 or higher on FAA Math.	By June 2013 70% (11) of SWD students will score a proficiency level of 7 or higher on FAA Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not actively engaged during instructional delivery in class.	Continue to utilize FCIM to implement specific strategies for students performing above mastery to increase engagement	Administration, SA Coach, Teachers	Review of student grouping to ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment data.	Progress of students on assessments and FAA.
2	Students not actively engaged during instructional delivery in math class.	Continue to utilize FCIM to implement specific strategies for students performing above mastery to increase engagement	Administration, SA Coach, Teachers	Review of student grouping to ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment data.	Progress of students on assessments and FAA.
3	Differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all learners	Utilize the FCIM to identify strategies that are working and implement them throughout the math department.	Administration, SA Coach, Teachers	Data Feedback Strategies and lesson plans will be monitored and reviewed during classroom walkthroughs,	Progress of students on assessments and FAA.

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:	In 2012, 58% of students made learning gains on FCAT Math. By June 2013, 68% of students will make learning gains on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 58% (223)of students made learning gains on FCAT Math.	By June 2013, 68% (477) of student in grades 6th-8th will make learning gains on FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not aware of their individual performance targets	Student achievement chats will be conducted with all students following diagnostic assessments and benchmark assessments and documented in student portfolios	Principal, Assistant Principal, SA Coaches	Review of student portfolios and/or review of teachers data binder	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if data chats are successful and check student portfolios.
2	Instruction not differentiated to meet the needs of all learners	Increase the use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematics concepts.	Principal, Mathematics Coach, Assistant Principal, Math, Science and Elective Teachers	Math Coach will assist teachers in the creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented.	Progress of students on benchmark and diagnostic assessment data.
3	Students not actively engaged during instructional delivery of content by Math Teachers	Continue to utilize the FCIM to identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment.	Principal, Mathematics Coach, Assistant Principals, Math Teachers	Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment.	Progress of students on benchmark and diagnostic assessment data.
4	Teachers wisely utilizing subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons.	1. Teachers will participate in a demonstration lesson to observe planning and delivering a higher order lesson. 2. Teachers will utilize subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons. 3. Teachers will receive coaching support from Math Coach in developing and implementing higher order lessons.	Principal, Mathematics Coach, Assistant Principals, Math Teachers	Administrators will monitor higher order lessons by conducting classroom walkthroughs and reviewing lesson plans	Progress of students on benchmark and diagnostic assessment data

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Based on 2012 FAA, 39% of SWD students made learning gains in Math. By June 2013 50% of SWD students will make learning gains on FAA.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 39% (7) of SWD students made learning gains on FAA Math	By June 2013 50% (9) of SWD students will make learning gains on FAA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not aware of their individual performance targets	Student achievement chats will be conducted with all students following benchmark assessments	Administration, SA Coaches	Review of student portfolios and/or review of teachers data binder.	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if data chats are successful.
2	Instruction not differentiated to focus on targeted benchmarks needing improvement.	Continue to utilize EQUALS curriculum with fidelity.	Administration, SA Coaches, ESE Contact	Review of assessment data	Teacher made assessments and FAA.
3	Students using prior knowledge in Mathematics to make connections to the real world.	Infusing Higher Order Questioning techniques during daily instruction.	Administration, SA Coaches, ESE Contact	Data Feedback Strategies and lesson plans will be monitored and reviewed during classroom walkthroughs, weekly learning team meetings to ensure that they are aligned with formative assessment data	Teacher made assessments and FAA.

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:	In 2012, 64% of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT Math. By June 2013, 75% of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT Math.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 64% (113) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in math.	By June 2013, 75% (134) of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not receiving supplemental support.	Implement a tutorial program whose instruction correlates with the IFC.	Tutorial Monitor, Administration	Conduct CWT in the tutorial programs	Benchmark Assessment data and Diagnostic data
2	Instruction not differentiated to meet the needs of all learners	Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing benchmark assessment data for all students within bottom quartile. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based	Math Coach, LTM Facilitator	Grade-level teams will review results of benchmark assessment data every other week to determine progress toward benchmark	Benchmark assessments tied to Math Standards/identified as areas of weakness

		instruction/ interventions within the mathematics blocks.			
3	Students may need additional time to grasp a concept beyond pacing guide limits	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of benchmark assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction.	Math Coach, LTM Facilitator	Grade-level teams will review results of benchmark assessment data every other week to determine progress toward benchmark	Benchmark assessments tied to Math Standards/identified as areas of weakness
4	Students may need additional time to grasp a concept beyond pacing guide limits	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	RtI Facilitator/ RtITeam	Grade-level teams will review results of benchmark assessment data weekly to determine progress toward benchmark	Benchmark assessments tied to Math Standards/identified as areas of weakness
5	Teachers wisely utilizing subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons.	1. Teachers will participate in a demonstration lesson to observe planning and delivering a higher order lesson. 2. Teachers will utilize subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons. 3. Teachers will receive coaching support from Math Coach in developing and implementing higher order lessons.	Administration, SA Coacn and LTF	Administrators and Math Coache will monitor differentiated instruction in a small group infusing the "Gradual Release Model" by reviewing data binders, lesson plans, and conducting classroom walkthroughs.	Benchmark assessment data, diagnostic data and FCAT

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 # In six years our school will reduce the achievement gap by 50%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

	41	47	52	57	63	
--	----	----	----	----	----	--

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:	The Black and Hispanic subgroup did not meet the 2012 Math Targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% Black and 63% Hispanic	By 2013, 57% of Black students and 47% of Hispanic students will not make satisfactory progress.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not receiving supplemental support.	Implement a tutorial program whose instruction correlates with the IFC.	Tutorial Monitor, Administration	Conduct CWT in the tutorial programs	Benchmark Assessment data and Diagnostic data
2	Students weaknesses may not be identified and/or remediated prior to end of year assessments (FCAT)	Continue to create an Instructional Focus Calendar for Math and Science classes that targets specific areas of instruction based on student data.	Math Coach, Assistant Principal, Teachers	Administration will review lesson plans and monitor daily instruction via CWT's	Lesson Plans, Diagnostic Data and Secondary Benchmark data
3	Teachers will implement strategies to build students' foundational mathematical knowledge and skill deficiencies.	Teachers will utilize bell ringer to review and maintain proficiency with benchmark Teachers will provide support for Level 1 and Level 2 students	Math Coach, Assistant Principal, Teachers	Administration will review lesson plans and monitor daily instruction via CWT's	Lesson Plans, Diagnostic Data and FCAT

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:	The ELL subgroup did not meet the 2012 Math Targets
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% of ELL students did not meet the 2012 Math Targets.	By 2013, 69% of ELL students will not make satisfactory progress.

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	Instruction not differentiated to focus on targeted benchmarks	Ensure teachers are utilizing the Rotational Instructional Model (RIM)	SA Coaches, Administration, Teachers	Conduct CWT to ensure the RIM is being utilized with fidelity.	Data from Benchmark Assessments and Diagnostic tests

2	Students may need additional assistance beyond the regular classroom time	Provide students with after-school tutorial opportunities	SA Coaches, Administration, Teachers	Students will take assessments at the completion of benchmark instruction to gauge their level of mastery	2013 FCAT, Fall/Winter Diagnostics and Benchmark Assessment data
3	Teachers will utilize data to make instructional decisions and differentiate instruction to all levels of student achievement.	Professional development and collegial planning in subject area PLC's	SA Coaches, Administration, Teachers	Data Feedback Strategies and lesson plans will be monitored and reviewed during classroom walkthroughs	2013 FCAT, Fall/Winter Diagnostics and Benchmark Assessment data

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The SWD subgroup did not meet the 2012 Math Targets
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84% of SWD did not meet the 2012 Math Targets.	By 2012, 61% of SWD will not make satisfactory progress.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not receiving supplemental support.	Implement a tutorial program whose instruction correlates with the IFC.	Tutorial Monitor, Administration	Conduct CWT in the tutorial programs	Benchmark Assessment data and Diagnostic data
2	Instruction not differentiated to meet the needs of all learners	Increase the use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematics concepts.	Principal, Mathematics Coach, Assistant Principal and Teachers	Math Coach will assist teachers in the creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented.	Diagnostic data secondary benchmark data and nine week exams
3	Students progress or lack of progress is not closely monitored	Identify and closely monitor the progress of the lowest 25 percentile consistently; revise instruction and intervention groups as indicated by student progress.	Principal, Mathematics Coach	Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized with the lowest 25 percentile.	Increased achievement between assessments.

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	The EC DIS subgroup did not meet the 2012 Math Targets
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% of EC DIS students did not meet the 2012 Math Targets.	By 2013, 53% of EC DIS students will not make progress

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students progress or lack of progress needs to be monitored more frequently.	LSMS will utilize benchmark assessments based on identified areas of need/benchmarks to monitor student progress.	Principal, Assistant Principals, SA Coaches, Teachers, LTF	Regularly review benchmark assessment data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	Benchmark Assessment data.
2	Instruction not differentiated to target benchmarks needing improvement	Continue to create an Instructional Focus Calendar for Math and Science classes that targets the weakest benchmark and weight for exposure during warm up (Do Now)	Math Coach, Assistant Principals, Science, Math, Elective Teachers and LTF	Administration will review lesson plans for inclusion and monitor instruction delivery through classroom walk-throughs.	Diagnostic data, secondary benchmark data, quarterly exam data

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	By June 2013 100% of all students taking the Algebra EOC will score a level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	By June 2013 100% (40) of all students taking the Algebra EOC will score a level 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	Instruction delivery not addressing the individual needs of all students.	Increase the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to reinforce algebra concepts	Administration, SA Coach, LTF	SA Coach will create a schedule and activities where students will utilize the math lab.	Progress of students on all assessments.
2	Teachers wisely utilizing grade level common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons.	<p>1. Teachers will participate in a demonstration lesson to observe planning and delivering a higher order lesson.</p> <p>2. Teachers will utilize grade level common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons.</p> <p>3. Teachers will receive coaching support from Math Coach in developing and</p>	Administration, SA Coach, LTF	Administrators will monitor higher order lessons by conducting classroom walkthroughs and reviewing lesson plans.	Diagnostic Data, Benchmark Assessment and Algebra EOC

	implementing higher order lessons.		
--	------------------------------------	--	--

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:	By June 2013 100% of all students taking the Algebra EOC will score a level 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	By June 2013 100% (40) of all students taking the Algebra EOC will score a level 4 or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instruction delivery not addressing the individual needs of all students.	Increase the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to reinforce algebra concepts	Administration, SA Coach, LTF	SA Coach will create a schedule and activities where students will utilize the math lab.	Progress of students on all assessments.
2	Teachers wisely utilizing grade level common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons.	1. Teachers will participate in a demonstration lesson to observe planning and delivering a higher order lesson. 2. Teachers will utilize grade level common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons. 3. Teachers will receive coaching support from Math Coach in developing and implementing higher order lessons.	Administration, SA Coach, LTF	Administrators will monitor higher order lessons by conducting classroom walkthroughs and reviewing lesson plans.	Diagnostic Data, Benchmark Assessment and Algebra EOC

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
EDW/Data Analysis	6-8	SA Coaches	All Teachers	10/8/2012	Learning Team Meetings, Review of Teachers Data Binder and Student Portfolios.	SA Coaches, LTF and Administration
FCIM	6-8	Math Coach	All Teachers	9/13/2012	Classroom walkthroughs, Review of lesson plans Learning Team Meetings	PD Facilitator, Administration
AVID Strategies	6-8	Math and Science Coach	All Teachers	Ongoing every Tuesday and Wednesday	Learning Team Meetings, Review of Teachers Data Binder and Student Portfolios.	SA Coaches, LTF and Administration
Writing Across the	6-8	Area Writing Specialist, Language	All Teachers	10/8/2012	Learning Team Meetings and	SA Coaches, LTF and

Curriculum		Arts Department Chair			Student Portfolios	Administration
Lesson Studies, Use of Manipulatives, Edmodo Training, Progress Monitoring	6-8	Math Coach	Math/Science Teachers	Ongoing every Tuesday and Wednesday	Learning Team Meetings, Review of Teachers Data Binder and Student Portfolios.	SA Coaches, LTF and 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
Curriculum conferences	Out of State Travel NTCM Conference	Title I	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$2,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Ensure students have the necessary materials for hands on activities	Provide classroom supplies to include: Mobi Pens, timers, clickers, scissors, markers, crayons, colored pencils, and sentence strips for whole and small group work	Title I	\$1,000.00
Provide a Math Coach to provide in house professional development, modeling, and coaching for classroom teachers	Salary for Coach, resource teacher/LTF	Title I	\$67,588.00
Professional development during school hours	Substitutes for teacher release time to attend professional development	Title I	\$6,258.00
			Subtotal: \$74,846.00
			Grand Total: \$77,346.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a:	In June 2012, 10% of students scored a Level 3 on FCAT Science. By June 2013, 20% of students will score a Level 3 or higher on FCAT Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 10% (39) of students scored a Level 3 on FCAT Science.	By June 2013, 20% (45) of students will score a Level 3 on FCAT Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may not be given any real world experiences when dealing with science concepts	Provide real world science experiences via projects or technology simulation	Science Resource Teacher, AP, Principal, Teachers	Data analysis from secondary benchmark assessments will inform reteaching methods and content focus.	Benchmark Assessments and Fall and Winter Diagnostic Results
2	Instructional delivery may not reach the different learning styles of all students	Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments. Provide real world science experiences via projects or technology simulation Provide weekly opportunities to work in collaborative or small-group learning activities that help students construct their own knowledge. Teachers/Coach will model and implement use of research based strategies to support active learning in the classroom	Principal, Assistant Principals, Science Coach, Science teachers and LTF	CWT trends and student portfolios, LTF meetings	Benchmark Assessments and Fall and Winter Diagnostic Results, classroom benchmark data charts, teacher data binders and evidence of exemplar student work supporting the rigor of the assignment and descriptive feedback.
3	Students are not grasping science concepts in the time allotted during class	Science Resource Teacher will push in/pull out to science classes and or science lab to offer additional support to those students.	School Administration, Science Coach	Data analysis from secondary benchmark assessments will inform reteaching methods and content focus.	Benchmark Assessments, Fall and Winter Diagnostic Results and Progress monitoring log
4	Students may not have an opportunity to write daily	Students will complete exit tickets, maintain the INB (Interactive Notebook), where opportunities for journaling and reflection will be recorded. Monthly writing assignments that will focus on current issues.	School Administration, Science Coach and LTF	Monthly writing samples for review.	Writing data, portfolio and INB
5	FCAT Testing Schedule	Testing Coordinator will alter the date of the exam	Testing Coordinator, Principal and Science Coach	Science scores on Winter Diagnostic	Winter Diagnostic 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 science. Science Goal #1b:	In 2012, 40% of SWD students scored a level 4,5,6 on FAA Science. By June 2013 50% will score a level 4,5,or 6.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 40% (2) of students scored a level 4,5,or 6 on	By June 2013 50% (9) will score a level 4,5,or 6 on FAA

FAA Science.			Science		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may not be given any real world experiences when dealing with science concepts	Provide real world science experiences via projects, inquiry based labs or technology simulation	Administration, SA Coach, LTF	Data analysis from assessments	all teacher and district made assessments
2	Instruction needs to be differentiated to focus on targeted benchmark improvement.	Use ACCESS Curriculum and manipulatives	Administration, SA Coach	Proficiency scores on FAA and benchmark assessments	all teacher and district made assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	In June 2012, 2% of students scored a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Science. By June 2013, 6% of students will score a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 2% (5) of students scored a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Science.	By June 2013, 6% (13) of students will score a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not actively engaged during instruction delivery in science class	Continue to utilize the FCIM to implement specific strategies for students performing above mastery	Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Resource Teacher, science teachers and LTF	Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment.	Data from benchmark assessments, Fall and Winter Diagnostic results, student progress monitoring log and student portfolio.
2	Instructional delivery may not reach the different learning styles of all students	Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments. Provide real world science experiences via projects or technology simulation. Provide weekly opportunities to work in collaborative or small-group learning activities that help students construct their own knowledge. Teachers/Coach will model and implement use of research based strategies to support active learning in the	Principal, Assistant Principals, Science Coach, Science teachers and LTF	CWT trends and student portfolios, LTF meetings	Benchmark Assessments and Fall and Winter Diagnostic Results, classroom benchmark data charts, teacher data binders and evidence of exemplar student work supporting the rigor of the assignment and descriptive feedback.

		classroom			
3	Teachers wisely utilizing subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons.	<p>1. Teachers will participate in a demonstration lesson to observe planning and delivering a higher order lesson.</p> <p>2. Teachers will utilize subject area common planning to effectively develop higher order lessons.</p> <p>3. Teachers will receive coaching support from Science Coach in developing and implementing higher order lessons.</p>	Principal, Assistant Principals, Science Coach, Science teachers and LTF	Administrators will monitor higher order lessons by conducting classroom walkthroughs and reviewing lesson plans	Data from benchmark assessments, Fall and Winter Diagnostic results, student progress monitoring log and student portfolio.

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:	In 2012, 60% of SWD students scored a level 7 or higher on FAA Science, by June 2013 70% of those students will score a 7 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 60% (10) of SWD students scored a level 7 or higher on FAA Science.	By June 2013, 70% (12) of SWD students will score a level 7 or higher on FAA Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not grasping the concepts in the time allotted for class	The SA Coach will push in to science classes to offer additional support to those students	Administration, SA Coach, LTF	Data analysis on assessments	Data on all teacher and district assessments.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
AVID Strategies	6-8	Math and Science Coach	All Teachers	Ongoing every Tuesday and Wednesday	Learning Team Meetings, Review of Teachers Data Binder and Student Portfolios.	SA Coaches, LTF and Administration

Lesson Studies, Use of Manipulatives, Edmodo Training, Progress Monitoring	6-8	Math/Science Coach	Math/Science Teachers	Ongoing every Tuesday and Wednesday	Learning Team Meetings, Review of Teachers Data Binder and Student Portfolios.	SA Coaches, LTF and Administration
EDW/Data Analysis	6-8	SA Coaches	All Teachers	10/8/2012	Learning Team Meetings, Review of Teachers Data Binder and Student Portfolios.	SA Coaches, LTF and Administration
FCIM	6-8	Math Coach	All Teachers	9/13/2012	Classroom walkthroughs, Review of lesson plans Learning Team Meetings	PD Facilitator, Administration
Writing Across the Curriculum	6-8	Area Writing Specialist, Language Arts Department Chair	All Teachers	10/8/2012	Learning Team Meetings and Student Portfolios	SA Coaches, LTF and Administration

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
Exposing students to various science related technology	EDUWare wizard game clickers	Title I	\$1,200.00
			Subtotal: \$1,200.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Staff Development in effective science strategies	Curriculum conferences to include NSTA	Title I	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$2,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide a Science Coach to provide in-house staff development, modeling and coaching for teachers.	Salary for Coach	Title I	\$67,588.00
Enrichment opportunities for students	Transportation to Museum of Science	Title I	\$1,420.00
Exposing students to science activities through hands on activities	Non-Consumable science supplies such as lab kits	Title I	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$70,008.00
			Grand Total: \$73,708.00

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:	In June 2012, 76% of students scored a Level 3 or higher on FCAT Writes. By June 2013, 80% of students will score a Level 3 or higher on FCAT Writes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 76% (162) of students scored a Level 3 or higher on FCAT Writes.	By June 2013, 80% (179) of students will score a Level 3 or higher on FCAT Writes.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may not have opportunities to practice writing daily.	Students will complete exit tickets at the end of each class period; all writing will be dated, and recorded in a notebook/ or work folder for monitoring of growth across time. Students will complete a writing prompt (simulation of the FCAT Writes) monthly-Palm Beach Writes	Principal, Language Arts Department Leader, AP and Writing Resource Teacher	Writing work folder/notebook will be monitored in all Language Arts classes, bi-weekly writing samples for review by AP, Principal and Writing Resource teacher	Palm Beach Writes data and work folders
2	Writing instruction may not be delivered at the level required for students to grasp and retain.	The revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and seen in student writing drafts.	Principal, Language Arts Department Leader, AP and Writing Resource Teacher	Writing work folder/notebook will be monitored in all Language Arts classes, monthly writing samples for review by AP, Principal and Writing Resource teacher	Palm Beach Writes data and student work folders
3	Teachers will use common planning to develop lessons that explicitly address the writing process.	1. Teachers will participate in professional development in the writing process. 2. Teachers will use common planning to develop and implement lessons that explicitly address the writing process. 3. Teachers in need of additional support will receive coaching assistance through the full coaching cycle.	Principal, Language Arts Department Leader, AP and Writing Resource Teacher	Administrators will monitor the fidelity of the writing process by attending common planning meetings and reviewing student work	Effectiveness will be determined by monthly Palm Beach Writes, school-wide writing assessments, and student performance on the 2013 FCAT Writes.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	In 2012, 100% of SWD students who take the FAA scored a level 4 or higher on Writing, By June of 2013 SWD students who take FAA will maintain proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 100% (4) of students who take the FAA scored	By June of 2013 SWD students who take FAA will

a level 4 or higher on Writing.			maintain proficiency.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not given the opportunity to write across all subject areas	Teachers are required to have all students complete exit tickets at the end of class.	Administration, SA Coaches, LTF, ESE Contact	Exit ticket samples	LSMS and Palm Beach Writes data.
2	Teachers will use common planning to develop lessons that explicitly address the writing process.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will participate in professional development in the writing process. Teachers will use common planning to develop and implement lessons that explicitly address the writing process. Teachers in need of additional support will receive coaching assistance through the full coaching cycle. 	Administration, SA Coaches, LTF	Administrators will monitor the fidelity of the writing process by attending common planning meetings and reviewing student work.	Effectiveness will be determined by monthly Palm Beach Writes, school-wide writing assessments, and student performance on the 2013 FCAT Writes.

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
Teaching the Writing Process	6-8	Isles, Jabouin and West Area Writing Team	Language Arts, Reading and Social Studies Teachers	11/6/2012 12/6/2012 1/24/2013 2/7/2013 3/7/2013	Data from Palm Beach Writes brought to Learning Team Meetings	Administration, SA Coaches, Language Arts Department Chair
How to Score Essays	6-8	Isles, Jabouin and West Area Writing Team	Language Arts, Reading and Social Studies Teachers	11/6/2012 12/6/2012 1/24/2013 2/7/2013 3/7/2013	Data from Palm Beach Writes brought to Learning Team Meetings	Administration, SA Coaches, Language Arts Department Chair

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

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:	By June 2013 the percentage of students with excessive absences will decrease by 2%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:

93% of all students were in attendance for the 2011-2012 school year.	For the 2012-2013 school year 95% of all students will be in attendance.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
55 students were absent for more than 10 days during the 2011-2012 school year.	The number of students who will have more than 10 days absent will average around 30.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
249 students had excessive tardies during the 2011-2012 school year	The number of students with excessive tardies will decrease by more than 40% for the upcoming school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	There may be underlying conditions causing students to have excessive unexcused absences from school	Utilize the phone dialer to inform parents of their child's daily attendance. Employ a Parent Liaison to conduct home visits to ensure school attendance.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Attendance Clerk, Parent Liaison	The number of students with excessive unexcused absences will decrease	Attendance Reports, Truancy referrals, Suspension data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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:	By June 2013, the number of students suspended will decrease by 3 percentage points.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
287	The expected number of students placed in ISS for the FY 13 school year will be 278
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
173 students were placed in ISS for the 2011-2012 school year.	167 students or less will be suspended in school.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
460	The expected number of students placed in OSS for the FY 13 school year will be 446
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
237 students were given an Out of School suspension for the FY 12 school year	229 students or less will be suspended out of 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
	Changing negative, entrenched student behaviors.	Implement "Positive Behavior Support" (PBS) program. Ensure students are represented on school leadership teams and focus groups when choosing reinforcers and	Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Staff, Staff Development resource teacher, Department Leaders and Team Leaders	Collect and analyze suspension data weekly with Administration and monthly with entire faculty. Informal/formal observations, Anecdotal feedback from staff	Gold Report data, Terms data, discipline referrals, Team Meeting minutes

1		determining behavior plans. Send representatives to training that promotes multicultural education. Cultural diversity awareness issues will also be incorporated into selected PDD sections.			
2	Getting school-wide buy-in of a new positive behavior support system that is multi-faceted and highly-focused.	Provide professional development for all faculty and staff in Single School Culture for behavior.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Staff and Team Leaders	Collect and analyze suspension data weekly with Administration and monthly with entire faculty.	Gold Report data, Terms data, discipline referrals, Team Meeting minutes
3	Changing negative, entrenched student behaviors.	Host a grade level recognition program each month for the grade level with the least amount of discipline incidents. Raffles that are tied to tardies, discipline and dress code.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Staff and Team Leaders	Collect and analyze suspension data weekly with Administration.	Gold Report data, Terms data, discipline referrals, Team Meeting minutes
4	Changing negative, entrenched student behaviors.	Implement a school-wide student recognition program providing positive feedback to parents via U.S. mail.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Staff and Teachers	Collect and analyze suspension data weekly with Administration and monthly with entire faculty.	Gold Report data, Terms data, discipline referrals, Team Meeting minutes
5	Changing negative, entrenched student behaviors.	Nominate a student of the month from every grade level based on created rubric for selection	Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Staff and Teachers	Collect and analyze suspension data weekly with Administration and monthly with entire faculty.	Gold Report data, Terms data, discipline referrals, Team Meeting minutes

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
SwPBS Program Professional Development	All Grades All Subjects	SwPBS personnel	All Teachers and non-instructional staff	Monthly Grade Level Meetings	Check SASSY report regarding OSS.	Administration, SwPBS personnel

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
An effective Tardy Diversion program	Purchase an Electronic Time Clock.	Title I	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
			Grand Total: \$300.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		Our goal is to improve parental involvement by offering activities that parents can volunteer and/or be a part of.			
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
25%		35%			
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
	Parents may not know how important it is for them to participate in the school's decision making process	<p>1. Parents will be invited to Open House and grade level specific Curriculum Night workshops.</p> <p>2. Parents are encouraged to become actively involved in the decision-making process at school by serving on SAC or volunteering on site.</p> <p>3. Parents have opportunities to serve on curriculum, discipline or other types of committees.</p> <p>4. Form partnerships</p>	Parent Liaison, Administration, SAC President and Teachers	Collect participation data and survey families.	Parent Attendance Sign-In sheets, Climate Surveys, Title I Surveys and Telephone Logs

with outside agencies, businesses, community members and institutions for higher education as a way of enhancing the cultural capital for children while providing effective communication and parental involvement.

5. Provide teachers with inservice on effective communication and parental involvement.

6. District Title I staff will meet with Parent Liaison and Principal to support Family Involvement.

7. Invite parents to school activities that reinforce

class work, such as the Science Fair.

8. Provide parents with workshops to assist students with FCAT preparation.

9. Encourage parents to attend conferences regarding student performance and report cards.

10. Information will be sent home in the language and format parents can understand.

11. A Parent Resource Room with learning materials, computer access and supplies will be made available for parents to utilize.

12. Teachers will contact all parents throughout the year to maintain a positive line of communication.

13. Utilize parent liaison to increase parent involvement and communication.

14. Parents will have access to computer training

	and technology through access of school related programs.			
	15. Parents will receive an information letter as well as an invite to our annual Title I meeting where all aspects of Title I will be discussed.			

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
FCAT Parent Nights for reading/math/writing&science	6-8/All Content	Academic Coaches	Parents	January 2013 – March 2013	Monitor using sign in sheet	Administration Parent Liaison
Provide professional development opportunities for all staff on How to have a successful conference.	6-8/ All content	Professional development team and Administration	All Staff	November 2012-March 2013	Parent Conference Notes, Reflection session with teachers, feedback from parents through Title I Survey's and SEQs	Administration and Guidance Counselors

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
Collaboration with other Parent Liaisons within the area	Attend Parent Trainings and Conferences	Title I	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Providing ongoing parent literacy training	Refreshments for parents	Title I	\$500.00
A person who can be the bridge between the parents and the school	Salary for Community Resource Person	Title I	\$31,822.00

The link between home and school needs to be better	Parent Communicator folders and student agendas	Title I	\$2,300.00
			Subtotal: \$34,622.00
			Grand Total: \$34,922.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:		All students enrolled in the pre-medical class will be able to successfully complete the required high school coursework.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students enrolled in the middle school program may not be interested in a career in medical science	Ensuring that students enrolled in the class are aware of what is required to be successful in the program	Guidance Counselors, Administration, Teacher	The level of engagement observed when completing CWT and the number of students who successfully complete the high school program	Successful completion of high school coursework.

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
Reading	Implementation of Reading Plus to help students with fluency	Online subscription/Software Rental/License	Title I	\$8,500.00
				Subtotal: \$8,500.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	Exposing students to various science related technology	EDUWare wizard game clickers	Title I	\$1,200.00
				Subtotal: \$1,200.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Staff development in effective writing strategies for instructional and administrative staff provided by out of state conferences.	Out of State Travel Readers Workshop and IRA	Title I	\$6,000.00
Reading	Professional Development opportunities	Provide teachers with stipends for after hours professional development and Saturdays	Title I	\$7,812.00
Mathematics	Curriculum conferences	Out of State Travel NTCM Conference	Title I	\$2,500.00
Science	Staff Development in effective science strategies	Curriculum conferences to include NSTA	Title I	\$2,500.00
Parent Involvement	Collaboration with other Parent Liaisons within the area	Attend Parent Trainings and Conferences	Title I	\$300.00
				Subtotal: \$19,112.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	All classrooms have adequate classroom libraries	Enhance classroom libraries; add more leveled text, books in a series and student requests	Title I	\$1,900.00
Reading	All classrooms have materials for student use	Travel drives, easels and CD's	Title I	\$600.00
Reading	Increase student achievement scores with additional support	Supplies for Tutoring: consumables, paper, hi-liters, pencils, folders, universal rolling carts, etc.	Title I	\$5,000.00
Reading	Increase student achievement with tutorials	Student transportation for tutorials	Title I	\$3,000.00
Reading	Resource Teacher to help monitor school-wide Initiatives	Salary for classroom/resource teachers	Title I	\$63,644.00
Reading	Increase student achievement with additional support	Part Time In-System	Title I	\$6,000.00
Reading	Increase student background knowledge with informational text.	Time for Kids Magazines	Title I	\$1,352.00
		Provide classroom supplies to include:		

Mathematics	Ensure students have the necessary materials for hands on activities	Mobi Pens, timers, clickers, scissors, markers, crayons, colored pencils, and sentence strips for whole and small group work	Title I	\$1,000.00
Mathematics	Provide a Math Coach to provide in house professional development, modeling, and coaching for classroom teachers	Salary for Coach, resource teacher/LTF	Title I	\$67,588.00
Mathematics	Professional development during school hours	Substitutes for teacher release time to attend professional development	Title I	\$6,258.00
Science	Provide a Science Coach to provide in-house staff development, modeling and coaching for teachers.	Salary for Coach	Title I	\$67,588.00
Science	Enrichment opportunities for students	Transportation to Museum of Science	Title I	\$1,420.00
Science	Exposing students to science activities through hands on activities	Non-Consumable science supplies such as lab kits	Title I	\$1,000.00
Suspension	An effective Tardy Diversion program	Purchase an Electronic Time Clock.	Title I	\$300.00
Parent Involvement	Providing ongoing parent literacy training	Refreshments for parents	Title I	\$500.00
Parent Involvement	A person who can be the bridge between the parents and the school	Salary for Community Resource Person	Title I	\$31,822.00
Parent Involvement	The link between home and school needs to be better	Parent Communicator folders and student agendas	Title I	\$2,300.00
				Subtotal: \$261,272.00
				Grand Total: \$290,084.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 1/14/2013)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount

Incentives for students

\$1,000.00

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

SAC will review SIP and Parent Compact periodically, and will design events as incentives for student academic and behavioral goals

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Palm Beach School District LAKE SHORE MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	32%	50%	80%	21%	183	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	50%	63%			113	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	69% (YES)	73% (YES)			142	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					438	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Palm Beach School District LAKE SHORE MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	39%	52%	84%	24%	199	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	54%	68%			122	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	61% (YES)	69% (YES)			130	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					451	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested