FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: KINLOCH PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Scott A. Weiner

SAC Chair: Edward A. Brown

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

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	Scott A. Weiner	Degrees: BS Food and Nutrition, Exercise Physiology MS Health Education Certifications: Health, Middle Grades General Science, Ed Leadership	6	11	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 '07 School Grade C B B B C C High Standards Rdg. 43 53 58 51 45 46 High Standards Math 40 57 56 56 59 48 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 65 62 67 68 58 54 Lrng Gains-Math 64 69 68 69 69 66 Gains-Rdg-25% 69 68 73 78 72 66 Gains-Math-25% 61 71 73 77 70 78 AMO-Rdg. 46 41 AMO- Math 48 43
Assis Principal	Morris L. Salty	Degrees: BS ESE Specific Learning Disabilities, ESE Emotionally Handicap MS Educational Leadership Certifications: Varying Exceptionalities, Specific Learning Disability, Ed.	10	11	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 '07 School Grade C B B B C C High Standards Rdg. 43 53 58 51 45 46 High Standards Math 40 57 56 56 59 48 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 65 62 67 68 58 54 Lrng Gains-Math 64 69 68 69 69 66 Gains-Rdg-25% 69 68 73 78 72 66 Gains-Math-25% 61 71 73 77 70 78 AMO-Rdg. 46 41 AMO- Math 48 43

		Leadership			
Assis Principal	Gina Shannon Spicer		2	8	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 '07 School Grade C D D D C F High Standards Rdg. 43 37 32 33 34 26 High Standards Math 40 43 42 41 42 25 Lrng. Gains-Rdg. 65 56 37 71 41 33 Lrng. Gains-Math 64 64 73 69 74 57 Gains-Rdg.- 25% 69 68 74 43 58 46 Gains-Math-25% 61 66 74 72 75 64 AMO-Rdg. 46 41 AMO- Math 48 43

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Janisse Molina	Degrees: BA Pre-K Primary Education MS Reading K-12 Certifications: Reading, ESOL	1	1	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 '07 School Grade A A B A A A High Standards Rdg. 68 76 77 75 75 77 High Standards Math 71 78 75 81 75 73 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 76 68 68 64 64 66 Lrng Gains-Math 74 67 51 65 75 62 Gains-Rdg-25% 73 54 56 56 59 53 Gains-Math-25% 75 81 53 70 77 70 AMO-Rdg. 46 41 AMO- Math 48 43
Math	Jessica Loe	Degrees: BS Computer Science Certifications: Math, Middle Grades	22	2	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 '07 School Grade C B B B C C High Standards Rdg. 43 53 58 51 45 46 High Standards Math 40 57 56 56 59 48 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 65 62 67 68 58 54 Lrng Gains-Math 64 69 68 69 69 66 Gains-Rdg-25% 69 68 73 78 72 66 Gains-Math-25% 61 71 73 77 70 78 AMO-Rdg. 46 41 AMO- Math 48 43

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. Networking with other schools to recruit teachers.	Administration	On-going	
2	2. Development of Professional Learning Communities to help retain teachers	Administration/Reading Coach/Department Chairs	On-going	
3	3. Partnering new teachers with a veteran teacher in a Mentoring/Buddy Program.	Administration	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
	Instructional staff and paraprofessionals are consistently given information on specific

None	courses for their certification requirement, along with scheduled professional development bi-weekly and on required teacher planning days. (November 2012 and February 2013)

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
63	3.2%(2)	9.5%(6)	46.0%(29)	41.3%(26)	33.3%(21)	52.4%(33)	7.9%(5)	3.2%(2)	17.5%(11)

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
NA			

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

A variety of services are provided to students who require additional remediation via extended learning opportunities. Kinloch Park Middle School's extended learning opportunities include after-school programs, Saturday Academy, Credit Recovery, Supplemental Education Services, and Summer School. The KPMS reading coach examines student data to help teachers assess student needs and provide the proper research-based intervention strategies. The coach also helps coordinate school-wide academic screening programs, assist in the design and implementation of progress monitoring programs, and design and deliver professional development on research-based intervention programs. Other facets of the school-wide program include a Parental Resource Center, Supplemental Educational Services, and support services to all special needs populations.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Kinloch Park Middle School provides services and support to migrant students and parents. The District Migrant liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs and conducts comprehensive needs assessment of migrant students to ensure that the unique needs of migrant students are met. Students are also provided extended learning opportunities (before-school and/or after-school, and summer school) by Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

Title I, Part D

Kinloch Park Middle School receives funds to support the Educational Outreach Program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-Out Prevention programs.

Title II

Kinloch Park Middle School uses supplemental funds for improving basic education in the following areas:
1. Training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program.
2. Training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, and ESOL

3. Training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL)
4. Focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.

Title III

Title III funds are used to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learner (ELL) and immigrant students by providing funds to implement and/or provide tutorial programs (HLAP), professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers, reading and supplementary instructional materials, and hardware and software for the development of language and literacy skills. The above services will be provided should funds become available for the 2011-2012 school year and should the FLDOE approve the applications.

Title X- Homeless

The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and community. Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assists Kinloch Park Middle School with identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students. The Homeless Liaison provides training for the KPMS registrar on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless and are provided with all entitlements. The Liaison will continue to participate in community organization meetings and task forces as it relates to homeless children and youth. Project Upstart provides homeless sensitivity and awareness campaign to all the schools, including Kinloch Park Middle School. The project will provide each school with a video and curriculum manual.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Kinloch Park Middle School will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.

Violence Prevention Programs

Kinloch Park Middle School follows the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program. This program specifically addresses violence and drug prevention/intervention through the curriculum delivered by the classroom teachers and the school TRUST specialist. The TRUST specialist's main goal is to counsel students on how to solve problems related to drugs/alcohol, stress, suicide, isolation, family violence, and other crises. Kinloch Park Middle School also makes use of Peer Mediation for violence prevention.

Nutrition Programs

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

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

1. By promoting Career Pathways and Programs of Study Kinloch Park Middle School 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.
2. Articulation agreements allow KPMS 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.
3. KPMS students will gain an understanding of business and industry workforce requirements by acquiring Ready to Work and other industry certifications.
Readiness for postsecondary opportunities will strengthen with the integrations of academics and career and technical education components and a coherent sequence of courses.

Job Training

N/A

Other

Parental
Kinloch Park Middle School will involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extend an open invitation to our school's parent resource center or parent area in order to inform parents regarding available programs, their rights under No Child Left Behind, and other referral services.

Kinloch Park Middle School will increase parental engagement/involvement through developing (with on-going parental input) our school's Title I School-Parent Compact; our school's Title I Parental Involvement Plan; scheduling the Title I Annual Meeting; and other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements.

Kinloch Park Middle School will conduct informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents, and schedule workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents. This positively impacts our goal of empowering parents and building their capacity for involvement.

Kinloch Park Middle School will complete Title I Administration Parental Involvement Monthly School Reports (FM-6914 Rev. 06-08) and the Title I Parental Involvement Monthly Activities Report (FM-6913 03-07), and submit to Title I Administration by the 5th of each month as documentation of compliance with NCLB Section 1118. Additionally, The M-DCPS Title I Parent/Family Survey, distributed to the schools by Title I Administration, is to be completed by parents/families annually in May. The Survey's results are to be used to assist with revising our Title I parental documents for the approaching school year.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The RtI Leadership Team consists of the Principal, the three Assistant Principals, the Reading Coach, the Math Coach, one Counselor, and one Teacher.

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 MTSS Leadership team functions in a variety of ways which include the following:
1. Monitoring academic and behavior data by evaluating progress and by addressing the following important questions: What will all students learn? (Curriculum based on standards), How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments), How will we respond when students have not learned? (Response to intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions), How will we respond when students have learned, or already know, the content? (enrichment opportunities)
2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention of achievement needs.
3. Hold regular team meetings.
4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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?

MTSS/RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP. The RtI Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis. The Team will also monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention. The Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

MTSS Implementation

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

1. Data, from Edusoft reports, PMRN reports, and program-specific reports, will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students in the following ways; adjust the delivery of curriculum and instructions to meet specific needs of students, adjust the delivery of behavior management systems, adjust the allocation of school-based resources,

drive decisions regarding targeted professional development, and create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions.
2. The managed data will be broken down into two categories, Academic and Behavior. The Academic data will include the FAIR Assessments (PMRN reports), the Interim Assessments (Edusoft reports), district based Math and Science assessments (Edusoft reports), FCAT (FLDOE and District reports), classroom grades, and any school site specific assessments. The Behavior data will include the Student Case Management System, Detentions, Suspensions/Expulsions, Referrals sorted by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative content, Office referrals per day per month, Team Climate surveys, Attendance, and 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, data analysis process.
2. Providing support for school staff to understand basic RtI principals and procedures.
3. Providing a network of ongoing support for RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team consists of the following members: Mr. Weiner (Principal), Ms. Spicer (Assistant Principal), Mrs. Molina (Reading Coach), Mr. Nemorin (Teacher), Ms. Loe (Teacher), Ms. Peckins (Media Specialist), Ms. St. Juste (Teacher), Dr. Brown (Counselor), Ms. Figueroa (Teacher), Ms. Richter (Teacher), Ms. Rodriguez (Teacher), Mr. Gardner (Teacher), Mrs. Delgado (Teacher), Mr. Goodstein (Teacher), and Mr. Vergara (Teacher), Mr. Boza (Teacher), Mr. Heras (Teacher), Ms. Roine (Teacher).

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

The purpose of our Literacy Leadership Team is to create an increase in the capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal, assistant principal, reading coaches, mentor reading teachers, and teachers from all content areas serve on this team to study scientifically based reading research, develop a school-based literacy plan of action including school-wide professional development, inquire, and reflect on reading practices school-wide, and discuss and utilize school and district test data to make teaching decisions.

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

1. School-wide focus on utilizing various reading strategies in differentiated homerooms - The strategies include previewing and predicting before reading, analyzing questions, interacting with text using the Say Something and Questioning Strategies during reading, and using the process of elimination when answering test questions.
2. Departmental focus on vocabulary strategies such as Vocabulary Maps, Concept of Definition, Prediction-Association-Verification-Evaluation (PAVE) procedure, and Vocabulary Trees (focus on Root Words). “Word Generation Program” will be implemented in order to develop vocabulary in writing.
3. School-wide implementation of teacher and student Think-Alouds – This reading strategy helps make thinking before, during, and after reading explicit. In order to help all students, teachers and students must demonstrate the comprehension processes and the strategies used to make sense of text.
4. School-wide implementation of Two-Column Notes – This type of note-taking stimulates organizational and critical thinking skills, helps students remember what is said in class, and can help students work on assignments and prepare for tests outside of the classroom.

5. School-wide implementation of Writing to Learn Activities with focus on evidentiary writing. Writing one’s own response to a lesson helps to solidify understanding of content and engage in reflection. Students are encouraged to get their thoughts on paper immediately via Quick-writes and Entry/Exit Slips. Student’s written reflections also help teachers monitor student progress.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

*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.

In order to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher, Kinloch Park Middle School will continue to utilize the school wide reading strategies, which were introduced during the 2010/2011 school year. These strategies include Two Column Notes, Quick Writes/Exit Slips, Active Reading techniques, and Think-Alouds. For the 2011/2012 school year each department will be focusing on the use of FCAT Task Cards as well as implementing a department wide vocabulary strategy. Each department has chosen a specific vocabulary strategy that they will utilize throughout the school year. These strategies include Vocabulary Maps, Concept of Definition, Prediction-Association-Verification-Evaluation (PAVE) procedure and Vocabulary Trees (focus on Root Words). The Literacy Leadership Team will also continue to provide professional development on the scientifically research based reading strategies mentioned above.

*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:	During the 2012 school year 25% (299) of students scored at FCAT 2.0 Level 3 in Reading. For the 2012-2013 school year 30% (366) of the students are expected to score a Level 3 in Reading on the FCAT 2.0 2013. This is an increase of 5 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (299)	30% (366)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the lowest reporting category in 6th -7th grade was Informational Text/Research Process and Literary Analysis in 8th grade. Strong vocabulary and grammar foundation due to primary language interference.	Individual department wide vocabulary strategies will be implemented. Strategies include: Vocabulary Maps, word of the Week, Concept of Definition, and PAVE using Differentiated Instruction in (6-7th grade) Informational Text/Research Process and 8th grade Literacy Analysis	MTSS/RtI	Weekly Vocabulary/Grammar Quick Quizzes and First Focus activities to assess the effectiveness of Instruction	Formative: Mini Assessments Lesson Plans Interim Exams Summative: FCAT 2.0 Reading 2013

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year 15% (187) of students scored at FCAT 2.0 Levels 4 and 5 in Reading. 18% (220) of students are expected to score at FCAT2.0 Levels 4 and 5 in Reading for the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 school year. This is an increase of 3 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
155(187)	18%(220)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the lowest reporting category in 6th grade was Reading Application, Information Text/Research Process in 7th grade, and Literacy Analysis Fiction/Non Fiction in 8th grade. A need for rigorous instruction utilizing visuals to provide higher performing students with enrichment.	1. Higher performing students will build skills and accelerate academic growth in the following areas: 2. Analysis Fiction/ Non Fiction, 7th-Information Text/Research Process and 8th-Literacy Analysis Fiction/Non Fiction utilize graphic organizers, multi-media and practice anchoring conclusions	MTSS/RTI	Formative reports from student folder audits will be used to determine student's on-going progress. Lesson plans will be monitored to demonstrate evidence of multi-media use, as well as classroom walkthroughs	Formative: Mini Assessments Interim Exams Reading Plus FCAT Explorer Summative: FCAT 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning	During the 2011-2012 school year 66% (697) of students

gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	made learning gains in Reading for the 2012-2013 school year. 71% (749) of students are expected to make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 in reading for the 2012-2013 school year. This is an increase of 5 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (697)	71%(74)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the lowest reporting category in 6th – 8th grade was Reading Application. Students receive limited guided instruction that ensures every student receives exposure and reinforcement in the weakest benchmarks.	Teachers will use data to provide Differentiated Instruction, as well as an adopted framework utilizing instructional time in the block schedule.	MTSS/RTI	Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs and examine student work folders based on the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) Accelerated Reader Reading Plus	Summative: Mini Assessments Reading Plus FCAT Explorer Formative: FCAT 2.0 Reading

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	During the 2011-2012 school year 71% (198) of the Lowest 25% students made learning gains on the 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0. 76% (212) of the Lowest 25% students are expected to make learning gains in Reading for the 2012-2013 school year. This is an increase of 5 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

71%(198	76% (212)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the lowest reporting category in 6th – 8th grade was Informational Text/Research. Students scoring in the Lowest 25% in Reading on the FCAT 2.0 need small group instruction that allows for category and content focused instruction in the area of Informational Text/Research Process that is in need of improvement.	Specialized homerooms will be created where the Lowest 25% in reading will receive small group instruction that focuses on their reading weakness	MTSS/RtI	Teacher Test District assessments Lesson Plans	Summative: Mini Assessments Reading Plus Formative: FCAT 2.0 Reading
2	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the lowest reporting category in 6th – 8th grade was Informational Text/Research. Students scoring in the Lowest 25% in Reading on the FCAT 2.0 need small group instruction that allows for category and content focused instruction in the area of Informational Text/Research Process that is in need of improvement.	After School Tutoring/ALL Stars	MTSS/RtI	FCAT Explorer reports	Summative: Monthly reports FCAT Explorer Formative: FCAT 2.0 Reading
3	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the lowest reporting category in 6th – 8th grade was Informational Text/Research. Students scoring in the Lowest 25% in Reading on the FCAT 2.0 need small group instruction that allows for category and content focused instruction in the area of Informational Text/Research Process that is in need of improvement.	Morning Tutoring-computer based programs	MTSS/RtI	Compass Learning FCAT Explorer Achieve3000	Summative: Monthly computer-generated reports Formative: FCAT 2.0 Reading

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	46	51	56	61	66	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	During the 2011-2012 school year 42% (502) of the Hispanic subgroup made satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading. The Hispanic subgroup is expected to make 50% (598) progress on the FCAT 2.0 Reading for the 2012-2013 school year. This is an increase of 8 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 47% (8) Black: NA Hispanic: 42% (502) Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 60% (10) Black: NA Hispanic: 50% (598) Asian: NA American Indian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the lowest reporting category for the Hispanic subgroup in 6th – 8th grade was Vocabulary. A large percentage of Hispanic students do not have a basic foundation of the English Language due to their native home language.	Departments will implement vocabulary strategies, such as Vocabulary Maps, PAVE, Oral language activities to help increase vocabulary exposure for students in grades 6 to 8th	MTSS/RtI	Achieve 3000 Reports Imagine Learning Reports Lesson Plans	Summative: Mini Assessments District Assessments Formative: FCAT 2.0 Reading

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year 26% (92) of the ELL subgroup made satisfactory progress in Reading. 33% (117) of the ELL subgroup is expected to make satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Reading, an increase of 7 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (92)	33% (117)

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 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the lowest reporting category in ELL for 6th - 8th grade was Vocabulary.	ELL students will be placed in specialized homerooms where they will receive small group instruction focusing on vocabulary skills. Teacher will model Reciprocal	MTSS/RtI	Achieve 3000 Reports Imagine Learning Reports Lesson Plans	Summative: Mini Assessments Teacher Reports Formative: FCAT 2.0 Reading

1	Small group instruction ensures all ELL students receive instruction in reading outside of their ELL classes.	Teaching. All ELL students will utilize Language programs, audio books, Think/Pair/Share to improve vocabulary and reading. Graphic Organizers Word Relationships Task Cards			

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year 19% (26) of the SWD subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in reading. 34% (46) of the SWD subgroup is expected to make satisfactory progress in Reading for the 2012-2013 school year. This is an increase of 15 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (26)	34% (46)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the lowest reporting category for the SWD subgroup for 6th - 8th grade was Informational Text/Research. All students with disabilities subgroup need improvement in Informational Text/research Process along with individualized group instruction to meet their educational needs in reading.	SWD students in grades 6-8th will be placed in specialized, small homerooms where they will receive individualized instruction designed to reinforce reading skills in Informational Text/Research Process using newspapers, magazines, and print-rich materials	MTSS/RtI	School Site Data Sheets Discovery Education Reports Lesson Plans Class Room Walk through	Summative: Mini Assessments Teacher Reports Formative: FCAT 2.0 Reading

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:	During the 2011 school year 42% (479) of the ED subgroup made satisfactory progress in Reading. 50% (570) of the ED subgroup is expected to make satisfactory progress in Reading for the 2012-2013 school year. This is an increase of 8 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (479)	50% (570)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the lowest reporting category for the ED subgroup for 6th - 8th grade was Vocabulary. Lack of instruction that ensures that all of the ED students are receiving vocabulary instruction.	All ED students will receive daily reading skill reinforcement activities during homeroom that focus specifically on increasing key vocabulary and vocabulary with context clues across all content areas.	MTSS/RtI	Teacher, school, and district test results will be analyzed to ensure that ED students are making progress. The Administration and Reading Coach will monitor the progress and direct instruction based on identified weaknesses.	Summative: Interim Assessments/Teacher Reports Formative: FCAT 2.0 Reading

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
5D. 1 Differentiated Instruction	All Departments	District Representative	6-8th grade	Early Release Nov. 2012	Random Check for implementation of strategies	School Administration
5D.2 Vocabulary Maps and School-Wide Word Generation Program	All Departments	Reading Coach	6-8th grade	October 18, 2012	Random check for implementation of strategies	School Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
4A.2	Tutoring	Children's Trust	$200,000.00
			Subtotal: $200,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $200,000.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	During the 2011-2012 school year 32% (113) percentage of the students will increase to 37% (118) percentage points on the administration of the CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
32%(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	Based on the 2012 Spring Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning assessment, the lowest reporting category for 6th - 8th grade was Vocabulary. Students have limited exposure to the English language at home, therefore limiting proficient listening/speaking opportunities.	Students in grades 6-8th grade will analyze language/speaking experiences after stories, classroom activities, school functions that provide opportunities for expression. Teachers will vary the complexity of assignments through differentiated instruction.	MTSS/RtI	Classroom visitations will monitor the implementation of language/speaking experiences. Odyssey, Reading Plus, and Achieve 3000 reports	Summative; Bi-weekly assessments/ Computer-generated progress tracking reports Formative: 2013 CELLA

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on the 2012 Spring Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning assessment, the lowest reporting category for 6th - 8th grade was Vocabulary.	Students will practice and reinforce the use of reading and vocabulary skills of the English language through the use of graphic organizers, visual aids, and Task Cards.	MTSS/RtI	Achieve 3000 Reports Imagine Learning Reports FCAT Explorer Reports	Summative; Bi-weekly assessments/ Computer-generated progress tracking reports Formative: 2013

	Students continue to resort back to their home language as their primary language during instructional and home learning.				CELLA
2	Based on the 2012 Spring Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning assessment, the lowest reporting category for 6th - 8th grade was Vocabulary. Students continue to resort back to their home language as their primary language during instructional and home learning.	Afterschool Tutoring	MTSS/RtI	Bi-weekly assessments/Achieve 3000 Reports	Summative; Bi-weekly assessments/ Computer-generated progress tracking reports Formative: 2013 CELLA

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	During the 2011-2012 school year, students showed 26% (91) proficiency on the Writing section of the CELLA . During the 2012-2013 school year expected level of performance is 31% (96), an increase of 5 percentage points.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
26% (91)	

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	Based on the 2012 Spring Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning assessment, the lowest reporting category for 6th - 8th grade was Vocabulary. Students are not proficient in the steps of the writing process as it relates to the English language.	Students will use the following steps to the writing process: planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing (according to each child's individual writing level), as well as sharing and responding to writing.	MTSS/RtI	Monthly writing prompts, informal writing assessments, student work samples, home learning	Summative: Writing samples in work folders/ Monthly Prompts Formative: 2013 CELLA

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
2.2 ELL tutoring	Tutors/Supplies	Title III	$7,500.00

			Subtotal: $7,500.00
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: $7,500.00

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year 21% (253) of students scored at Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Math. During 2012-2013 30% (366) of the students are expected to score at Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 in Math, an increase of 4 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (253)	30% (366)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the lowest reporting category for Students scoring a Level 3 in 6th - 8th grade was Geometry and Measurement.	Students will receive a short period of spiral review each class will focus on increasing their fundamental Geometry and Measurement skills. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to investigate geometric properties through Differentiate Instruction for students in grades 6-8th.	MTSS/RtI	1.1. Data from district provided interim exams will be analyzed to assess whether students are performing at a proficient level. 1.2. FCAT Explorer Reports	Summative: Mini-formative assessments Interim Exams Formative: FCAT Math as a final summative evaluation.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	During the 2011 school year 18% (205) of students scored at FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in Math. 19% (223) of students are expected to score at FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in Math for the 2012 School Year. This is an increase of 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (205)	19% (223)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the lowest reporting category for Students scoring Levels 4 and 5 in 6th - 7th grade was Geometry and Measurement, and Expression, Equations, & Functions in 8th grade.	Higher performing students will complete weekly Gizmo online activities to help enrich their instruction.	MTSS/RtI	Data from teacher, school, and district-based tests will be used to ensure that high performing student are making adequate progress to maintain their high level of achievement.	Summative: Mini Assessments Formative: FCAT 2.0 Math

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	During the 2011-2012 school year 66% (689) of students made learning gains in FCAT 2.0 Math. For the 2012-2013 school year 71% (741) of students are expected to make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Math, an increase of 5 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (689)	68% (185)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the lowest reporting category for students making learning gains in 6th - 8th grade was Geometry and Measurement.	3.1. Provide students with Differentiated Instruction in Geometry and Measurement based on given data that includes semicircles and on-line and off-line manipulative..	MTSS/RtI	Data from teacher, school, and district-based tests will be used to ensure that progress is being made toward reinforcing the weakest benchmarks.	Summative: Mini Assessments Interim Assessments Formative: FCAT 2.0

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	During the 2011-2012 school year 63% (171) of the Lowest 25% Students made learning gains in Math. During 2012-2013 school year 68% (185) of the students are expected to make 68% (185) , an increase of 5 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (171)	68% (185)

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 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the lowest	These students will be placed into specialized homerooms based on	MTSS/RtI	Data from teachers, school, and district-based assessments will	Summative: Mini Assessments Reports/

1	reporting category for students in the lowest 25% in 6th - 7th grade was Fractions, in 8th grade was Ratios/Proportional Relationships and Statics. Identifying student's specific level of performance and properly aligning instruction to meet individual student needs.	their level of performance and will receive daily instruction targeted to Reinforce Fractions, Ratios/Proportional Relationships and Statistics.		be analyzed to ensure the students in the Lowest 25% are making progress.	Interim Assessments Formative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	48	53	57	62	67	

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year 41% (490) of the Hispanic subgroup made satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math. The Hispanic subgroup is expected to make 53% (633) progress on the FCAT 2.0 Math for the 2012-2013 school year. This is an increase of 12 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 24% (4) Black: NA Hispanic: 41% (490) Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 51% (9) Black: NA Hispanic: 53% (633) Asian: NA American Indian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the lowest reporting category for Hispanic students in 6th - 8th grade was Expressions and Equations. Small group instruction will ensure all Hispanic students are receiving the necessary assistance in mastering Expressions and Equations in math content using the English language vocabulary.	Home Language Assistance Paraprofessionals will be utilized by providing additional assistance to Hispanic students in 6-8th grade math classes. The use of manipulatives and real world scenarios (budgets) to develop meanings and integers, and related vocabulary to help students in grades 6-8th.	MTSS/RtI	Data from teacher, school, and district-based tests will be analyzed to ensure that Hispanic students are making progress.	Summative: Mini Assessments/Interim Assessments Formative: FCAT 2.0 CELLA

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year 28% (99) percent of the ELL subgroup made proficiency in Math. During 2012-2013 school year 39% (138) percent of the ELL subgroup is expected to make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0, an increase of 11 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (99)	39% (138)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the lowest reporting category for students in the ELL subgroup in 6th - 8th grade was Geometry and Measurement.	Students will be explicitly taught concept-based vocabulary to solve simple problems involving rates and derived measurements for such attributes as velocity and density In Geometry and Measurement. for all grades levels.	MTSS/RtI	Data from teacher, school, and district-based tests will be analyzed to ensure that ELL students are making progress	Summative: Mini Assessments/Interim Assessments Formative: 2013 FCAT 2.

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year 20% (27) of the SWD subgroup made proficiency in Math. During 2012-2013 school year 37% (50) of the SWD subgroup is expected to make progress in Math, an increase of 17 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (27)	37% (50)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the lowest reporting category for students in the SWD subgroup in 6th - 8th grade was Geometry and Measurement. Lack of instruction that ensures SWD students are receiving the specialized math instruction dictated by their individual disabilities denoted by their IEP's.	Inclusion teachers will make sure that the accommodations of the SWD students are being met. Solve simple problems involving rates and derived measurements for such attributes as velocity and density in Geometry and Measurement for all grade levels.	MTSS/RtI	Data from First Focus Activities, school-based tests, and district-based tests will be analyzed to ensure that SWD students are making progress.	Summative: Mini Assessments/Interim Assessments Formative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year 42% (479) percent of the ED subgroup made proficiency in Math. During 2012-2013 school year 50% (570) of the ED subgroup is expected to make progress in Math, an increase of 8 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (479)	50% (570)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the lowest reporting category for students in the ED subgroup in 6th - 8th grade was Geometry and Measurement. Due to economic disadvantage, students lack technological resources in the home to supplement instruction.	The math department will implement department-wide computer intervention using FCAT Explorer and Odyssey.	MTSS/RtI	Data from teacher, school, and district-based tests will be analyzed to make sure the Hispanic subgroup is making proper progress.	Summative: Mini Assessments/Interim Assessments Formative: 2013 FCAT 2..0

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicates that 23% (10) of students scored at Level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain (or increase) 23% (10) of students achieving mastery.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (10)	23% (10)

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	Based on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC assessment, the lowest reporting category for students at Achievement Level 3 was Polynomials and Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics.	Students will use graphic calculators, Pearson success Net, and other technology to solve quadratic equations, as it relates to real-world applications. Polynomials and	MTSS/RtI	Bi-weekly Assessments District Interim Data	Summative: Bi-weekly Assessments District Assessments Formative: Algebra EOC 2013

		Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics			

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 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicate that 74% of the students scored at Level 4 and Level 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain at 74% (32)or increase the percentage of students achieving Levels 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (32)	74% (32)

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	Based on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC assessment, 98% of the students scored in the upper third level (3-5) in the area of Functions, Linear Equations, and Inequalities.	Students will use the Florida Focus to complement instruction in the area of greatest need, following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model.	MTSS/RtI	Bi-weekly assessments District Interim Data	Summative: Bi-weekly Assessments District Assessment Formative: Algebra EOC 2013

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 : Kinloch Park Middle School will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	48	53	58	63	68	

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:	According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment 98% (41) made proficient progress and 2% (1) percent was not proficient. Our goal is to increase this 2% (1) to the 2013 Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: NA Black:NA Hispanic: 41% (17) Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: NA Black: Hispanic: 53% (22) Asian: NA American Indian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	Based on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC assessment, the lowest reporting category for Hispanic students was Polynomials and Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics. Hispanic students lack technology and supplement resources at home.	Differentiated Instruction through the use of Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, and Math Task Cards.	MTSS/RtI	Computer generated reports Bi-weekly Assessments	Summative: Bi-weekly Assessments District Interim Assessments Formative: FCAT 2.0 Algebra EOC 2013

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	The results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment indicate that 40% (16) of Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is 53% (22), an increase of 13 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (16)	53% (22)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC assessment, the lowest reporting category for ED students was Polynomials and Quadratics and Discrete Mathematics. One Economically Disadvantaged student did not meet satisfactory progress on the Algebra EOC examination.	Student will receive additional support and instruction in the area of Polynomials and Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics. By providing inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities.	MTSS/RtI	Bi-weekly Assessment District Data reports Computer-generated Reports	Summative: Mini Assessments Formative: Algebra EOC 2013

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
Florida Focus	6-8th grade Math	Math Department Chairperson	Math Department 6-8th grade	October 2012	Assessments/Computer program quizzes	RtI/MTSS
Gizmos	6-8th grade Math	PLC Leader	Math Department 6-8th grade	November 2012	Assessments	RtI/MTSS
Edusoft	6-8th grade Math	PLC Leader	Math Department 6-8th grade	Bi-weekly	Evidence in data binder Assessments	RtI/MTSS

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Higher order thinking	Math Task Cards	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 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.	During the 2011-2012 school year 23% (104) of students scored a Level 3 in Science. 28% (126) of students are expected to make

Science Goal #1a:	a Level 3 in Science for the 2013 School Year. This is an increase of 5 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (104)	28% (126)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the lowest reporting category for students at Achievement Level 3 in 6th – 8th grade was Nature of Science.	Assign projects for students to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Scientific Thinking.	MTSS/RtI	Projects and lab reports will be reviewed to ensure progress.	Summative: Interim assessments Formative: Science FCAT 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	During the 2011 school year 4% (20) of students scored at FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in Science. 7% (30) of students are expected to score at FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in Science for the 2012 School Year. This is an increase of 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4% (20)	7% (30)

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	Higher achieving students demonstrate in the Content Cluster of Scientific Thinking due to a lack of inquiry based learning.	Higher performing Science students will complete weekly, inquiry-based GIZMO online laboratory activities to help enrich their knowledge of Scientific Thinking.	Science Department Chair	The Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) will be used to determine effectiveness of instruction and drive changes in instruction based on student achievement data.	Formative: In-class assessment. Summative: Baseline Benchmark Assessment (BBA), Interims, and FCAT 2.0 Science 2012.

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
Discovery Education	ALL	Representative from Discovery Education	Science Department	November 6, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs, evidence of student engagement	Administration, Coaches, Department Chair
CRISS	ALL	District Personnel	All Faculty	November 6, 2012	Classroom walkthroughts, evidence in student portfolios	Administration, Coaches, Department Chair

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1A. Raise a Level	Incentive Program	EESAC	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00
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: $1,500.00

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year 64% (248) of students scored a Level 3 or higher in writing. 68% (262) of students are expected to make a Level 3 or higher for the 2013 school year, an increase of 4 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (248)	68% (262)

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	Based on the 2012 FCAT Writing Test, the area of deficiency was a lack of adequate support in their persuasive arguments.	Students will state an effective lead and a statement of the opinion or position, a middle with a series of supported arguments to convince the reader, and an ending focusing on the best argument with a strong conclusion.	RtI/MTSS	Individual writing conferences with students, monitoring of work folder samples, monthly writing prompts	Summative: Monthly writing prompts and classroom assessments. Formative: FCAT 2.0 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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
CRISS	6-8th grade/All Departments	District Personnel	All Faculty	October 2012	Class room walk though, lesson Plans	MTSS/RtI

Writing Budget:

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CIVIC EOC	7th/Social Studies	Social Studies Department Chairperson	Social Studies Department	November/December 2012	Readiness Evidence in Lesson Plans, assessments, and Classroom walk through	MTSS/RtI

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, the daily attendance rate was 94.99% (1174). The expected average daily attendance rate for 2012 is 95.49% (1180) . This is an increase of 0.5 percentage points. The number of students with excessive absences for the 2011-2012 school year was 407. The expected number of students with excessive absences for 2012-2013 school year is 387. This is a decrease of 20 students. The number of students with excessive tardies for the 2011-2012 school year was 105. The expected number of students with excessive tardies for 2012 -2013 is 100. This is a decrease of 5 students.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94.93 (1201)	95.43(1207)

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
381	362
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
98	93

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Due to limited control of private bus transportation arriving to school on time, our student attendance and tardy percentages may increase. Miami Dade Public Schools provide two buses for our students, however, there are 12 private buses transporting children at Kinloch Park Middle School on a daily basis.	Attendance based incentives including dances, game days, field days, and food based rewards.	MSST/RtI	Review of quarterly attendance statistics for individual students, grade levels, and the entire school.	District provided attendance reports

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
Student Attendance	ALL	Student Services Department	All Faculty	Oct, Nov.2012 Jan., April, May 2013	Quarterly review of District provided attendance reports	Administration

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.1 Increase attendance rate	Incentives	EESAC	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00

			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

End of 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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, the numbers of In-School suspensions were 310. The expected number of In-School suspensions for 2012-2013 is 279. This is a decrease of 31. The total number of student's suspended In-School for 2011-2012 was 200. The expected number of student's suspended In-School for 2012-2013 is 180. This is a decrease of 20. The number of Out-of-School suspensions for 2011-2012 was 150. The expected number of Out-of-School Suspensions for 2012-2013 is 135. This is a decrease of 15. The total number of students suspended Out-of-School for 2011-2012 was 101. The expected total number of students suspended Out-of-School for 2012-2013 is 91. This is a decrease of 10students.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
118	106
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
230	207
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
209	188
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
118	106
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	Due to students' lack of familiarity with the Code of Student Conduct as it relates to Indoor and Outdoor Suspension may lead to conflicts throughout the 2012-2013 school year.	Administration, Student Services, and grade level teams will complete student orientations, team meetings, and grade level parent and student conferences for all grade levels during the 2012-2013 school year. Increased use of peer mediation and counseling from the Student Services department to help develop conflict resolution skills. Student Orientation will be held in September 2012 to discuss the Code of Student Conduct. Grade level assemblies will be held quarterly (September 2012, December 2012, March 2013, May 2013) to discuss the Code of Student Conduct. Grade level teachers will meet twice a week (bi-weekly) with students and parents to discuss conduct and academic issues to help decrease Indoor and Outdoor suspensions.	MTSS/RtI	Review of quarterly statistics to examine the number of students that have been suspended. Cognos Report Student Daily Attendance Bulletin	District and School Suspension Reports

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
Progressive Discipline	All Grade Levels/All Departments	Student Services	Faculty and Staff	Early Release Days January 17, 2013 May 2, 2013	Administration will track students that have/have not been suspended through district reports.	Administration

Suspension Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Improve student behavior	Incentives	School-Based Budget	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00
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: $1,500.00

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.*	N/A
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					

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:	During the 2012-2013 school year students in all grade levels will increase their knowledge of STEM by participating in local science fairs, engineering, Gizmos Science, and Gizmos Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 assessments, areas of difficulty for students in grades 6th -8th are Math and Science. To effectively deliver STEM programs and integrate strategies	During the 2012-2013 school year, Differentiated Instruction will be utilized to incorporate and assess inquiry-based learning, while infusing digital technology into the curriculum.	MTSS/RtI	Classroom grouping and informal assessments will be focused on inquiry based activities and the use of innovative thinking strategies.	Classroom STEM activities and informal assessments with task specific rubrics.

	into the curriculum while enhancing technology literacy.				

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
Gizmos Math	6th-8th grade Math Department	Math Chairperson	Math Department	Early Release Jan. 2013	Gizmos Reports	MSST/RtI
Gizmos Science	6th-8th grade Science Department	Science Chairperson	Science Department	Early Release Jan. 2013	Gizmos Reports	MSST/RtI

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:	During the 2012 school year we plan to increase the number student enrollment in CTE courses by 5 percentage points.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not old enough for CTE program certification	CTE teacher will implement CTE state curriculum standards as outlined by CTE professional development activities.	MTSS/RtI	Class room Walk Through Student Assessments	Summative: Mini Assessments Class test Formative: District Assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Vocabulary Maps	6th-8th Grade/ALL subjects	Reading Coach	All Faculty	PLC-Monthly	Lesson Plans, Classroom walk through, student assessment	MSSt/RtI
Word Generation	6th-8th Grade/ALL subjects	Reading Coach	All Faculty	PLC-Monthly	Lesson Plans, Class room walk through, student assessment	MSSt/RtI

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	4A.2	Tutoring	Children's Trust	$200,000.00
CELLA	2.2 ELL tutoring	Tutors/Supplies	Title III	$7,500.00
Mathematics	Higher order thinking	Math Task Cards	EESAC	$200.00
Science	1A. Raise a Level	Incentive Program	EESAC	$1,500.00
Attendance	1.1 Increase attendance rate	Incentives	EESAC	$1,000.00
Suspension	Improve student behavior	Incentives	School-Based Budget	$1,500.00
				Subtotal: $211,700.00
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: $211,700.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

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
FCAT Parent Workshop Safe Internet Usage Workshop Curriculum Fair-High School Articulation	$800.00

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

The School Advisory Council will do everything it can to help improve student achievement. The Council will sponsor numerous incentive programs throughout the year for both student and teacher achievement. These incentives will be based around achievement on a wide variety of assessments and/or the completion of academically based programs. The Council will also continue to advise school leadership on ways that they may help increase 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
KINLOCH PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	53%	57%	83%	34%	227	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	62%	69%			131	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?	68% (YES)	71% (YES)			139	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					497	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
KINLOCH PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	58%	56%	91%	26%	231	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	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?	73% (YES)	73% (YES)			146	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					512	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested