FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: FORT CLARKE MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Alachua

Principal: Donna Kidwell

SAC Chair: Robert Flaherty

Superintendent: W. Daniel Boyd

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/11/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
		BS-Elementary			Principal at Ft. Clarke MS 2011-12: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 66%, Math 61%, Science 59%, Writing 86%. 2010-11: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 81%, Math 77%, Science 66%, Writing 94%. AYP: 82%: FRPL, SWD, and Black students did not make AYP in reading or math. 2009-10: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 77%, Math 75%, Science 55%, Writing 93%. AYP: 79%, FRPL, SWD and Black students did not make AYP in reading or math. 2008-09: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 77%, Math Proficiency 75%, Science Proficiency 62%, Writing 97%. AYP: 92%, FRPL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. SWD did not make AYP in math. 2007-08: Grade: A, Reading Prof. 77%, Math Prof. 72%, Science Prof. 61%, Writing 98%. AYP: 85%, Black, FRPL, and SWD did not

Position	Name	Education	Col1	Col2	Performance Record
Principal	Donna Kidwell	and Special Education, University of Maryland; Masters-Special Education, University of Florida, EdS-Educational leadership, University of Florida; Principal Certification-	11	16	make AYP in reading. Or math. 2006-07: Grade: A, Reading Prof. 71%, Math Prof. 67%, Science 51%, Writing 96%. AYP 85%: Black, FRPL and SWD did not make AYP in reading or math. 2005-06: Grade: A, Reading 68%, Math 67%, Writing 96%. AYP 87%: Black and FRPL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Black and FRPL did not make AYP in math. 2004-05: Grade: A, Reading 66%, Math 67%, Writing 89%. AYP 80%: Black, FRPL and SWD did not make AYP in reading or math. 2003-04: Grade: A, Reading 68% Math 68% Writing 94%. AYP: 80%. Black, FRPL and SWD did not make AYP in reading or math. 2002-03: Grade: A, Reading 68%, Math 75%, Writing 94%. AYP: N/A 2001-2002: Grade: A, Reading 66%, Math73%, Writing 95%. AYP N/A. AP at Lincoln Middle School: 2000-01: Grade: A, Reading 58%, Math 68%, Writing, 98%. AYP N/A. 1999-2000: Grade: A, Reading 53%, Math 57%, Writing 98%. AYP N/A. 1998-1999: Grade: C.
Assis Principal	C. Ann Scott	BS-Special Ed, Eastern Michigan Univ.; MS-Guidance and Counseling, Eastern Michigan Univ.; Certification-Educational Leadership, University of FL.	11	22	AP at Ft. Clarke MS 2011-12: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 66%, Math 61%, Science 59%, Writing 86%. 2010-11: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 81%, Math 77%, Science 66%, Writing 94%. AYP:82%: FRPL, SWD, and Black students did not make AYP in reading or math. 2009-10: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 77%, Math 75%, Science 55%, Writing 93%. AYP:79%, FRPL, SWD and Black students did not make AYP in reading or math. 2008-09: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 77%, Math Proficiency 75%, Science Proficiency 62%, Writing 97%. AYP: 92%, FRPL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. SWD did not make AYP in math. 2007-08: Grade: A, Reading Prof. 77%, Math Prof. 72%, Science Prof. 61%, Writing 98%. AYP: 85%, Black, FRPL, and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Or math. 2006-07: Grade: A, Reading Prof. 71%, Math Prof. 67%, Science 51%, Writing 96%. AYP 85%: Black, FRPL and SWD did not make AYP in reading or math. 2005-06: Grade: A, Reading 68%, Math 67%, Writing 96%. AYP 87%: Black and FRPL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Black and FRPL did not make AYP in math. 2004-05: Grade: A, Reading 66%, Math 67%, Writing 89%. AYP 80%: Black, FRPL and SWD did not make AYP in reading or math. 2003-04: Grade: A, Reading 68% Math 68% Writing 94%. AYP: 80%. Black, FRPL and SWD did not make AYP in reading or math. 2002-03: Grade: A, Reading 68%, Math 75%, Writing 94%. AYP: N/A 2001-2002: Grade: A, Reading 66%, Math73%, Writing 95%. AYP N/A. 2000-2001: AP at Lincoln Middle School: Grade: A, Reading 58%, Math 68%, Writing, 98%. AYP N/A. 1999-2000: Grade: A, Reading 53%, Math 57%, Writing 98%. AYP N/A. 1998-1999: Grade: C.

| | | | | | AP at Ft. Clarke Middle School
2011-12:
Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 66%, Math 61%, Science 59%, Writing 86%.
2010-11:
Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 81%, Math 77%, Science 66%, Writing 94%.
AYP: 82%: FRPL, SWD, and Black students did not make AYP in reading or math. |
| Assis Principal | J. Kelly Brill | BA-Psychology, Southern Methodist University; Masters-Special Education, University of North Texas; Specialist in Education-Educational Leadership, University of Florida | 3 | 5 | 2009-10:
Grade: A, Reading Proficiency 77%, Math 75%, Science 55%, Writing 93%.
AYP: 79%, FRPL, SWD and Black students did not make AYP in reading or math.

AP at Lawton Chiles Elementary School
2007-08:
Grade: B, Reading proficiency 84%, Math proficiency 82%, Science 66%, Writing 96%. AYP 85%, Black, FRPL, SWD did not make AYP in reading or math.
2008-09:
Grade: A, Reading proficiency 86%, Math 85%, Science 61%, Writing 96%. AYP: 97%, Black subgroup did not make AYP in reading. |

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. Regularly scheduled meetings of new teachers, administrators, support staff 2. Formation of Peer Coaching Teams of individual choosing with structured activities. 3. Soliciting of qualified teachers from current employees and professional contacts at other schools	Principal Teachers Principal	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
There are none at this time.	

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
54	3.7%(2)	40.7%(22)	27.8%(15)	29.6%(16)	48.1%(26)	98.1%(53)	27.8%(15)	1.9%(1)	14.8%(8)

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
Stella Arduser	Lauren Hiner Shauna Ferry	District Appointed	Classroom observations, coaching sessions, goal setting, modeling of best practice, weekly meetings and discussions

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

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Ann Scott, Candice Nobles, Karen Mason, Kim Kazimour, Darlene Greenaway, Terri Schimel, Marissa Aulick

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 team meets monthly to monitor the progress of interventions already in place and to analyze current data about additional students experiencing difficulties.

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

The team shares progress data with our SAC, the Peer Coaching Teams and the depts. They also analyze discipline data and share that with the appropriate committees and teams. Through this dissemination of information, vertical depts. make revisions and suggestions for the School Improvement Plan regarding interventions that have worked with specific populations, subgroups and individuals.

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.

We utilize the On Track and FAIR assessment system for this purpose as well as the DOE spread sheets that display disaggregated whole group and sub group FCAT data. We also refer to weekly discipline data from the deans and FCIM frequent assessments given by the teachers.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Candice Noble (counselor) and Kim Kazimour (school psychologist) schedule regular trainings throughout the school year with whole faculty groups as well as grade level teams. The district also offers training sessions.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS is supported through the support of identified students by each grade level as their 'Targeted 25". Progress is monitored weekly by each team.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Our Literacy Council consists of the Principal, APC, Department Chairpersons, and those reading and content teachers who volunteer to participate.

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

The Literacy Council meets at least once a semester to plan school-wide literacy events,review the school's literacy plan for compliance and discuss effective literacy strategies that are research-based to be added to the plan in the future.

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

Determining which school-wide literacy activities we will engage in as a school and to support teachers in implementing the 12 school-wide strategies across all content areas.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Our elective and social studies teachers are frequently assessing all students according to the reading benchmarks. Additionally, all content area teachers are teaching students the use of specific literacy strategies as assigned to each grade level by the Literacy Committee. District social studies pacing guides have imbedded the reading benchmarks into their content area instructional calendar.

*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

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

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:	In 2013, at least 35% of students will score a 3 or above on FCAT reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (203)	35% (282)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Lack of variety of research-based instructional strategies used in the classroom.</td><td>Peer Coaching Teams collaborate to increase strategies in all teachers' plans.</td><td>Teachers, Administration</td><td>Lesson Plan monitoring and frequent assessment process</td><td>Lesson plans, assessment data, strategies logs</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Need for a wider variety of instructional methods to increase student engagement</td><td>2. Implement a variety of research-based instructional strategies including the 12 school-based strategies, Kagan Strategies for Secondary Learners, CRISS, etc.</td><td>Administration, Dept. Chairs</td><td>PDP process, CWT observations, Lesson Plan monitoring</td><td>PDP documents, Lesson Plan monitoring data</td></tr>
</table>

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	In 2013 55% (5) of the students will score at levels 4,5 and 6 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (4)	55% (5)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited student use of technology during all phases of instruction.</td><td>Increase training and access to instructional technology for all teachers.</td><td>Tech coach, administration</td><td>CWT, Lesson plans, progress monitoring data</td><td>PDPs, lesson plans strategies logs</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Limited use of higher order questions and activities</td><td>Inclusion of H.O.T. questions and activities in lesson plans and in</td><td>teachers, administrators</td><td>lesson plan monitoring, PCT logs, strategies logs, assessment data</td><td>lesson plan monitoring, PCT logs, strategies</td></tr>
</table>

					logs, assessment data

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In 2013, at least 50% (403) of students will score at level 4 or 5 on FCAT reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (321)	50% (403)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited direct instruction of content area vocabulary</td><td>Increase use of direct vocabulary across all content areas</td><td>teachers, administration</td><td>lesson plan monitoring, assessment data</td><td>lesson plans, strategies logs</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Content teachers not addressing reading comprehension</td><td>Implement a variety of research-based instructional strategies (school-based, Kagan, CRISS)</td><td>Administration</td><td>PDP process, CWT, Observations, Lesson plan monitoring</td><td>PDP's, Observations</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Above grade level students not challenged to think at higher levels</td><td>Collaboration in lesson planning to include more HOT questions following Webb's DOK model.</td><td>Dept. Chairs, Peers, Admin.</td><td>Monitor lesson plans and Intervention Logs</td><td>Student assessment data</td></tr>
</table>

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	In 2013, 55% (5) students will score at or above level 7 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (4)	55% (5)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited direct instruction of vocabulary in all content areas</td><td>Increase teacher training and use of vocabulary instruction</td><td>teachers, administrators</td><td>progress monitoring data</td><td>assessments</td></tr>
</table>

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning

gains in reading.

Reading Goal #3a:

In 2013, 75% (562) will make learning gains on FCAT reading

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (517)	75% (562)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited use of interactive instructional strategies	Train teachers and increase use of strategies such as Kagan to engage and focus all students	teachers, administrators	PCT logs, progress monitoring data	monitoring logs
2	Lack of variety and differentiation in instruction	2. Implement a variety of research-based instructional strategies including the 12 school-based strategies, Kagan Strategies for Secondary Learners, CRISS, etc.	Administration, Dept. Chairs	PDP process, Log of strategies used, CWT, Observations	PDPs. Logs

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	In 2013, 55% (5) students will make gains in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (4)	55% (5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited access to independent level text	Increase scope of text at lower reading levels	teachers	progress monitoring data	assessments

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In 2013, at least 72% (138)in the lowest 25% will make Learning Gains
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (121)	72% (138)

2	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of individual student support for struggling students	Assign an adult mentor for each student to meet with regularly, set and monitor goals.	teachers	progress monitoring data	assessment data
2	Ineffective progress monitoring of student growth	2. Identify and closely monitor the progress of the lowest quartile; revise instruction and intervention groups based upon student progress. 3. Model frequent monitoring assessments after the FCAT style of questioning	Team Leaders, Administration Dept. Chairs	Progress monitoring data, student performance documentation	Test scores, attendance, referral data Copies of FCIM assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # By school year 2016-17 our reading achievement gap will be reduced by 50%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66	73	76	79	81	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2013, 58% (131) black studentswill not make progress in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (142)	58% (131)

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of support for struggling students	Assign an adult mentor to help set and reach goals and assist with school work	mentors	assessment data	progress monitoring data, report card grades
2	Lack of variety of research-based remediation activities employed in the classroom	READ 180 teachers develop detailed plans for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions when students are not progressing.	Department chairs, Administration	Lesson Plan and Frequent Assessment process	Lesson Plans, Frequent Assessment data, Strategies Logs

		Increase student engagement by employing more research-based strategies into all teachers' repertoires.			

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:	In 2013, 25% (4) ELL students will not make progress in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (6)	25% (4)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited access to direct instruction in vocabulary across all content areas</td><td>Train teachers and increase vocabulary instruction in all classes</td><td>teachers, administrators</td><td>lesson plan monitoring, progress monitoring</td><td>assessment</td></tr>
</table>

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In 2013, 50% (73) will make satisfactory progree in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (100)	50% (73)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Lack of variety of research-based remediation activities used in the classroom.</td><td>READ 180 teachers develop detailed plans for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions when students are not progressing.

Increase student engagement by employing more research-based strategies in all classrooms.</td><td>Administration, Dept. Chairs</td><td>Lesson Plan, Frequent Assessment process</td><td>Lesson plans and Frequent Assessment documentation,Strategie Logs</td></tr>
</table>

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

	5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In 2013, 50% (151) of Economically Disadvantaged students will score a Level 3 or above on FCAT reading
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	45% (136)	50% (151)

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of individualized plans for success	Identify and closely monitor the progress of the lowest quartile; revise instruction and intervention groups based upon student progress. Incorporate effective remediation techniques into initial instruction.	Team Leaders, Administration Dept. Chairs	Progress monitoring documentation and ensuing discussions	Progress monitoring data, lesson plans

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
Improving planning and instruction through professional collaboration	all	principal	Peer Coaching Teams-all instructional personnel participate	2 school wide meetings on 2nd/4th Thurs. of each month; 2 independently scheduled meetings/month	PCT meeting logs	Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PCT collaboration teams	time, effort	n/a	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			

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

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

End of Reading Goa

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	In 2012-2013, 95% (20)of ELL students will score as proficient in listening/speaking.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:
86% (18) are currently proficient in listening/speaking.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of direct instructional strategies in content area vocabulary.	Increasing direct instruction in content area vocabulary.	Teachers, administration	progress monitoring data	assessments

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	In 2012-13, 95% (20) of ELL students will score proficient in reading.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:
86% (18) proficient in reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of exposure to a wide variety of comprehension strategies	Increasing the variety of before/during/after reading comprehension strategies used during instruction	Teachers, Administration	Progress monitoring data	student assessments

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	In 2012-13, 95% (20) of ELL students will score proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

86% (18) are proficient in writing

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of writing opportunites dealing with nonfiction text	Increase the written analysis of nonfiction text	Teachers, Administrators	Progress monitoring data	student assessments

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Improving planning and instruction through professional collaboration on Peer Coaching teams	time, effort	n/a	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In 2013, at least 30% (242) of students will score a level 3 or above on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24%(191)	30% (242)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Lack of variety of research-based instructional strategies used in the classroom.</td><td>Peer Coaching Teams collaborate to increase strategies in all teachers' plans.</td><td>Teachers, Administration</td><td>Lesson Plan monitoring and frequent assessment process</td><td>Lesson plans, assessment data, strategies logs</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Less frequent use of student-centered technology and/or hands on activities</td><td>Increase incorporation of instructional technology and hands on activities in all math classrooms.</td><td>Admin, Dept. Chairs</td><td>CWT, Progress monitoring data</td><td>PDP's, Lesson Plans, Strategy Logs</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Lack of a variety of research-based strategies used for concept acquisition</td><td>Increase use of oral and written language to explain the problem-solving process needed for various math concepts</td><td>Department chairs, Administration</td><td>CWT, Lesson Plan monitoring, PDP process</td><td>PDPs, Lesson Plans</td></tr>
</table>

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	In 2013, 55% (5) students will score at levels 4,5 and 6 in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (3)	55% (5)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited student use of technology during all phases of instruction.</td><td>Increase training and access to instructional technology for all teachers.</td><td>Tech coach, administration</td><td>CWT, Lesson plans, progress monitoring data</td><td>PDPs, lesson plans strategies logs</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Limited use of higher order questions and activities</td><td>Inclusion of H.O.T. questions and activities in lesson plans and in</td><td>teachers, administrators</td><td>lesson plan monitoring, PCT logs, strategies logs, assessment data</td><td>lesson plan monitoring, PCT logs, strategies</td></tr>
</table>

			room agendas			logs, assessment data

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In 2013, 45%(363) of all students will score at Level 4 or 5 on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (298)	45% (363)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited direct instruction of content area vocabulary</td><td>Increase use of direct vocabulary across all content areas</td><td>teachers, administration</td><td>lesson plan monitoring, assessment data</td><td>lesson plans, strategies logs</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Limited access to higher order questioning strategies and activities</td><td>Teachers develop HOT questions and activities through Lesson Plan Studies and collaboration within Peer Coaching Teams</td><td>Administration, Peer groups</td><td>Lesson Plan monitoring, CWT, PCT Logs</td><td>Lesson Plans, Logs</td></tr>
</table>

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	In 2013, 66% (6) students will scores at or above level 7 in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (5)	66% (6)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Students not retaining the procedures needed to solve math problems</td><td>Require students to express in oral and written language the problem solving steps involved</td><td>math dept., administrators</td><td>progress monitoring</td><td>assessment data</td></tr>
</table>

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2013, at least 70% (524) of all students will make learning gains in math.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	62% (461)	70% (524)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited use of interactive instructional strategies	Train teachers and increase use of strategies such as Kagan to engage and focus all students	teachers, administrators	PCT logs, progress monitoring data	monitoring logs
2	Students not grasping abstract concepts	In crease the use of manipulatives, technology, research-based strategies and computer based learning to teach/reteach math concepts.	Dept. chair, Administrators	Monitor Lesson Plans, Straegies Logs and CWT data	Assessment data, Strategies Logs, Lesson Plans

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	In 2013, 77% (7) students will make learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (6)	77% (7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Less frequent use of student-centered technology and hands-on activities	Increase the incorporation of instructional technology and hands on activities in the math classroom	administrators, department chairs	CWT, progress monitoring data	PDPs, lesson plans strategies logs

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2013, at least 60% (118) of struggling learners will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (100)	60% (118)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of individual student support for struggling students	Assign an adult mentor for each student to meet with regularly, set and monitor goals.	teachers	progress monitoring data	assessment data
2	Students not grasping astract concepts	Increase the use of manipulatives, technology, research-based strategies and computer based learning to teach/reteach math concepts.	Dept. Chair, Administrators	Progress monitoring	Assessment data, Lesson Plans and Strategies Logs

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal #
	By school year 2016-17, our achievement gap will be reduced by 50%.
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	61	70	73	76	79	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In 2013, at least 50% (113) of Black students will score at least a Level 3 on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (156)not making progress	50% (113)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of support for struggling students	Assign an adult mentor to help set and reach goals and assist with school work	mentors	assessment data	progress monitoring data, report card grades
2	Students not fully engaged in the learning process	Increase student engagement in all math classrooms through instructional technology, hands on activities and collaborative lesson planning	Math teachers, Dept, Chairs, Admin	Progress Monitoring	Assessment data, Lesson Plans, PCT logs
3	Students not retaining the procedures needed to solve math problems.	Require students to express in oral and written language the problem solving steps involved.	Math Dept. and teachers	Progress monitoring	Assessment data

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

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

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

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In 2012, at least 50% (123) of SWD will score at Level 3 or above on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (103)are not making progress	50% (123)making progress

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of hands on activities and materials	Increase the use of manipulatives, technology, research-based strategies and computer based learning to teach/reteach math concepts.	Dept. Chairs, Administration	Progress monitoring	Assessment data, lesson plans, Strategies Logs

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	In 2013, at least 50% (151) of Economically Disadvantaged students will score a Level 3 or higher on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| 64% (194)are not making progress | 50% (151)making progress |

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of hands on activities and materials	Increase the use of manipulatives, technology, research-based activities and computer based learning to teach/reteach math concepts.	Dept. Chairs and Administrators	Progress Monitoring	Assessment data, Lesson Plans, Strategies Logs

End of Middle School Mathematics Goa

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:	In 2013, no more than 4%(3)students will score at level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4% (3)	No more than 4% (3).

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of variety of research-based instructional strategies used in the classroom.	Peer Coaching Teams collaborate to increase strategies in all teachers' plans.	Teachers, Administration	Lesson Plan monitoring and frequent assessment process	Lesson plans, assessment data, strategies logs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	In 2013, all students will score at level 4 or above in algebra
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
96% (65)	100% (68)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Limited direct instruction of content area vocabulary	Increase use of direct vocabulary across all content areas	teachers, administration	lesson plan monitoring, assessment data	lesson plans, strategies logs

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 # 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:	
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 Algebra. Algebra 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

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 Algebra. Algebra 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 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. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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 # 3A :

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Enhance lesson planning and instruction through professional collaboration in Peer Coaching Teams	all teachers, all subjects	Principal	school wide	4 per month	log of meetings and topics	principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Peer Coaching Teams	time, effort	none	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In 2013, at least 50% (137) students will score at least a leavel 3 on FCAT Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
38% (104)	50% (137)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of variety of research-based instructional strategies used in the classroom.	Peer Coaching Teams collaborate to increase strategies in all teachers' plans.	Teachers, Administration	Lesson Plan monitoring and frequent assessment process	Lesson plans, assessment data, strategies logs
2	Students have difficulty grasping abstract concepts and content vocabulary.	Increase the use of demonstrations, hands-on activities, research-based strategies in the classroom to reinforce science inquiry with proper use of lab equipment emphasized.	Science teachers/Dept. Chair	Progress monitoring	Assessment data, Strategies Logs, Lesson Plans
3	Below level students have difficulty understanding and applying content.	Offer ESE coteach science for applicable students	APC, ESE teachers	Progress monitoring	FCAT scores, report cards
4	Difficulty reading and understanding science test items and science vocabulary	Use GEMS for inquiry-based activies, FCAT test item specifications, CPALMS for state-approved methods to teach each standard and science voyager to provide comprehensive practice of FCAT skills	teachers, administrators	CWT, progress monitoring data	test data

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	In 2013, 50% (1) of students will score at levels 4,5 and 6 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	50% (1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited student use of technology during all phases of instruction.	Increase training and access to instructional technology for all teachers.	Tech coach, administration	CWT, Lesson plans, progress monitoring data	PDPs, lesson plans, strategies logs
2	Limited use of higher order questions and activities	Inclusion of H.O.T. questions and activities in lesson plans and in room agendas	teachers, administrators	lesson plan monitoring, PCT logs, strategies logs, assessment data	lesson plan monitoring, PCT logs, strategies logs, assessment data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	In 2013, at least 25%(68)of students will score a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20%(56)	25% (68)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited direct instruction of content area vocabulary	Increase use of direct vocabulary across all content areas	teachers, administration	lesson plan monitoring, assessment data	lesson plans, strategies logs
2	Students not able to generalize scientific concepts to a variety of situations.	Increase use of HOT questions and activities in applying concepts.	Science teachers, Dept. Chairs	Progress monitoring	Assessment data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	In 2013, 100% (2) of students will score at or above level 7 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	100% (2)	100% (2)		

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Difficulty reading and understanding science vocabulary	use GEMS to provide inquiry based activities to increase student engagement in and understanding of topics in science	teachers, administrators	progress monitoring data	assessment data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Enhancement of planning and instruction through professional collaboration in Peer Coaching Teams	all	principal	school-wide	4 times/month	PCT logs	principal

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PCTs	time, effort	none	$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

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In 2013, at least 92%(255) of students will score a 3.0 on FCAT Writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (238)	92% (255)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not proficient in revising own work.	The revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and assessed using student writing pieces.	L.A. teachers and Dept. Chairs	Progress monitoring	Assessment
2	Students not proficient in analytical writing	Incorporate common core and inquiry-based essay writing	teachers, administrators	progress monitoring	assessment data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	In 2013, 100% (2) of students will score at 4 or higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2)	100% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of experience with the writing process	Increase the opportunity for writing to a prompt and have students score writing samples using the rubric	teachers, administrators	progress monitoring data	assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Enhancement of planning and instruction through professional collaboration in Peer Coaching Teams	all	principal	school-wide	4/month	PCT meeting logs and topics covered	principal

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PCTs	time, effort	none	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of variety of research-based instructional strategies used in the classroom.	Peer Coaching Teams collaborate to increase strategies in all teachers' plans.	Teachers, Administration	Lesson Plan monitoring and frequent assessment process	Lesson plans, assessment data, strategies logs

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

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

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

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	In 2013, the average daily rate of absences will be no greater than 20 absences per day.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
In 2011, there was an average daily rate of 29 absences.	Average daily rate: 20 absences
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
168 students had 10 or more unexcused absences	120 students with excessive absences
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
30 students	15 students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with excessive absences are feeling disenfranchised from school.	Students with excessive absences will be assigned an adult mentor and an individual contract for attending school.	APA	On going tracking of absences	Documented absences from school
2	Students do not feel connected to the school setting.	All students will communicate with each other within the safe environment and adult facilitation of the classroom meetings held during regularly	APA, Team Leaders,Administration	Tracking of chronic absentees	Attendance info

		scheduled extended AA time.			

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	In 2013, no more than 72 students will be assigned ISS and no more than 61 students will be assigned OSS.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

209 ISS	185 ISS
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
80 students	72 students
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
369 OOS Suspensions	300 OOS Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
67 Students suspended out of school	61 students suspended out of school

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Some Students are repeatedly being suspended from instructional contact.	An administrator will intervene and monitor on a weekly basis those receiving a referral in efforts to keep them from being repeat offenders.	administration	Data recording and monitoring	Student data
2	Students missing instruction due to ISS or OOS.	An adult mentor will be assigned to meet regularly with repeat offenders.	APA	Monitor Discipline data	Discipline data
3	Students lack social and communication skills.	Continue to implement classroom meetings within a regularly scheduled long AA period.	teachers, administrators	Monitor discipline data	Discipline data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Review and implementation of a school wide discipline plan (ipod)	all	APA, Team Leaders	all	2nd, 4th Thursdays	PCT logs	Principal

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Professional collaboration through Peer Coaching teams	time, effort	n/a	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	In 2013, the number of volunteer hours accumulated will total at least 22,000 hours.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
21,131.50 hours of volunteer time have been documented	At least 22,000 hours volunteer time

	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	Parents are reticent to volunteer in the middle school setting	School staff will reach out to parents at various times of the year to encourage volunteering at school in the following ways; regular phone homes, marquee announcements, mass emails to parents and articles in each newsletter	Volunteer Coordinator	Tracking of volunteer hours	Year end Volunteer hours report

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

CTE Goal #1:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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	PCT collaboration teams	time, effort	n/a	$0.00
CELLA	Improving planning and instruction through professional collaboration on Peer Coaching teams	time, effort	n/a	$0.00
Mathematics	Peer Coaching Teams	time, effort	none	$0.00
Science	PCTs	time, effort	none	$0.00
Writing	PCTs	time, effort	none	$0.00
Attendance				$0.00
Suspension	Professional collaboration through Peer Coaching teams	time, effort	n/a	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $0.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

j͡n Priority	j͡n Focus	j͡n Prevent	j͡n NA

Are you a reward school: j͡n Yes j͡n No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/11/2012)

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.

☒ No. Disagree with the above statement.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

The following steps were taken to solicit members representative of our school community:
1. Contacted the Leadership Gainesville class for prospective members.
2. Sent nomination forms home to all families from our 3 feeder elementary schools.
3. Solicited minority and low SES families by phone to invite to serve.
4. Contacted previous members for suggestions

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Funds will be used to: 1. Provide guidance clerical hours 2. Pay stipends for summer planning sessions 3. Purchase hand sanitizer for student dispensers 4. Provide travel and materials for students to participate in National History Day	$11,300.00

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

SAC plans to:
1. Continue to sponsor improvements to our media center
2. Provide Guidance Clarical hours that were cut
3. Support instructional activities as requested by teachers
4. Support school wide behavioral reward days

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Alachua School District
FORT CLARKE MIDDLE SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	81%	77%	94%	66%	318	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	69%	75%			144	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?	67% (YES)	70% (YES)			137	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					599	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Alachua School District
FORT CLARKE MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	75%	93%	55%	300	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	67%	68%			135	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)	62% (YES)			127	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					562	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested