

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: PONCE DE LEON MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Martha C. Chang

SAC Chair: Stephanie Milford

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/10/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Martha C. Chang	Degrees: Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education, Indiana University Master of Science in Mathematics Education, Florida State University Educational Specialist in Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern Educational Specialist in Education,	1	10	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A C C B A AMO 61 High Standards Rdg. 60 15 12 46 70 High Standards Math 58 41 42 74 71 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 71 41 41 59 67 Lrng Gains-Math 73 70 77 77 75 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 57 49 58 66 Gains-Math-25% 71 65 89 73 75

		University of Central Florida Certifications: Middle Grades Math (5-9), Gifted Endorsement and Educational Leadership			
Assis Principal	Yader F. Lacayo	Degrees: Bachelor of Science in Mathematics Education Master of Science in Mathematics Certifications: Math Grades 6-12 Ed. Leadership	4	4	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A AMO 61 57 High Standards Rdg. 60 69 71 High Standards Math 58 64 65 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 71 66 66 Lrng Gains-Math 73 71 68 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 70 65 Gains-Math-25% 71 68 68
Assis Principal	Jeanette Sierra-Funcia	Degrees: Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice Master of Science – Education Certifications: Ed. Leadership, Social Science, MG Social Science	3	9	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A D D C AMO 61 57 High Standards Rdg. 60 69 35 35 35 High Standards Math 58 64 41 35 36 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 71 66 51 57 54 Lrng Gains-Math 73 71 61 59 65 Gains-Rdg-25% 71 70 58 69 61 Gains-Math-25% 71 68 60 65 69

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.

	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)
No data submitted					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Reading and/or Mathematics coach	Principal	Monthly	
2	2. Mentor teacher partnership	Assistant Principals	Monthly	
3	3. Soliciting referrals from current employees	Principal	N/A	

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	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
---	---

effective. There are currently 7 instructional staff that are teaching out-of-field. There is one instructional staff member who received less than an effective rating	Teachers will be encouraged to take the subject area certification exam in the content area they are currently assigned to teach.
--	---

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
62	0.0%(0)	17.7%(11)	59.7%(37)	22.6%(14)	56.5%(35)	69.4%(43)	16.1%(10)	3.2%(2)	24.2%(15)

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

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

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

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Ponce de Leon Middle School provides services and support to migrant students and parents. The District Migrant liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs and conducts a comprehensive needs assessment of migrant students to ensure that the unique needs of migrant students are met.

Title I, Part D

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

Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:

1. training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
2. training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL
3. training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.

Title III

Ponce de Leon Middle School uses Title III funds to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learner (ELL) and immigrant students by providing funds to implement and/or provide:

1. Tutorial programs
2. Parent outreach activities through Bilingual Parent Outreach Program (BPOP)
3. Behavioral/mental counseling services
4. Reading and supplementary instructional materials
5. Hardware and software for the development of language and literacy skills in reading, mathematics and science, is purchased to be used by ELL and immigrant students
6. Coaching and mentoring for ESOL and content area teachers
7. Professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers

Title X- Homeless

1. The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.
2. The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and are provided with all entitlements.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Ponce de Leon Middle School receives funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.

Violence Prevention Programs

Ponce de Leon Middle School is a participant in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program.

1. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, Drug Free Youth In Town (DFYIT), addresses violence and drug prevention and intervention services for students through curriculum implemented by classroom teachers, counselors, and the TRUST Specialist.
2. Training and technical assistance for elementary, middle, and senior high school teachers, administrators, counselors, TRUST Specialists, and Safe School Specialists are also a component of this program.
3. The Safe School Specialists provide training and follow-up activities to all school staff in the areas of violence prevention, stress management and crisis management.
4. TRUST Specialists focus on counseling students to solve problems related to drugs and alcohol, stress, suicide, isolation, family violence and other crisis.

Nutrition Programs

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

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

By promoting Career Pathways and Programs of Study students will become academy program completers and have a better understanding and appreciation of the postsecondary opportunities available and a plan for how to acquire the skills necessary to take advantage of those opportunities.

Articulation allows students to earn college and postsecondary technical credits in high school and provide more opportunities for students to complete 2 and 4 year postsecondary degrees.

Students will gain an understanding of business and industry workforce requirements by acquiring Ready to Work and other industry certifications.

Job Training

N/A

Other

Health Connect in Our Schools

- Health Connect in Our Schools (HCiOS) offers a coordinated level of school-based healthcare which integrates education, medical and/or social and human services on school grounds.
- Teams at designated school sites are staffed by a School Social Worker (shared between schools), a Nurse (shared between schools) and a full-time Health Aide.
- HCiOS services reduces or eliminates barriers to care, connects eligible students with health insurance and a medical home, and provides care for students who are not eligible for other services.
- HCiOS delivers coordinated social work and mental/behavioral health interventions in a timely manner.
- HCiOS enhances the health education activities provided by the schools and by the health department.

HCiOS offers a trained health team that is qualified to perform the assigned duties related to a quality school health care program.

HIV/AIDS Curriculum: AIDS Get the Facts!

- AIDS: GET the Facts!, is an curriculum that provides a series of general objectives, lessons, activities and resources for providing HIV/AIDS instruction in grades K-12.
- HIV/AIDS curriculum is consistent with state legislation, as well as school policy and procedures including: Florida Statute 1003.46, Health education; instruction in acquired immune deficiency syndrome, School Board Policy: 6Gx13-5D-1.021 Welfare; School Health Services Program, the M-DCPS Worksite HIV/AIDS Hand Book, and Control of Communicable Disease in School Guidebook for School Personnel.
- HIV/AIDS curriculum content is also in alignment with Florida Sunshine State Standards.
- HIV/AIDS content teachers are trained on the curriculum and can participate in yearly professional development about health and wellness related topics.

Miami Lighthouse / Heiken Children's Vision Program

Heiken Children's Vision Program provides free complete optometric exams conducted at school sites via vision vans and corrective lenses to all failed vision screenings if the parent /guardian cannot afford the exams and or the lenses.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

MTSS/RtI is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.

1. RtI leadership is vital, therefore, in building our team we have considered the following:

- Administrator(s) who will ensure commitment and allocate resources;
- Teacher(s) and Coaches will extend and report on meeting the goals of the leadership team at grade level, subject area, and intervention group, problem solving

- Team members who will meet to review consensus, infrastructure, and implementation of building level.
2. The school's Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:
- School reading, math, science, and behavior specialists
 - Special education personnel
 - School guidance counselor
 - School psychologist
 - School social worker
 - Member of advisory group
3. Community stakeholders MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. RtI uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.
- The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.
 - The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support.
 - The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally.
- There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data. The MTSS/ RtI four step problem-solving model will be used to plan, monitor, and revise instruction and intervention. The four steps are problem identification, problem analysis, intervention implementation, and response evaluation

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 following steps will be considered by the school's Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the MTSS/RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.

The Leadership Team will:

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

Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for meeting Annual Measurable Objectives

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?

1. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.

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

The leadership team will consider data the end of year Tier 1 problem solving

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.

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:

- adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
- adjust the delivery of behavior management system
- adjust the allocation of school-based resources
- drive decisions regarding targeted professional development

create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions

2. Managed data will include:

Academic

- FAIR assessment (Broad Screening, Progress Monitoring, Targeted Diagnostic Indicators, Broad Diagnostic Indicators, Ongoing Progress Monitoring Tools, Phonics Screening Inventory)
- Oral Reading Fluency Measures
- Voyager Checkpoints
- Voyager Benchmark Assessments
- Baseline Benchmark Assessments
- Success Maker Utilization and Progress Reports
- Interim assessments
- State/Local Math and Science assessments
- FCAT
- Student grades
- School site specific assessments

Behavior

- Student Case Management System
- Detentions
- Suspensions/expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
- Office referrals per day per month
- Team climate surveys
- Attendance
- Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:

1. training for all administrators in the RtI problem solving at Tiers 1, 2, and 3 (SST), using the Tier 1 Problem Solving Worksheet, Tier 2 Problem Solving Worksheet, and Tier 3 Problem Solving Worksheet and Intervention Plan

2. providing support for school staff to understand basic RtI principles and procedures; and

providing a network of ongoing support for RtI organized through feeder patterns

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Based upon the information from http://www.florida-rti.org/educatorResources/MTSS_Book_ImplComp_012612.pdf, but not limited to the following:

1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS framework with district & school mission statements and organizational improvement efforts.
2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.

3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.
4. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.
5. Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.
6. Sufficient availability of coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.
7. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.
8. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Martha Chang, Principal
- Jeanette Sierra-Funcia, Assistant Principal
- Yader Lacayo, Assistant Principal
- Phyllis Bellinger, Mathematics Curriculum Leader
- Lillian Mila, Language Arts Curriculum Leader
- Eugene Machado, Science Curriculum Leader
- Ann Lee, Humanities Curriculum Leader
- Glenn Drew, United Teachers of Dade Steward
- Magaly Ercilla, Exceptional Student Education Curriculum Leader
- Yudenis Fernandez, English Language Learners Curriculum Leader
- Javier Trujillo, Electives Curriculum Leader
- Corinne L'Hermitte, Foreign Language Curriculum Leader

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

The LLT will meet monthly throughout the school year. The principal will nurture the vision for improved school-wide literacy across all content areas by being an active member in all Literacy Leadership Team meetings and activities. The principal will provide essential resources to the LLT. The reading coach will serve as a member of the Literacy Leadership Team. The coach will share his/her knowledge in reading instruction, evaluation, and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. The reading coach will work with the Literacy Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CIRP. The reading coach will provide enthusiasm and encourage a spirit of teamwork within the Literacy Leadership Team to create a school-wide focus on literacy and reading achievement by establishing model classrooms; conferencing with teachers and administrators; and providing professional development

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

The LLT will work collaboratively to ensure the implementation of the CIRP. We will ensure that the teachers are utilizing Voyager Passport Reading Journeys in the Intensive Reading classes and Language! for the Intensive Reading Plus classes. CIRPs include instructional content based on the six essential components of reading instruction (oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension). CIRPs are used to accelerate growth in reading with the goal of returning students to grade level proficiency. The LLT will also initiate the use of Accelerated Reader through the advisement period.

Public School Choice

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

applicable.

*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.

Reading strategies are implemented in all content areas. All staff is afforded the opportunity to participate in applicable professional development. Literacy leadership Team monitors the implementation of school-wide literacy strategies across the curriculum. Administrative staff is monitoring the implementation of Reading Strategies across the curriculum.

*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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 30% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 students proficiency by percentage points to 32%.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

30% (342)

32% (370)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 Test was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Students demonstrate difficulty with word relationships and analyzing words in context	Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include vocabulary word maps, concept maps, word walls, personal dictionaries, instructions in shades of meaning and context, affix or root words, reading from a variety of texts. Development and implementation of Reading Instructional Focus Calendar	Literacy Leadership Team, MTSS/RTI Team	Implementation of FCIM, Review formative monthly assessments data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed	Formative: FAIR, Monthly assessments, Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
2	1A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. Students demonstrate difficulty explaining how text features aid in reading comprehension.	1A.2. Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include building strong arguments to support answers, exploring shades of meaning, using reciprocal teaching and question-answer relationships, questioning the author and summarizing.	1A.2. Literacy Leadership Team, MTSS/RTI Team	Review formative monthly assessments data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed	Formative: Mini-Assessments, Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.

Reading Goal #1b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test indicate that 28 % of students achieved levels 4 and 5 of proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage point to 30 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (328)	30% (347)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/ Research Process. Students demonstrate difficulty explaining how text features aid in reading comprehension.	Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include building strong arguments to support answers, exploring shades of meaning, using reciprocal teaching and question-answer relationships, questioning the author and summarizing	Literacy Leadership Team, MTSS/RTI Team	Review formative monthly assessments data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed	Formative: Mini-Assessments, Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 Test was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Students demonstrate difficulty with word relationships and analyzing words in context.	Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include vocabulary word maps, concept maps, word walls, and personal dictionaries, instructions in shades of meaning and context, affix or root words, reading from a variety of texts. Development and implementation of Reading Instructional Focus Calendar	Literacy Leadership Team, MTSS/RTI Team	Implementation of FCIM, Review formative monthly assessments data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed	Formative: FAIR, Monthly assessments, Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
--	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test indicate that 71% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is increase student achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 76%.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (738)	76% (790)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 Test was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Students demonstrate difficulty with word relationships and analyzing words in context.	3a.1. Identify and schedule intervention groups into computer labs twice a week for 30 minutes to access Reading Plus to support the core reading programs with structured independent reading practice to enhance silent reading proficiency.	3a.1. Literacy Leadership Team, MTSS/RTI Team	3a.1. Review Reading Plus reports monthly to ensure students are making adequate progress and adjust intervention as needed.	3a.1. Formative: Reading Plus Reports, Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test indicate that 71% of students in lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is increase student s in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 76%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (192)	76% (206)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 Test was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Students demonstrate difficulty with word relationships and analyzing words in context.	4a.1. Provide students with more practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms and antonyms. Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word meanings and word relationships from context, as well as provide instruction on word meanings. Students will be scheduled for bi-weekly interventions.	4a.1. MTSS/RTI Leadership Team	4a.1. Review bi-weekly Reading Plus and FCAT Explorer data reports to ensure progress is made and adjust intervention as needed	4a.1. 4a.1. Formative: FAIR, Mini-Assessments, Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.

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 # Our goal is to decrease by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0. 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	61	64	68	71	75	

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.	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test indicate that % of the students in the Black and % of the students in the Hispanic subgroups achieved proficiency. Our goal is to
--	--

Reading Goal #5B:	increase student proficiency by percentage points to % for the Black subgroup and by % for the Hispanic subgroup
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 39% (55) Hispanic: 60% (532)	Black: 48% (67) Hispanic: 65% (577)

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	<p>As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test, the Black and Hispanic subgroup did not meet AMO-2.</p> <p>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Identify and understands the meaning of conceptually advanced prefixes, suffixes and root words.</p> <p>Students demonstrate difficulty with word relationships and analyzing words in context</p>	<p>Provide students with more practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms and antonyms. Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word meanings and word relationships from context, as well as provide instruction on word meanings.</p> <p>Utilizing data identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate interventions within the first two weeks of the 2012- 2013 year and monitor student progress using data monthly</p>	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments. Monthly data chats will be held.	<p>Formative: FAIR, District and School-site assessment data, intervention assessments.</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.</p>

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test indicate that 25% of the students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 17 percentage points to 42 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (35)	42% (58)

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
	<p>As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test the English Language Learners subgroup did not meet AMO.</p> <p>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012</p>	<p>Provide students with more practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms and antonyms. Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word meanings and word relationships from context, as well as</p>	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments.	<p>Formative: FAIR, District and School-site assessment data, intervention assessments.</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.</p>

1	administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Students demonstrate difficulty with word relationships and analyzing words in context	provide instruction on word meanings. Utilizing data identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate interventions within the first two weeks of the 2012-2013 school year and monitor student progress using data monthly		
---	---	--	--	--

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test indicate that 34% of the students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 38%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (42)	38% (47)

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	As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test. Students with Disabilities subgroup did not meet the AMO. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 Test was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary. Students demonstrate difficulty with word relationships and analyzing words in context.	Provide students with more practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms and antonyms. Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word meanings and word relationships from context, as well as provide instruction on word meanings. Utilizing data identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate interventions within the first two weeks of the 2012-2013 school year and monitor student progress using data monthly	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments.	Formative: FAIR, District and School-site assessment data, intervention assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test indicate that 55% of the students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (509)	59% (546)

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	<p>As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading 2.0 Test the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not meet AYP.</p> <p>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading 2.0 Test was Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary.</p> <p>Students demonstrate difficulty with word relationships and analyzing words in context.</p>	<p>Provide students with more practice with prefixes, suffixes, root words, synonyms and antonyms. Teachers should emphasize strategies for deriving word meanings and word relationships from context, as well as provide instruction on word meanings.</p> <p>Utilizing data identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate interventions within the first two weeks of the 2012-2013 school year and monitor student progress using data monthly</p>	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments.	<p>Formative: FAIR, District and School-site assessment data, intervention assessments.</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment.</p>

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
Implementation of FAIR Assessments/Data Analysis with all Content Teachers	Language Arts and Reading, 6-8	Language Arts Curriculum Leader	Language Arts and Reading, 6-8	December 13, 2012	Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	RtI Leadership Team, Literacy leadership Team
Effective Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendars	Language Arts and Reading, 6-8	Language Arts Curriculum Leader	Language Arts and Reading, 6-8	October 25, 2012	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs	RtI Leadership Team, Literacy Leadership Team

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goals 1,2,3,4,5	Student Incentives based on Performance	EESAC	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$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
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: \$500.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:		The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Exam indicate that 40% achieved proficiency in Listening/ Speaking. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
40% (55)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the Listening/Speaking portion of the CELLA exam was Speaking Vocabulary. Students demonstrate difficulty with oral vocabulary. This is mainly due to Students speaking their heritage language at home and in their communities, which limits the use of the English language to the school setting	Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include: Use Task Cards, Focus on Key Vocabulary, Vocabulary with Context Clues, Vocabulary Improvement Strategy (VIS), Use Multiple Meaning Words, Interactive Word Walls, Use of Cognates, Word Banks/Vocabulary Notebooks, Structural Analysis, Heritage Language/English Dictionary	MTSS/Rtl Leadership Team	The MTSS/Rtl Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments.. LEP committee meetings will be conducted to assess progress monitoring	Formative: FAIR, CELLA, District and School-site assessment data, intervention assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Exam indicate that 29% achieved proficiency in Reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students scoring proficient in Reading.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

29% (40)

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	<p>The area of deficiency as noted on the Reading portion of the CELLA exam was Reading Comprehension. Students demonstrate difficulty understanding reading passages, including passages that present academic information. Some of the factors affecting students reading comprehension skills are the lack instruction in their home language which delays the English language acquisition process. Also, some ELL students have not been fortunate enough to attend school regularly and there may be major gaps in their education.</p> <p>Additionally, high mobility rate causes instability and in some cases interruption of services which delay the language acquisition process</p>	<p>Provide a variety of instructional strategies and activities that include: Use Task Cards Think/Pair/Share, Reading Response Journal/Log, Brainstorming, Activate Prior Knowledge, Modeling Reciprocal Teaching, Think Alouds, Venn Diagrams, Realia.</p> <p>Use illustration s/Diagrams Audio Books Cooperative Learning (Group Reports/Projects), Reading for a Specific Purpose and Visuals</p>	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments. LEP committee meetings will be conducted to assess progress monitoring.	<p>Formative: FAIR, CELLA District and School-site assessment data, intervention assessments.</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.</p>

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Exam indicate that 27% achieved proficiency in Writing. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students scoring proficient in Writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

27% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	<p>The area of deficiency as noted on the Writing portion of the CELLA exam was Editing. Students demonstrate difficulty identifying</p>	<p>Utilizing conventional spelling of sight words and spelling patterns, and then apply to other spelling generalizations. Correct spelling</p>	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of	Formative: FAIR, CELLA District and School-site assessment data, intervention assessments.

1	<p>errors in grammar, mechanics and word choice. As well as for reading the factors affecting students writing are the lack instruction in their home language which delays the English language acquisition process. Also, some ELL students have not been fortunate enough to attend school regularly and there may be major gaps in their education.</p> <p>Additionally, high mobility rate causes instability and in some cases interruption of services which delay the language acquisition process</p>	<p>approximations previously circled, capitalizing the first word in each sentence. Completing sentences with correct capitalization including proper nouns, using ending punctuation including periods, questions marks and exclamation points, apostrophes, commas and colons. Using subject/verb and noun/pronoun agreement in simple and compound sentences within the writing piece,</p> <p>Including present/past tense agreement, subjective/objective pronouns, and plurals or irregular nouns.</p>		<p>program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments. LEP committee meetings will be conducted to assess progress monitoring.</p>	<p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.</p>
---	--	---	--	--	---

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal 1, 2	Incentives	EESAC	\$200.00
			Subtotal: \$200.00
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: \$200.00

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 25% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 students proficiency by 3 percentage point to 28%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (290)	28% (322)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement. This deficiency is due to limited hands-on activities in the classroom.	Develop a school-wide plan to provide teachers with an array of hands-on activities that will reinforce what is being taught in the classroom. Encourage teachers to implement the hands-on activities by sharing feedback on the effectiveness at department and team meetings	MTSS/RTI Team	Review formative bi-weekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. Review school-wide plan to ensure teachers are utilizing hands-on activities to reinforce what was taught in the classroom. Conduct grade level meeting to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of hands-on activities usage.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessment; District interim data reports; Student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics was in Reporting Category of Fractions/Ratios, Proportions	Implement the use of technology, graphing calculators, and Inquiry-based lessons to promote authentic and rigorous student engagement. Encourage teachers to implement the hands-on activities by sharing feedback on the effectiveness at department and team meetings	MTSS/RTI Team	Review formative bi-weekly assessment data report to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. Review school-wide plan to ensure teachers are utilizing hands-on activities and computer labs to reinforce what was taught in the classroom. Conduct grade level meeting to obtain teacher feedback on effectiveness of hands-on activities and computer lab usage.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessment; District interim data reports; Student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	
---	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 29% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 of proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (337)	30% (345)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The Level 4 and 5 students showed an area of deficiency in Geometry and Measurement. Students lack full understanding of geometric concepts and utilization of hands-on activities/manipulatives to solve problems.	Provide visual stimulus to develop students' spatial sense. Differentiate instruction for students. Solve simple problems involving rates and derived measurements for such attributes as velocity and density.	MTSS/RtI Team	Review ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of the skills taught.	Formative: Student authentic work; Monthly assessments. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 73% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 78%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (753)	78% (804)

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	As noted on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Administration, the areas of deficiency are Geometry and Measurement. Students' demonstrate difficulty in understanding that two variables can be represented through graphs, charts, pictographs, and line plot from data collection are disconnected from real-life situations.	Provide concrete real-world examples by fusing literacy into the mathematics instructional block. Additionally, student math journals will be utilized in tandem with manipulative to show transfer of mathematical theory to practical applications.	MTSS/RTI Team	Review formative bi-weekly assessment data reports to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. Conduct grade level discussions to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy	Formative: Student authentic work; bi-weekly assessments; student journals. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 71% of students in lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is increase in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 76%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (194)	76% (207)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics administration, it was noted that students had the greatest area of deficiency in Geometry and Measurement. Students' demonstrate difficulty in understanding that two variables can be represented through graphs, charts, pictographs, and line plot from data collection are disconnected from real-life situations.	Identify lowest performing students based on instructional needs and assign them to Intensive Mathematics classes. In addition, provide students with pull-out tutoring. Specifically target 6th grade students and correlating instruction to deficiencies.	MTSS/RTI Team	Review formative bi-weekly assessment data report as well as interim assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Bi-weekly assessments data reports; interim assessments. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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 # Our goal is to increase by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	57	61	65	69	73	

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	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 72% of the students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points.
--	--

satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 35% of the students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 72% (82) Black: 35% (48)	White: 75% (86) Black: 44% (60)

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	<p>The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 72% of the students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points.</p> <p>The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 35% of the students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points</p>	<p>White: On the 2013 FCAT Mathematics administration, it was noted that students had the greatest area of deficiency in Geometry and Measurement .</p> <p>Black: On the 2013 FCAT Mathematics administration, it was noted that students had the greatest area of deficiency in Geometry and Measurement .</p>	MTSS/RTI Team	MTSS/RTI Team members will monitor bi-weekly assessments and interim to adjust academic goals utilizing teacher feedback on student skill attainment.	<p>Formative: bi-weekly assessments data reports; interim assessments.</p> <p>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.</p>

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 results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 35% of the students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 6 percentage points
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (49)	44% (61)

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	<p>ELL: Mathematics administration, it was noted that students had the greatest area of deficiency in Measurement and Data Analysis.</p> <p>The ELL subgroup lacked an understanding of mathematical terms and</p>	Provide ELL students with classroom instruction in English using ESOL strategies. In addition, provide pull-out tutoring along with HLAP tutoring to those students who have the greatest needs.	MTSS/RTI Team	<p>Review formative bi-weekly assessment data report as well as interim assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.</p> <p>Conduct grade level data chats to attain teacher feedback on</p>	<p>Formative: bi-weekly and interim assessments data reports; interim assessments.</p> <p>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.</p>

ability to comprehend word problems and therefore hindering their performance		effectiveness of strategy.	
---	--	----------------------------	--

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 results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 27% of the students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 10 percentage points
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (32)	37% (44)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics administration it was noted that students had the greatest area of deficiency in Geometry and Measurement. The SWD subgroup lacked a deep understanding of mathematical concepts.	Implement a rotation schedule for small group instruction during the mathematics instructional block and provide tailored instruction based on assessments and hands on practice for students utilizing manipulatives to develop and understand of number sense concepts.	MTSS/RTI Team	Review formative bi-weekly assessment data report as well as interim assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. Conduct grade level data chats to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy.	Formative: bi-weekly assessments data reports; interim assessments. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 55% of the students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 1 percentage points
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (507)	56% (516)

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
	Economically Disadvantaged: On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics administration it was noted that students had the greatest area of deficiency in Geometry and Measurement and did	Implement a rotation schedule for small group instruction during the mathematics instructional block and provide tailored instruction based on assessments and hands on practice for students utilizing manipulatives to	MTSS/RTI Team	Review formative bi-weekly assessment data report as well as interim assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. Conduct grade level	Formative: bi-weekly assessment data reports; interim assessments. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Mathematics

1	not meet AYP. Students' demonstrate difficulty in understanding that two variables can be represented through graphs, charts, pictographs, and line plot from data collection are disconnected from real-life situations.	develop and understanding of number sense concepts.	discussions to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy	Assessment.
---	--	---	---	-------------

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:	The results of the 2011- 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Assessment indicate that 51% (84) of students scored at level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain in the percentage of students achieving proficiency
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (84)	51% (84)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 administration of the Algebra 1 EOC Assessment the areas of greatest difficulty for students were Reporting Category Polynomials and Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics. Consistent access to technology in order to enhance instructional delivery for these areas of deficiencies.	Use graphing calculators or computers with compatible software to explore slopes, graphs, and tables of linear functions. Increase departmental use of the Computer Lab in order to utilize Destination Math, FCAT Explorer, and Florida FOCUS Mathematics Teachers will attend the Algebra 1 Summer Institute.	Administrative Team Mathematics Department Curriculum Leader	Classroom Observation Conduct grade level data chats to review formative bi-weekly assessment reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed	Formative: Bi-weekly assessment; District interim data reports; Student authentic work. Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Assessment.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The results of the 2011- 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Assessment indicate that 34% of students scored at level 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

34% (55)			34% (56)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>According to the results of the 2012 administration of the Algebra 1 EOC Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students were Reporting Category Polynomials and Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics.</p> <p>Consistent access to technology in order to enhance instructional delivery for these areas of deficiencies.</p>	<p>Infuse the Step-It-Up Problem Solving Protocol into daily instruction to equip students with strategies to solve non routine and open ended real-world application based problems.</p> <p>Provide opportunities the students to participate in mathematics competitions throughout the district.</p>	<p>Administrative Team</p> <p>Mathematics Department Curriculum Leader</p>	<p>Classroom Observation</p> <p>Conduct grade level data chats to review formative bi-weekly assessment reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.</p>	<p>Formative: Bi-weekly assessment; District interim data reports; Student authentic work.</p> <p>Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Assessment.</p>

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Algebra Goal # Our goal is to decrease by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0. 3A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	<p>The results of the 2011-2012 Algebra 1 EOC Assessment indicate that 72% of the students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency.</p> <p>Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points.</p> <p>The results of the 2011-2012 Algebra 1 EOC Assessment indicate that 35% of the students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency.</p> <p>Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 9percentage points.</p>
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 72% (22) Black: 35% (4)	White: 75% (23) Black: 44% (5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	White: On the 2012	Provide students with	Administrative	Classroom Observation	Formative: Bi-

1	<p>Algebra 1 EOC Assessment it was noted that students had the greatest area of deficiency in Polynomials.</p> <p>Black: On the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Assessment, it was noted that students had the greatest area of deficiency in Polynomials.</p> <p>Consistent access to technology in order to enhance instructional delivery for these areas of deficiencies.</p>	<p>opportunities to complete more rigorous mathematical problems</p> <p>Use the Pacing Guide aligned Topic Assessments and the FLDOE Florida Achieves! Focus Resources to progress monitor students' mastery of targeted grade level objectives and essential content</p>	<p>Team</p> <p>Mathematics Department Curriculum Leader</p>	<p>Conduct grade level data chats to review formative bi-weekly assessment reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.</p>	<p>weekly assessment; District interim data reports; Student authentic work.</p> <p>Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Assessment.</p>
---	--	---	---	---	--

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:

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

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:

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
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 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.	The results of the 2011- 2012 Geometry EOC Assessment indicate that 100% (18) of students scored in the upper third.
---	--

Geometry Goal #2:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring in the upper third.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (18)	100% (18)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>According to the results of the 2012 administration of the Geometry EOC Assessment the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category Three Dimensional Geometry</p> <p>Consistent access to technology in order to enhance instructional delivery for the area of deficiency</p>	<p>Mathematics Teachers will attend the Geometry Summer Institute.</p> <p>Use computers with compatible software to explore geometrical concepts.</p> <p>Sketch, using a variety of tools (e.g., isometric dot paper), isometric perspectives and different views (i.e., top, side, front) of three-dimensional figures.</p>	<p>Administrative Team</p> <p>Mathematics Department Curriculum Leader</p>	<p>Classroom Observation</p> <p>Conduct grade level data chats to review formative bi-weekly assessment reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.</p>	<p>Formative: Bi-weekly assessment; District interim data reports; Student authentic work.</p> <p>Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC Assessment.</p>

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Geometry Goal # Our goal is to decrease by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0. 3A :			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	
Geometry Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	The results of the 2011-2012 Algebra 1 EOC Assessment indicate that 55% of the students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 1
---	--

	percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (61)	56% (62)

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	<p>Economically Disadvantaged:</p> <p>On the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Assessment it was noted that students had the greatest area of deficiency in Polynomials.</p> <p>Consistent access to technology in order to enhance instructional delivery for these areas of deficiencies.</p>	<p>Use hands-on experiences to facilitate the conceptual learning and understanding of algebraic concepts and apply the learning to solve real-world problems.</p> <p>Provide students with opportunities to complete more rigorous mathematical problems</p>	<p>Administrative Team</p> <p>Mathematics Department Curriculum Leader</p>	<p>Classroom Observation</p> <p>Conduct grade level data chats to review formative bi-weekly assessment reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.</p>	<p>Formative: Bi-weekly and interim assessments data reports; interim assessments.</p> <p>Summative: Results from 2013 Algebra 1 Assessment</p>

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
Effective use of Manipulatives	Mathematics 6-8	Mathematics Curriculum Leader	Mathematics 6-8	December 13, 2012	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, Interim Assessments	MTSS/RtI Team

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goals 1,2,3,4,5	Student Incentives based on Performance	EESAC	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$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
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: \$500.00			

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:	On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT, 29% of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3). The expected level of performance for 2013 is 33% achieving proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (123)	33% (141)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The content areas of deficiency according to the data are the Nature of Science and Physical Science. Students need to develop higher order thinking skills in order to increase levels of proficiency	Examine and explore student misconceptions using Formative Assessment Probes included in Pacing Guides and Learning Village; and provide opportunities for students to apply physical /chemical science concepts in real-world scenarios, and conduct laboratory investigations that include calculating, manipulating, and solving problems using Essential Labs and Higher Order Thinking Science Labs (HSL).	Professional Learning Community (PLC) team, Principal, Assistant Principals, Science Department.	Team will review the results of Formative Assessment Probes and of school –site assessments data to monitor student progress	Formative: school-site assessments, MDCPS Interim Assessments and Formative Assessment Probes. Summative: The 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment
2	Students need to develop a stronger knowledge base of science vocabulary, question structure analyses and higher order thinking skills in order to increase levels of proficiency. Students need to develop a stronger knowledge base of science vocabulary and higher order	Provide students opportunities to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze and explain science concepts through classrooms/lab journals, discussions, hand-on lab activities and ExploreLearning GIZMOS to reinforce higher order thinking skills.	Professional Learning Community (PLC) team, Principal, Assistant Principals, Science Department.	Team will review the results of school –site assessment data to monitor student progress to make suggestions in areas requiring strengthening.	Formative: MDCPS Baseline, Fall and Winter Assessments. Summative: The 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment

thinking skills.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.

Science Goal #1b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.

Science Goal #2a:

On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT, 11 % of students scored above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5). The expected level of performance for 2013 is 12% above proficiency

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

11% (45)

12% (53)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The areas of deficiency according to the data are the Nature of Science and Physical Science. Students need additional support to develop independent projects	Identify students scoring 4 or 5 on the Reading and Mathematics portion of the FCAT and mentor these students in the development of independent experimental or engineering projects that will be submitted towards the progress of STEM Goals.	Professional Learning Community (PLC) team, Principal, Assistant Principals, Science Department	Projects will be reviewed periodically using a rubric to be sure students are making progress and that adjustments are being made as necessary.	Formative: Science Fair Projects, School developed rubrics and Interim Assessments. Summative: The 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment
	Students need to develop a stronger knowledge base of science vocabulary, question structure analysis and higher order thinking skills in order to increase levels	Provide classroom and after-school opportunities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the	Professional Learning Community (PLC) team, Principal, Assistant Principals, Science Department	Team will review the results of school –site assessment data to monitor student progress and projects will be reviewed periodically to be sure students are making	Formative: Science Fair Projects, School developed rubrics, Fairchild Garden Challenge and Interim

2	of proficiency. Students need additional support to develop independent projects	development and discussion of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design as it relates to the Physical/Chemical Sciences (i.e., Science Fair, SECME, Fairchild Challenge).		progress and that adjustments are being made as necessary to adjust learning requirements.	Assessments. Summative: The 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment
---	--	---	--	--	--

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.
Science Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Effective use of the Common Core Standards in Science	Science 6-8	Science Curriculum Leader	Science Teachers 6-8	December 13, 2012	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, Interim Assessments	MTSS/RtI Team
Discovery Learning	Science 6-8	Science Curriculum Leader	Science Teachers 6-8	October 25, 2012	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, Interim Assessments	MTSS/RtI Team

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal 1,2	Students Incentives based on performance	EESAC	\$200.00
			Subtotal: \$200.00
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: \$200.00

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving 4.0 or higher to 78%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (338)	78% (349)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test was focus and elaboration. Students lack the necessary skills needed to incorporate real life experience into their writing.	During writing instruction, students will use a graphic organizer/plan to write a draft organized with a logical sequence of beginning, middle, and end, using supporting details, or providing facts, and/or opinions through (concrete examples, statistics, comparisons, real life examples, anecdotes, and amazing facts) to develop focus and elaboration.	Literacy Leadership Team	Administer and score students' monthly writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust focus as needed.	Formative: Students' scores on monthly writing assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.				
Writing Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teaching the use of revision and editing strategies	Language Arts 6-8	Reading/Language Arts Curriculum Leader	Language Arts and Social Studies Teachers	October 26, 2012	Lesson Plans, Walkthroughs, Use of Rubrics	Literacy Leadership Team
Effective implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendars to enhance the Writing process and make adjustments to strategies	Language Arts 6-8	Reading/Language Arts Curriculum Leader	Language Arts and Social Studies Teachers	December 13, 2012	Lesson Plans, Walkthroughs, Use of Rubrics	Literacy Leadership Team

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal 1	Student Incentives based on performance	EESAC	\$200.00
			Subtotal: \$200.00
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: \$200.00

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:	Schools will administer the District Baseline Assessment to set the level of performance.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (3)	11% (34)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The content area of deficiency is all benchmarks. Students need to develop higher order thinking skills in order to increase levels of proficiency	Utilize District-published lesson plans with assessments aligned to tested End of Course Exam Benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master tested content.	Professional Learning Community (PLC) Team, Principal, Assistant Principal, Social Studies Department Chair.	Team will review the results of school site assessment data to monitor student progress	Formative: School-site assessment, MDCPS Assessments.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in 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
Project Citizen	7th grade Social Science	District	7th grade Social Science teachers	Monthly Social Studies meetings	Department meetings to collaborate on implementation	Social Science Department Chair

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal 1	Student incentives based on performance	EESAC	\$100.00
Subtotal: \$100.00			
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: \$100.00			

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:	Our goal this year is to increase attendance to 95.84 % In addition, our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more), and excessive tardiness (10 or more).
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.34% (1153)	95.84% (1159)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
353	335
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
157	149

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	Truancy-increased by 1% from previous year. Students have many unexcused absences due to illnesses and failure to turn in admits. Teachers and office staff are not always able to communicate with parents regarding excessive absences due to incorrect parent contact information.	For the 2012-2013 school year students who may be developing a pattern of nonattendance and excessive tardies will be identified and given intervention services by the Truancy Child Study Team (TCST). Update parent contact information at the beginning of each quarter. *MDCPS Truancy Intervention Program 2012-2013	Assistant principal and /or designee	Weekly updates will be conducted to the Administration by the TCST. This information will be shared with the faculty during our monthly faculty meetings.	TCST logs, attendance rosters, and CIS visitation logs.
2	Students have many unexcused tardies due to illnesses and failure to turn in admits. Teachers and office staff are not always able to communicate with parents regarding excessive absences due to incorrect parent contact information.	For the 2012-2013 school year students who may be developing a pattern of nonattendance and excessive tardies will be identified and given intervention services by the Truancy Child Study Team (TCST). Update parent contact information at the beginning of each quarter. *MDCPS Truancy Intervention Program 2012-2013	Assistant principal and /or designee	Weekly updates will be conducted to the Administration by the TCST. This information will be shared with the faculty during our monthly faculty meetings	TCST logs, attendance rosters, and CIS visitation logs.

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
Truancy Prevention	6-8 ALL	MTSS/RtI Team	School-wide	August 17, 2012	A Truancy Intervention Program will be developed during the Professional Development. An Assistant Principal will monitor the implementation of this program by teachers and staff.	MTSS/RtI Team

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal 1	Student incentives for improved attendance and tardies	EESAC	\$150.00
			Subtotal: \$150.00
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: \$150.00

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

139	125
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
90	81
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
229	206
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
112	101

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The total number of indoor and outdoor suspension totaled 368 during the 2011-2012 school year. There are not enough opportunities to recognize students for positive behavior	Students will be provided a copy of the Student Code of Conduct to be reviewed by the homeroom teachers and the parents. Utilize the Code of Student Conduct by providing incentives for compliance through the use of Secondary SPOT Success Recognition Program.	1.1. Homeroom Teachers and Administrators	Monitor Spot Success report by grade level and monitor COGNOS report on student outdoor suspension rate.	Monthly COGNOS suspension reports.
2	Certain students with recurring behavior incidents do not benefit from repeated suspensions.	Students who fit the criteria will be referred to the Alternative to Suspension Program in lieu of outdoor suspensions.	Administration and Trust Counselor	Monitor reports on Alternative to Suspension Program	Alternative to Suspension Program Reports.
3	Students often lose valuable instructional time while assigned to indoor suspension.	Students will be assigned class work and computer assisted instruction based on benchmarks in Reading, Mathematics and Science during Indoor Suspension. Work is to be graded by the content area teachers.	Administration, Reading Coach, S.C.S.I. Instructor, and Content area Teachers	Feedback will be provided by content area teachers during Team Meetings.	Benchmark Packets.

(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
Code of Student Conduct	ALL	MTSS/RtI Team	Faculty and Staff	September 2012 – Faculty Staff Meeting	Utilize classroom walkthroughs to monitor teachers' enforcement of the Code of Student Conduct. Monitor Spot Success monthly report.	MTSS/RtI Team

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal 1	Student Incentives	EESAC	\$150.00
			Subtotal: \$150.00
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: \$150.00

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	See Title 1 Parent Involvement Policy
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
N/A	N/A

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT, 29% of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3). The expected level of performance for 2013 is 33% achieving proficiency and 11 % of students scored above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5). The expected level of performance for 2013 is 15 % above 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	A consistent area of deficiency according to the data is Physical Science. On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT only 8 out of 15 points were earned, 53.5% of the questions were correctly answered	Maintain fidelity to the curriculum and instruction offered to accelerated middle school students enrolled in Physical Science Honors as delineated in the Physical Science Honors Pacing Guide for middle school and mentor participation in South Florida Regional Science and Engineering Fair (SFRSEF) and SECME Bridge Building Competition.	Professional Learning Community (PLC) team	Projects will be reviewed periodically using a rubric to be sure students are making progress and that adjustments are being made as necessary.	Formative: Increased number of Bridge Competition Science Fair Projects and SECME participation. Summative: The 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards in Science	6-8	Science Curriculum Leader	Science and Math Teachers	October 26, 2012	A STEM action plan will be developed during the Professional Development. An Assistant Principal will monitor the implementation of this program by teachers and staff.	Science Curriculum Leader

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal 1	Student Incentive based on performance	EESAC	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
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: \$100.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:		Increase opportunities for STEM applied learning by increasing opportunities for students to participate in CTSO career and technical skill competitions.			
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 not trained as CTSO advisors to provide technical and leadership support required for CTSO student achievement. Teachers not trained in Project Based Learning instructional frameworks. Teachers not trained in adding rigorous problem-solving activities to lessons	Utilize Career Technical Student Organization (CTSO) Career Development Events and related curriculum aligned to appropriate CTE program to increase rigor, relevance, and opportunities for STEM activities.	Teachers attend curriculum and leadership CTSO Advisor training at the district and /or state level. Align curriculum to appropriate CTSO, and/or other competitions, such as: Miami-Dade County Fair, NFTE, Fairchild Challenge or other district-approved competition curriculum. Implement (or develop) career development events lesson plans using Project Based Learning instructional elements	Monitor the implementation of the guidelines and timeline for the teacher training and the progress of the CTE student competition projects.	CTE Student Competition Projects

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	Goals 1,2,3,4,5	Student Incentives based on Performance	EESAC	\$500.00
CELLA	Goal 1, 2	Incentives	EESAC	\$200.00
Mathematics	Goals 1,2,3,4,5	Student Incentives based on Performance	EESAC	\$500.00
Science	Goal 1,2	Students Incentives based on performance	EESAC	\$200.00
Writing	Goal 1	Student Incentives based on performance	EESAC	\$200.00
Civics	Goal 1	Student incentives based on performance	EESAC	\$100.00
Attendance	Goal 1	Student incentives for improved attendance and tardies	EESAC	\$150.00
Suspension	Goal 1	Student Incentives	EESAC	\$150.00
STEM	Goal 1	Student Incentive based on performance	EESAC	\$100.00
				Subtotal: \$2,100.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$2,100.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/10/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
EESAC funds will be used to purchase FCAT Reading incentives. EESAC funds will be used to purchase FCAT Mathematics incentives. EESAC funds will be used to purchase FCAT Science incentives. EESAC funds will be used to purchase FCAT Writing incentives EESAC funds will be used to purchase student incentives for attendance and suspension goal.	\$1,950.00

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

The EESAC will assist in the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The EESAC will also review and provide input on curricular issues as they relate to increasing student achievement.

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

Dade School District PONCE DE LEON MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	69%	64%	91%	48%	272	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	71%			137	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	70% (YES)	68% (YES)			138	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					547	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District PONCE DE LEON MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	65%	91%	45%	272	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	68%			134	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	65% (YES)	68% (YES)			133	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					539	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested