FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: CENTENNIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Yamila Carballo

SAC Chair: Kerra Nottage

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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	Yamila Carballo	Master of Science in Reading from Bachelor of Arts in Political Science/Pre Law from St. Thomas University Completed all Doctoral level courses in Educational Leadership	5	16	Principal of Centennial Middle School '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade: C C B C C AYP: N N N N N High Standards Rdg. 39 48 52 48 49 High Standards Math 33 43 50 46 47 Learning Gains-Rdg.: 63 61 64 59 61 Learning Gains-Math: 59 61 70 63 67 Gains- Rdg. 25% : 67 71 71 73 72 Gains- Math 25%: 62 66 69 67 66
		MS in Special Education from NOVA Southeastern			Assistant Principal of Centennial Middle School '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade: C AYP: N High Standards Rdg. 39

Assis Principal	Michelle McGrew-Clarit	University BS in Special Education from Florida International University Certification in Educational Leadership Reading Endorsement K-12	1	1	High Standards Math 33 Learning Gains-Rdg.: 63 Learning Gains-Math: 59 Gains- Rdg. 25% : 67 Gains- Math 25%: 62 Miami Southridge Senior High School '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade: A D F D AYP: N N N N High Standards Rdg. 29 25 24 24 High Standards Math 60 55 54 53 Learning Gains-Rdg.: 45 44 40 46 Learning Gains-Math: 68 75 66 74 Gains- Rdg. 25% : 49 40 47 51 Gains- Math 25%: 57 72 65 76
Assis Principal	Eduardo Tillet	BA- Technology Education, Florida International University; Master of Science-Technology Education, Florida International University, Ed Specialist, Nova University	1	22	Assistant Principal of Centennial Middle School '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade: C AYP: N High Standards Rdg. 39 High Standards Math 33 Learning Gains-Rdg.: 63 Learning Gains-Math: 59 Gains- Rdg. 25% : 67 Gains- Math 25%: 62 Assistant Principal Winston Park K-8 Center '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade: A AYP: N High Standards Rdg. 82 High Standards Math 87 Learning Gains-Rdg.: 69 Learning Gains-Math: 73 Gains- Rdg. 25% : 67 Gains- Math 25%: 71 Principal of Howard A Doolan Middle School '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade: A B B AYP: N N N High Standards Rdg. 68 70 65 High Standards Math 61 61 61 Learning Gains-Rdg.: 69 37 63 Learning Gains-Math: 67 64 69 Gains- Rdg. 25 : 68 71 65 Gains- Math 25: 68 62 71

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	Archalena Coats	M.Ed. in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University BS in Elementary Education from Florida Memorial University Certifications in Educational Leadership (all levels), Elementary Education (grades 1-6), ESE (grades K-12) Endorsement ESOL	5	4	Reading Coach at Centennial MS: '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade: C C B C C AYP: N N N N N High Standards Rdg. 39 48 52 48 49 High Standards Math 33 43 50 46 47 Learning Gains-Rdg.: 63 61 64 59 61 Learning Gains-Math: 59 61 70 63 67 Gains- Rdg. 25% : 67 71 71 73 72 Gains- Math 25%: 62 66 69 67 66

Writing	Ja'nine Bryant	BA in Journalism form Muhlenberg College Endorsement in Reading	1	1	Writing Coach at Centennial MS: '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade:C C A A C AYP: NN N N N High Standards Rdg. 39 57 86 83 42 High Standards Math 33 57 84 83 42 Learning Gains-Rdg.: 63 58 70 71 68 Learning Gains-Math: 59 52 77 80 67 Gains- Rdg. 25% : 67 61 68 68 81 Gains- Math 25%: 62 58 69 67 63
Math	Yolanda Shinhoster	MS in Mathematics Education from Nova Southeastern University BS in Business Management from Nova Southeastern University Certification in Mathematics Middle (grades 5-9) ESOL Endorsement	1	1	Mathematics Coach at Centennial MS: '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade: C A D F D AYP: N N N N N High Standards Rdg. 39 29 25 24 24 High Standards Math 33 60 55 54 53 Learning Gains-Rdg.: 63 45 44 40 46 Learning Gains-Math: 59 68 75 66 74 Gains- Rdg. 25% : 67 40 47 51 Gains- Math 25%: 62 72 65 76
Science	Deborah Rubio	MS in Secondary Administration and Supervision from Florida International University BA in Sociology from University of Miami Certifications in General Science (grades 5-9), Secondary Administration and Supervision	22	1	Science Coach at Centennial MS: '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade: C C B C C AYP: N N N N N High Standards Rdg. 39 48 52 48 49 High Standards Math 33 43 50 46 47 Learning Gains-Rdg.: 63 61 64 59 61 Learning Gains-Math: 59 61 70 63 67 Gains- Rdg. 25% : 67 71 71 73 72 Gains- Math 25%: 62 66 69 67 66

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	Principal	On-going	
2	2. Regular meetings with the Assistant Principal in Charge of Curriculum	Assistant Principal in charge of Curriculum (APC)	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
There are currently 10 teachers who have not been classified Highly Effective.	The teachers are in the process of testing for certification in the areas needed.

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
55	0.0%(0)	5.5%(3)	56.4%(31)	38.2%(21)	47.3%(26)	61.8%(34)	18.2%(10)	1.8%(1)	16.4%(9)

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
Marshall Ruffo Petra Burns	TBA TBA	MINT Trained MINT Trained	
Marshall Ruffo Petra Burns	TBA TBA	MINT Trained MINT Trained	
Marshall Ruffo Petra Burns	TBA TBA	MINT Trained MINT Trained	

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs or summer school. The District coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to secondary students. The Curriculum Coach and Department Chairs develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with District personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered “at risk”, assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school wide program include an extensive Parental Program; Title I CHESS; Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and delinquent students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:
• training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
• training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL
• training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.

Title III

Services are provided through the District for education materials and ELL District support services such as parent outreach activities, tutorial programs, and reading and supplementary instructional materials to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

Centennial Middle School through the Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community. Programs such as the Homeless Children and Youth Program assist schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students. Training by the Homeless Liaison for registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors ensures children are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated or isolated on their status and are provided with all entitlements.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

1) The 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

By promoting Career Pathways and Programs of Study students will become academy program completers and have a better understanding and appreciation of the postsecondary opportunities available and a plan for how to acquire the skills necessary to take advantage of those opportunities.
Students will gain an understanding of business and industry workforce requirements by acquiring Ready to Work and Industry certifications.
Readiness for postsecondary will strengthen with the integration of academic and career technical components and a coherent sequence of courses.

Job Training

N/A

Other

Centennial Middle School will involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extend an open invitation to utilize our
school's Parent Resource Center in order to:
• inform parents regarding available programs
• their rights under No Child Left Behind and other referral services.
• Increase parental engagement/involvement through developing (with on-going parental input) our Title I School-Parent Compact (for each student)
• our school's Title I Parental Involvement Policy
• scheduling the Title I Orientation Meeting (Open House)
• other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements
• Conduct informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents
• schedule workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents' schedule as part of our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement
• 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)
• submit to Title I Administration by the 5th of each month as documentation of compliance with NCLB Section 1118.

Confidential “as-needed services” will be provided to any student in the school in “homeless situations” as applicable. Additional academic and support services will be provided to students and families of the Migrant population as applicable.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The School-based MTSS/RtI leadership Team is comprised of the Principal, the Assistant Principal in charge of curriculum, the science department chairperson and general science teacher, one reading and a mathematics department chairperson, and the computer specialist. The school's Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team. These members include Special education personnel, school psychologist, school social worker and school guidance counselor.
Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, and ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation. The Principal is accompanied by the Assistant Principal for curriculum, who seconds the principal in all initiatives and works actively on the implementation of all strategies.
Science General Education Teacher/Instructional Coach: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Mathematics Teacher/ Instructional Coach: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co teaching.
One Reading / Language Arts Department Chair: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with District personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to
be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
One Technology Specialist: Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data; provides technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.

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 will function in the following manner:
• Monitor what all students are learning and their progress by using District Assessments data.
• Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
• Hold regular monthly team meetings.
• Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
• Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
• Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
• Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for 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?

The RtI Leadership Team facilitates involvement of school community in designing, implementing, monitoring and assessing the school improvement plan. The Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data analysis. The Team will also monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and interventions.

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.

Academic: FAIR assessment, Interim assessments, State/Local Math and Science assessments, FCAT, Student grades, School site specific assessments
Behavior: Student Case Management System, Detentions, Suspensions/expulsions, Referrals by student behavior, staff

behavior, and administrative context, Office referrals per day per month, Team climate surveys, Attendance

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Create a network using the MTSS Leadership team to implement the process. The MTSS Leadership team meets monthly to review and discuss tier 1-3 problem solving process and will ensure it is implemented with fidelity.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Yamila Carballo, Principal, Michelle McGrew-Clarit, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Eduardo Tillet, Assistant Principal, , Archalena Coats, Reading / Language Arts Department Chair, and Petra Burns, Mathematics Department Chair.

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

The team meets twice a month to engage in the following activities: To discuss observed practices of teacher; To anticipate areas of concern, to be proactive with innovative ideas, and to find solutions to problems as they arise.
Review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting expectations.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT this year will be to encourage literacy strategies embedded into instruction, identify further needs for continuing professional development and coaching, increase the frequency of classroom observations and understanding the degree of literacy implementation.

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.

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*All teachers will attend weekly grade level, departmental, and team level meetings to discuss and determine reading needs of their students based on District and school site assessments.

*School wide data chats among students, teachers, school support personnel and administrators. All instructors will be required to implement One Book One

*School during the homeroom of each day. This will be a daily 15 minute portion used to infuse school-wide reading strategies, selected reading benchmark(s), and vocabulary terms by having all students read the same novel or passage. The novel will be selected by the LLT, in order to ensure high interest reading level among all subject areas. The reading and

writing coach will be responsible for delivering the literacy framework to the teachers on a weekly basis. The administrative team will conduct walkthroughs during homeroom to ensure the teachers are using the time effectively. If a teacher is struggling with the implementation of the lessons, it will be the responsibility of the reading or writing coach to model a lesson and coach that teacher.

*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?

Centennial offers applied and integrated courses in various departments. It is the objective of these courses to create relevancy for the student in that subject matter. For example, the school offers Materials and Processes (Woodshop) for those students who are interested in the career of woodworking and construction. Students are exposed to the field of wood technology; including, obtaining knowledge of woods and uses, calculations of materials, reading project drawings, and project procedures.

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?

The students at Centennial Middle/High School have the opportunity to select and apply to an academy when entering their 9th grade year. Currently, the school offers three academy choices:

- COAST
- iPrep
- Liberal Arts

The COAST academy focuses on the advancement of marine and environmental conservation through scientific research, literacy and mathematics education, leading to responsible stewardship and the sustainability of our natural marine resources. The iPrep academy will provide students with an opportunity to participate in a rigorous curriculum that is technologically enriched. These students will participate in various college preparatory and college level courses. The academy will prepare students to be well-rounded intellectually and become leaders in our community. The Liberal Arts Academy courses are designed to provide students with the opportunity to explore, analyze, synthesize, and respond to various subjects connected to Global Studies.

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 23 ¬% (211) of the students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 students proficiency by 6 percentage points to 29% (267).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (211)	29% (267)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, students show deficiency in reporting category 1: Vocabulary	To improve the students weaknesses in Vocabulary students will utilize the following: vocabulary word maps; word walls; personal dictionaries; instruction in different levels of content-specific words (shades of meaning); reading from a wide variety of texts; instruction in differences in meaning due to context; and engaging in affix or root word activities.	Literacy Leadership Team	Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data. The data will be utilized to drive instruction through daily lessons and will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the students 'needs. This information will be utilized to formulate bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups.	Formative Assessments: Baseline Benchmark Assessments, Interim Assessment, Teacher Assessments, FAIR Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Assessment indicate that 28 % (5) of students scored level 4 ,5, or 6 in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4, 5, and 6 by 5 percentage points to 33% (6).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (5)	33% (6)

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	The area that showed minimal growth, as noted in the FAA is in acquiring and using new vocabulary.	Use technology for websites and programs that link words with pictures. Direct instruction of new vocabulary in content materials, read aloud passages and activities of daily living.	Program Specialist SPED Teachers Administrator	Monitor weekly charts, lesson plans, and/or individual and small group instruction based on targeted common needs	Formative: 6-8 Functional / Modified curriculum using Access points IEP benchmarks Summative: 2013 FAA IEP Annual Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 14¬¬¬% (133) of the students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 17% (157).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (133)	17% (157)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, students show deficiency in reporting category 2: Reading Application	The use of graphic organizers, summarization activities, Reciprocal Teaching, questioning the author, text marking and encouraging students to read from a variety of texts. Using the above-named strategies, students will identify details from the passage to determine main idea, plot and purpose. Students will also learn to make inferences, draw conclusions and identify implied main idea and author's purpose	Literacy Leadership Team	Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data. The data will be utilized to drive instruction through daily lessons and will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the students 'needs. This information will be utilized to formulate bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups.	Formative Assessments: Baseline Benchmark Assessments, Interim Assessment, Teacher Assessments, FAIR Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Assessment indicate that 39% (7) of students scored level 7in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 42% (8).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (7)	42% (8)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area that showed minimal growth as noted in the FAA of students scoring level 7-9 is comprehension skills.	Train teachers to effectively implement access points. Provide students with direct instruction and repetition using questioning techniques and visual cues for literal and inferential comprehension skills - who, what, where, when, and why.	Program Specialist SPED Teachers Administrator	Administration's observation of student work folders, IEP benchmarks aligned with Access Points in lesson plans.	Formative: 6-8 Functional/modified curriculum IEP benchmarks Brigance Summative: 3013 FAA IEP Annual Goals mastery

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicates that 63% (479) of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student's achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 68% (516).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (479)	68% (516)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading results, an area in need of improvement is Reporting category 4 –Informational Text/Research Process.	Teachers will use assigned curriculum with fidelity to improve student skills such as locating and verifying details, critically analyzing text, and synthesizing details to draw conclusions. Strategies will include reciprocal teaching, note-taking skills and questioning the author.	Literacy Leadership Team	Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data. The data will be utilized to drive instruction through daily lessons and will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the students 'needs. This information will be utilized to formulate bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups.	Formative Assessments: Baseline Benchmark Assessments, Interim Assessment, Teacher Assessments, FAIR Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Assessment indicate that 61 % (9) of students making learning gains in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student's achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to

	66% (10).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (9)	66% (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	The area of deficiency as noted in the 2012 FAA assessment is cognitive and language understanding.	Emphasize instruction that helps students build stronger comprehension and oral skills.	Program Specialist SPED Teachers Administrator	Administrators will conduct walkthroughs to insure classroom teacher's daily lessons are aligned to the access point being targeted.	Formative: Unique Skills Curriculum Summative: 2013 FAA 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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 67% (141) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 72% (151).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (141)	72% (151)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading results, an area in need of improvement is Reporting category 3–Literary Analysis	Teachers will emphasize placing questions in context by rereading to review what preceded and what followed the passage, paragraph, or sentence in question. *Students should be able to distinguish literal from figurative interpretations. *Useful instructional strategies include: • vocabulary word maps; • word walls; • personal dictionaries; • instruction in different levels of content-specific words (shades of meaning); • reading from a wide variety of texts; • instruction in differences in meaning because of context; and • engaging in affix or root word activities.	Literacy Leadership Team	Review the Master Schedule and ensure that students are correctly placed based on the 2011 FCAT results. *Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule Quarterly data chats that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data. The data will be utilized to drive instruction through daily lessons and will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the students 'needs. This information will be utilized to formulate bell ringers, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction and the focus in tutorial groups.	Formative Assessments: Baseline Benchmark Assessments, Interim Assessment, Teacher Assessments, FAIR Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 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
	41	47	52	57	63	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 59 % (38) of students in the White Subgroup achieved proficiency. Centennial Middle School's goal is to increase student proficiency by 8 percentage points to 67 %(43). The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 29 % (112) of students in the Black Subgroup achieved proficiency. Centennial Middle School's goal is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points to 38 %(147).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 59% (38) Black: 29% (112) Hispanic: 44% (198) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: 67% (43) Black: 38% (147) Hispanic: 53% (239) Asian: N/A American Indian: 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	According to the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the students in the White Subgroup show deficiency in Reporting Category 4: Informational Text/Research Process According to the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the students in the Black Subgroup show deficiency in Reporting Category 4: Informational Text/Research Process According to the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the students in the Hispanic Subgroup show deficiency in Reporting Category 4: Informational Text/Research Process	To improve the students weaknesses in the Informational text and Research Process category, students will utilize the following: reciprocal teaching; opinion proofs; question-and-answer relationships; note-taking skills; summarization skills; questioning the author; and encouraging students to read from a wide variety of texts..	Literacy Leadership Team	Using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), the LLT will determine the effectiveness of the strategies and the evaluation tools to measure outcome. In addition, quarterly data chats that will compare progress as indicated on the FAIR and Benchmark Assessment results	Formative Assessments: Teachers Assessments, Interim Assessments, FAIR For students in Intensive Reading: Results from 2012-2013 Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Jamestown Reading Navigator web-based program, Achieve 3000, and Voyager Journeys Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
	Students not showing growth on Baseline	Students should practice locating and verifying	Literacy Leadership Team	Student progress is assessed using FAIR	Formative Evaluations:

2	Assessments/ Interim Assessments, and other district/state mandated assessments. These students may also have issues with decoding and fluency.	details, critically analyzing text, and synthesizing details to draw correct conclusions. Teachers should emphasize instruction that helps students build stronger arguments to support their answers. Students should explore shades of meaning to better identify nuances. Both students and teachers should examine rubrics and the appropriate benchmarks to ensure a complete understanding of the skills being assessed.		Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days and Core Curriculum assessments (JRN, Voyager Journeys, Language! or Hampton-Brown Edge). Percent of student making adequate progress toward the benchmark is calculated.	*Florida Assessment in Reading (FAIR) *Interim Assessments *Teacher created assessments Summative Assessments: *2012 FCAT Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 25 % (19) of students in the ELL Subgroup achieved proficiency. Centennial Middle School's goal is to increase student proficiency by 20 percentage points to 45% (33).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (19)	45% (33)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the students in the ELL Subgroup show deficiency in Reporting Category 1: Vocabulary	The following strategies will be utilized to support students' use of context clues and multiple meanings: engaging in root word activites, personal dictionaries and instruction in different levels of content-specific words. Students will practice using context clues to distinguish the correct meaning of words that have multiple meanings	Literacy Leadership Team ELL Teachers	Using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), the LLT will determine the effectiveness of the strategies and the evaluation tools to measure outcome. In addition, quarterly data chats that will compare progress as indicated on the FAIR and Benchmark Assessment results	Formative Assessments: Teachers Assessments, Interim Assessments, FAIR For students in Intensive Reading: Results from 2012-2013 Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Jamestown Reading Navigator web-based program, Achieve 3000, and Hampton-Brown EDGE Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
	According to the 2012	Identifying signal or key	Literacy Leadership	Using the Florida	Formative

2	administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, students in the ELL subgroup show deficiency in the following reporting category: Reporting Category 3: Literary Analysis	words in a text and the use of recognizing text features in a passage.	Team ELL Teachers	Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), the LLT will determine the effectiveness of the strategies and the evaluation tools to measure outcome. In addition, quarterly data chats that will compare progress as indicated on the FAIR and Benchmark Assessment results.	Assessments: Teachers Assessments, Interim Assessments, FAIR For students in Intensive Reading: Results from 2012-2013 Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Jamestown Reading Navigator web-based program, Achieve 3000, and Hampton-Brown EDGE Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
3	Students not showing growth on Baseline Assessments/ Interim Assessments, and other district/state mandated assessments. These students may also have issues with decoding and fluency. *Additionally, these students may continually be deficient all reporting categories. *ELL students may also have language barriers that may inhibit them from achieving adequate yearly progress.	Students should practice locating and verifying details, critically analyzing text, and synthesizing details to draw correct conclusions. *Teachers should emphasize instruction that helps students build stronger arguments to support their answers. *Students should explore shades of meaning to better identify nuances. * Both students and teachers Should examine rubrics and the appropriate benchmarks to ensure a complete understanding of the skills being assessed. * More practice should be provided with methods of development and understanding the term supporting details in performance tasks. * Useful instructional strategies include: • vocabulary word maps; • word walls; • personal dictionaries; • instruction in different levels of content-specific words (shades of meaning); • reading from a wide variety of texts; • instruction in differences in meaning because of context; and • engaging in affix or root word activities	Literacy Leadership Team ELL Teachers RtI Team	Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days and Core Curriculum assessments (McDougal Littell or Hampton-Brown Edge). *Percent of student making adequate progress toward the benchmark is calculated.	Formative Evaluation: *FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress in the Reading benchmarks. *Interim Assessments *Teacher created assessments Summative Evaluation: *2012 FCAT Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 16% (36) of students in the SWD Subgroup achieved proficiency. Centennial Middle School's goal is to increase student proficiency by 22 percentage points to 38% (84).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (36)	38% (84)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the students in the SWD Subgroup show deficiency in Reporting Category 4: Informational Text/Research Process.	Use of questioning the author and encouraging students to read a wide variety of text where students can synthesize, analyze and evaluate information to determine the validity and reliability of the text.	Literacy Leadership Team SPED Program Specialist	Using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), the LLT will determine the effectiveness of the strategies and the evaluation tools to measure outcome.	Formative Assessments: Teachers Assessments, Interim Assessments, FAIR Summative Assessments: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
2	Students not showing growth on Baseline Assessments/ Interim Assessments, and other district/state mandated assessments. *These students may also have issues with decoding and fluency. *Additionally, these students may continually be deficient in specific benchmarks because of their distinct learning disabilities.	Teach students to graphically depict comparison and contrast relationships to help understand them. *Students should be given more experience with problem and-solution-finding activities. *Teachers should emphasize identifying words and clue words that signal relationships. *Students should practice reducing textual information to key points so that comparisons can be made across texts; students should also become more familiar with comparing and contrasting in and across a variety of genres. *More emphasis should be placed on reading closely to identify relevant details that support comparison and contrast. * Useful instructional strategies include: • graphic organizers;	Literacy Leadership Team SPED Program Specialist RtI TEam	Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days and Core Curriculum assessment (Language!). *Percent of student making adequate progress toward the benchmark is calculated.	Formative Evaluation: *FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress in the Reading benchmarks *Interim Assessments *Teacher created assessments Summative Evaluation: *2012 FCAT Assessments

		• concept maps; • open compare/contrast; • signal or key words			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 36% (288) of students in the ED Subgroup achieved proficiency. Centennial Middle School's goal is to increase student proficiency by 8 percentage points to 44% (352).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (288)	44% (352)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the students in the ED Subgroup show deficiency in Reporting Category 4: Informational Text/Research Process.	Summarization skills and question-answer relationships using Task cards.	Literacy Leadership Team	Using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), the LLT will determine the effectiveness of the strategies and the evaluation tools to measure outcome.	Results from 2012-2013 Interim Assessments Results from Teacher-created assessments For students in Intensive Reading: Results from 2012-2013 Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Jamestown Reading Navigator web-based program, Achieve 3000, and Language!, and Voyager Journeys Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment
	Many of these students will not be able to participate in the after school tutoring programs offered at the school due to transportation issues. *ED Students may not have the resources available such as technology and enrichment reading opportunities.	Students should practice using and identifying details from the passage to determine main idea, plot, and purpose. *Students need practice in making inferences, drawing conclusions, and identifying implied main idea and author's purpose. *Teachers should ingrain the practice of justifying answers by going back to the text for support. *Teachers should help	Literacy Leadership Team RtI Team	*Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days and Core Curriculum assessments (JRN, Voyager Journeys,Language! or Hampton-Brown Edge). *Percent of student making adequate progress toward the benchmark is calculated	

2		students use graphic organizers to see patterns and summarize the main points. *Students must understand how patterns support the main idea, character development, and author's purpose. *Students should practice analyzing the author's perspective, choice of words, style, and technique to understand how these elements influence the meaning of text. * Useful instructional strategies include: • graphic organizers (e.g., note taking, mapping); • summarization activities; • questioning the author; • anchoring conclusions back to the text (e.g., explaining and justifying decisions); • opinion proofs *Provide extended learning opportunities for ED students though pull-out tutoring during class time.			

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Effective Vocabulary Strategies	Content Area Teachers: Grades 7th-9th	Instructional Supervisor for Curriculum and Instruction	Content Area Teachers	November 6, 2012	Observations, Coaching Cycles, and classroom walkthroughs will be conducted	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Coaches, Department Chairs
CRISS Training	Grades 7th-9th	CRISS Trainer	All instructional staff	November 13, 2012	Follow up assignments from CRISS training sessions	Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, and Literacy Coaches
Effective Use of Data to Differentiate and Drive Instruction	Grades 7th-9th	Literacy Coaches	All instructional staff	October 25, 2012	Observations, Coaching Cycles, and classroom walkthroughs will be conducted	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Coaches, Department Chairs
The Florida Alternate Assessment and Access Points	Grades 7th-9th	Jill Brookner	SPED Teachers	November 6, 2012	Lesson plans, observations, and classroom walkthroughs	Assistant Principal for Curriculum

Reading Strategies and Best Practices	Grades 7th-9th	Literacy Coaches	All instructional staff	September 2012-June 2013 Department Meetings	Observations, Coaching Cycles and classroom walkthroughs will be conducted	Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, and Literacy Coaches

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	Increase percentage of students scoring proficient in listening and speaking by 15%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
29% (24)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 CELLA is the language barrier related to the	1.1. To support vocabulary development, understanding the tone and speed. Teachers	1.1. ELL teacher, Language Arts teachers, Reading teachers, ELL/LA	1.1. ELL Department Chair and teachers will monitor the delivery of lesson plans.	1.1. Formative: The 3 administrations of FAIR: Reading Comprehension,

1	speed, tone, and vocabulary.	will use visual cues with flash cards, read/think aloud, audio books, and role playing.	Department Chair	Samples of student work will be collected and analyzed by the classroom teacher and Language Arts Department chair.	Maze and Word Analyses. Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	Increase percentage of students scoring proficient in Reading by 15%
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
22% (19)	

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	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 CELLA is related to understanding the essential message and main idea in text for overall comprehension.	2.1. Students will use graphic organizers to summarize the main points as well as utilize highlighting the text and marginal note taking. In addition, teachers will chunk the text during instruction as well as provide the students opportunity to use videos/CDs/audio books when reading text independently.	2.1. Literacy Leadership Team	2.1. ELL Department Chair and teachers will monitor the delivery of lesson plans. Classroom observations of ELLs to ensure students' progress and the effectiveness of program delivery.	2.1. Formative: The 3 administrations of FAIR: Reading Comprehension, Maze and Word Analyses. Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Increase percentage of students scoring proficient in Writing by 15%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
24% (21)	

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	2.1. Limited use of the writing components of Achieve 3000	2.1. Evaluate and provide feedback for one question or writing	2.1. ESOL Teachers Assistant Principal for Curriculum	2.1. Achieve 3000 reports with a focus on thought question and writing	2.1. FCAT Writing Assessment

		assignment per student every 2 weeks.		assignment completion	Summative: 2013CELLA Assessment
2	2.2. Limited use of daily writing practice (journals, quick write, bell ringer, exit slip, home learning)	2.2. Provide professional development of use of appropriate writing activities. Provide coaching support on infusion of daily writing lessons.	2.2. ESOL Teachers; ESOL Coach; Administration	2.2. Lesson Plan Student work folder evaluation	2.2. Classroom Walkthroughs; Work Folders Summative: 2013CELLA Assessment

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicate that 18% (169) of students scored a level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring a level 3 to 25% (229) increasing by 7 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (169)	25% (229)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. The area of deficiency for Level 3 Students on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 administration for all grade levels was Geometry and Measurement. This deficit was due to limited spatial orientation skills and lack of fluency in algebraic problem solving skills when utilizing formulas.	1A.1. Include enrichment and acceleration activities to enhance grade level instruction; develop a computer lab schedule to increase utilization of Computer Assisted Programs (CAP) including Florida FOCUS, GIZMOs, and Riverdeep ; accelerate instructional materials to promote greater depth of understanding for algebraic problem solving; implement a consistent problem solving protocol to ensure a problem solving standard.	1A.1. APC, Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	1A.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration	1A.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Assessment indicate that 44% (8) of students scoring at levels 4, 5, 6. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring levels 4, 5, and 6 49% (9) increasing by 5 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (8)	49% (9)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The 2012 FAA identified a weakness , in the ability of pupils levels 4-5, to identify fraction halves, fourths, and thirds using whole objects, pictures, and number names.	1.1. Provide students with opportunities to learn concepts using manipulatives and real world materials. Provide direct instruction and repetition using visual choices as presented in the FAA.	1.1. Program Specialist SPED Department Chair SPED Teachers Administration	1.1. Administrators will observe small group and individualized lessons; teacher progress monitoring charts; and pupil demonstration.	1.1. Formative: IEP benchmarks 6-8 Functional Modified Curriculum Brigance Summative: 2013 FAA Annual IEP goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 13% (123) of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Centennial Middle School's goal is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points to16 % (147).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (123)	16% (147)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. The area of deficiency for Achievement Levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Base Ten Number Systems for Grade 7. This was due to deficiencies with integers and exponent concepts. For Grade 8 the area of deficiency was Geometry and Measurement due to the lack of ability to solve multi-step step equations.	2A.1. Include enrichment and acceleration activities to enhance grade level instruction through the development of a computer lab schedule to increase utilization of Computer Assisted Programs (CAP) including Florida FOCUS, GIZMOs, and Riverdeep which focus on algebraic problem solving; utilize Math Counts materials to enhance grade level instruction; accelerate instruction of materials to match learner abilities; incorporate use of technology , such as TI-Inspire calculators, to demonstrate and derive Algebraic processes; implement a consistent problem solving protocol to ensure a problem solving standard.	2A.1. APC, Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	2A.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration.	2A.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Assessment indicate that 28% (5) of students scoring at levels at or above a level 7 in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at levels at or above a level 7 to 31% (6) increasing by 3 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (5)	31% (6)

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	2B.1. The area that showed minimal growth in the 7-9 scores of the 2012 FAA is the interpretation of concepts, such as largest and smallest, category presented in bar graphs.	2B.1. Provide students with opportunities to learn concepts with concrete manipulatives and the reinforcement of technology. Use the FAA practice materials, related to graphs, for direct instruction.	2B.1. Program Specialist SPED Department Chair SPED Teachers Administration	2B.1. Teacher will assure Aligned Access Points, and IEP benchmark instruction in daily lesson plans.	2B.1. Formative: 6-8 Functional / Modified Curriculum IEP benchmarks Summative: 2013 FAA IEP Annual Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 59% (450) of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student's achieving learning gains by10 percentage point to 69% (527).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (450)	69% (527)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3A.1. The area of deficiency for Students Making Learning Gains on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test administration for all grade levels was Geometry and Measurement. This deficit was due to limited spatial orientation skills and lack of fluency in algebraic problem solving skills when utilizing formulas.	3A.1. Develop a computer lab schedule to increase utilization of Computer Assisted Programs (CAP) including Florida FOCUS, GIZMOs, and Riverdeep in order to provide differentiated learning opportunities focused on the developing spatial orientation skills using algebraic problem solving processes; incorporate real world applications of	3A.1. APC, Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	3A.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math	3A.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0

		geometric problem solving; implement a consistent problem solving protocol to ensure a problem solving standard.		teachers by administration.	Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Assessment indicate that 54% (8) of students making learning gains in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student's achieving learning gains by 10 percentage points to 64% (10).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (8)	64% (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	3B.1. The area of deficiency in the 2012 FAA is solving real world problems involving perimeter using visual models	3B.1. Emphasize instruction through small group and one on one utilizing manipulatives.	3B.1. Program Specialist SPED Department Chair SPED Teachers Administration	3B.1. Monitor the progress of students via community based instruction	3B.1. Formative: Unique Skills Curriculum Summative: 2013 FAA 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:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that ¬¬¬62% (128) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student's achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 67% (138).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (128)	67% (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
	4A.1. The area of deficiency for students in the Lowest 25% as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the content area of Geometry and	4A.1. Develop a computer lab schedule to increase utilization of Computer Assisted Programs (CAP) including Florida FOCUS, GIZMOs, Virtual Manipulatives and	4A.1. APC, Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	4A.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and	4A.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida

1	Measurement. This deficit was due limited spatial orientation skills and lack of fluency in algebraic problem solving skills when utilizing formulas.	Riverdeep in order to provide differentiated learning opportunities focused on the developing spatial orientation skills and use algebraic problem solving processes; incorporate real world applications of geometric problem solving; implement a consistent problem solving protocol to ensure a problem solving standard.		remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration.	Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # 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
	37	43	48	54	60	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment indicates that 51% (33) percent of students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the White subgroup proficiency by 8 percentage points to 59% (38). The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment indicates that 24% (92) percent of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the Black subgroup proficiency by 10 percentage points to 34% (130). The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment indicates that 38% (170) percent of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the Hispanic subgroup proficiency by 10 percentage points to 48% (215).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:51% (33) Black:24% (92) Hispanic:38% (170) Asian:NA American Indian:NA	White: 59% (38) Black:34% (130) Hispanic:48% (215) 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
	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian:	5B.1. Modeling of instruction by Math Coach in classrooms	5B.1. APC, Classroom teacher, and Department	5B.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target	5B.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft;

1	American Indian: The area of deficiency for Black and Hispanic students as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the content area of Geometry and Measurement. This deficit was due limited spatial orientation skills and lack of fluency in algebraic problem solving skills when utilizing formulas.	Provide after school tutoring and differentiated instruction.	Chairperson	application of topic of instruction. Adjust instruction as needed to ensure adequate progress. Incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified from assessments as deficient. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration.	District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 34% (26) of the ELL Subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the ELL subgroup proficiency by 18 percentage points to 52% (39).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (26)	52% (39)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C.1. The area of deficiency for English Language Learners as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the content area of Geometry and Measurement. This deficit was due limited spatial orientation skills and lack of fluency in algebraic problem solving skills when utilizing formulas.	5C.1. Modeling of instruction by Math Coach in classrooms Provide after school tutoring and differentiated instruction.	5C.1. APC, ELL teacher, and Department Chairperson	5C.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration	5C.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that15% (33) of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the SWD subgroup proficiency by 17 percentage points to 32% (70).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (33)	32% (70)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. The area of deficiency for Students with Disabilities as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the content area of Geometry and Measurement. This deficit was due limited spatial orientation skills and lack of fluency in algebraic problem solving skills when utilizing formulas.	5D.1. Develop a computer lab schedule to increase utilization of Computer Assisted Programs (CAP) including Florida FOCUS, GIZMOs, Virtual Manipulatives and Riverdeep in order to provide differentiated learning opportunities focused on the developing spatial orientation skills and use algebraic problem solving processes Math Coach will conduct Push-ins with SWD subgroups focusing on specific benchmarks. Provide after school tutoring and differentiated instruction.	5D.1. APC, Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	5D.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration.	5D.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment indicates that 31% (247) of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup proficiency by 10 percentage points to 41% (326).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (247)	41% (326)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. The area of deficiency for Economically Disadvantages Students on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the content area of Geometry and Measurement. This deficit was due limited spatial orientation skills and lack of fluency in algebraic problem solving skills when utilizing formulas.	5E.1. Incorporate discovery-based learning and technology to enhance student-centered learning. Provide after school tutoring and differentiated instruction.	5E.1. APC, Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	5E.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by	5E.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics

				administration.	Assessment

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 indicate that 45% (13) of the students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 5 percentage points to 50% (15).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (13)	50% (15)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics.	1.1. Teachers will meet collaboratively to develop assessments and teaching strategies in an effort to pinpoint areas of weakness and to reteach skills needed to be competent in mathematics; Include enrichment and acceleration activities to enhance understanding deficient concepts; incorporate enrichment materials to promote greater depth of understanding for algebraic problem solving; implement a consistent problem solving protocol to ensure a problem solving standard.	1.1. APC, Math Coach Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	1.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Quarterly data chats between the student and teacher that will be held to examine progress as indicated by Interim Assessment Data & Benchmark Assessment results. Focused walkthroughs, data review and	1.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 EOC Algebra Assessment

				discussion with Math teachers by administration.	

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 48% (14) of the students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Centennial Middle School's goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring a level 4 and 5 to 50% (15) increasing by 2 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (14)	50% (15)

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	2.1. According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics.	2.1. Include enrichment and acceleration activities to enhance understanding deficient concepts; incorporate enrichment materials to promote greater depth of understanding for algebraic problem solving; implement a consistent problem solving protocol to ensure a problem solving standard. Provide students with more practice using complex quadratic equations and questions to solve real-world problems. Create problem solving activities for students requiring the student to solve non routine and open-ended real world problems.	2.1. APC, Math Coach, Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	2.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration.	2.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 EOC Algebra Assessment

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Algebra Goal # 3A :			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	37	43	48	54	60	

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:	The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment indicate that 24% (2) of the students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 10 percentage points to 34%. The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment indicate that 38% (5) of the students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 10 percentage points to 48%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: NA Black: 24% (2) Hispanic: 38% (5) Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: NA Black: 34% (3) Hispanic: 48% (6) 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	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the Algebra EOC for all subgroups was Rational, Radicals, Quadratics and discrete math.	3B.1. Provide small group differentiated instruction to address the needs of the subgroups; incorporate enrichment materials to promote greater depth of understanding for algebraic problem solving; implement a consistent problem solving protocol to ensure a problem solving standard.	3B.1. APC ,Math Coach, Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	3B.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration.	3B.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 EOC Algebra Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
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
	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.

1	Students struggle with comprehending Algebra concepts because of limited mathematical vocabulary development.	Provide small group differentiated instruction to address the needs of all learners; incorporate enrichment materials to promote greater depth of understanding for algebraic problem solving; implement a consistent problem solving protocol to ensure a problem solving standard. Teachers will assist students with identifying key terms and concepts in mathematical problems.	APC, Math Coach, Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration.	Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 EOC Algebra Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
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
1	3D.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the Algebra EOC was Polynomials and Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and discrete math	3D.1. Provide small group differentiated instruction to address the needs of all learners; incorporate enrichment materials to promote greater depth of understanding for algebraic problem solving; implement a consistent problem solving protocol to ensure a problem solving standard. Increase explicit instruction through the “I do, We do, You do” the gradual release model and the use of active learning strategies.	3D.1. APC, Math Coach, Algebra teacher, and Department Chairperson	3D.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration.	3D.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 EOC Algebra Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	The results of the 2012 Algebra I EOC assessment indicate that 31% (8) of the ED Subgroup scored a level 3. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of the ED Subgroup scoring a 3 by 10 percentage

	points to 41%(11).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (8)	41% (11)

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	3E.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011-2012 administration of the Algebra EOC was Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics and discrete math.	3E.1. Provide small group differentiated instruction to address the needs of all learners; Provide inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities using small group instruction. Provide the students with more practice with activities which target deficiencies of specific benchmarks. Provide all students opportunities to explore and apply the use of a system of equations in the real-world	3E.1. APC, Classroom teacher, and Department Chairperson	3E.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of mathematics topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments. Focused walkthroughs, data review and discussion with Math teachers by administration.	3E.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Florida Achieves (FOCUS) benchmark assessments Summative: Results from 2013 EOC Algebra Assessment

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:	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
	1.1. The anticipated barriers to increasing the	1.1. Provide students with models, both digital and	1.1. APC and Mathematics	1.1. During department meetings, results of	1.1. Formative: Bi weekly

1	percentage of students who maintain proficiency in the Geometry EOC is reporting category 1- Two-Dimensional	tangible, to enable them to visualize and draw cross-sections of the structures and of a range of geometric solids.	Department Chair	biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.	assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	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
1	2.1. The anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students who maintain proficiency in the Geometry EOC is reporting category 1- Two-Dimensional	2.1. Develop school site mathematics course-alike learning teams to build the capacity to research, discuss, design and implement the following research-based instructional strategies that: Provide students with practice in using coordinate geometry to find slopes, parallel lines, perpendicular lines, and equations of lines Provide inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities Honor student learning styles through an instructional model that embraces diversity and the brain's natural learning cycle.	2.1. APC and Mathematics Department Chair	2.1. During department meetings, results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.	2.1. Formative: Bi weekly assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC assessment.

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:	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
1	3B.1. The anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students who maintain proficiency in the Geometry EOC is reporting category 1- Two-Dimensional	3B.1. Provide students with models, both digital and tangible, to enable them to visualize and draw cross-sections of the structures and of a range of geometric solids.	3B.1. APC and Mathematics Department Chair	3B.1. During department meetings, results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.	3B.1. Formative: Bi weekly assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry 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
1	3C.1. The anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students who maintain proficiency in the Geometry EOC is reporting category 1- Two-Dimensional	3C.1. Provide students with models, both digital and tangible, to enable them to visualize and draw cross-sections of the structures and of a range of geometric solids.	3C.1. APC and Mathematics Department Chair	3C.1. During department meetings, results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.	3C.1. Formative: Bi weekly assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry 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
1	3D.1. The anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students who maintain proficiency in the Geometry EOC is reporting category 1- Two-Dimensional	3D.1. Provide students with models, both digital and tangible, to enable them to visualize and draw cross-sections of the structures and of a range of geometric solids. Provide inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities using small group instruction	3D.1. APC and Mathematics Department Chair	3D.1. During department meetings, results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.	3D.1. Formative: Bi weekly assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NAN	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	3E.1. The anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students who maintain proficiency in the Geometry EOC is reporting category 1- Two-Dimensional	3E.1. Provide students with models, both digital and tangible, to enable them to visualize and draw cross-sections of the structures and of a range of geometric solids.	3E.1. APC and Mathematics Department Chair	3E.1. During department meetings, results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.	3E.1. Formative: Bi weekly assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry

		Provide inductive reasoning strategies that include discovery learning activities using small group instruction			EOC assessment.

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
Shared Best Practices	Math	MathematicsDept. Chair	All Math Teachers	Monthly Department Meetings	Feedback on the success of activities will be shared at subsequent dept. meetings.	Mathematics Dept. Chair
Effective Use of Data to Differentiate Instruction	Across the curriculum	In-house data specialist	All instructional staff	September 2012 (early release)	Submission of Artifacts from workshop	Assistant principal for Curriculum
Effective Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar	Math	MathematicsDept. Chair	Teachers	September 2012	Classroom Visits and Monitoring Lesson Plans	Mathematics Dept. Chair

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The re results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment indicate that 29% (81) of 8th grade students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 students proficiency by 5 percentage points to 34% (94).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (81)	34% (94)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. The area where students experienced the most difficulty was Category 1: The Nature of Science. Students need more opportunities to carry out scientific investigations and practice using science skills including observing, hypothesizing, evaluating, concluding and making models to study the real world	1A.1. Provide additional opportunities for hands-on science experiences and demonstrations with emphasis on practicing science skills including observing, hypothesizing, evaluating, concluding and making models to study the real world. Use GIZMOs that emphasize the Nature of Science.	1A.1. APC, Science Coach, and Science Department Chairperson	1A.1. Data from school-based assessments, District Baseline and Interim assessments will be analyzed and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal. Adjustment to instructional focus will be made as appropriate.	1A.1. Formative: School based assessments, District Baseline and Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science

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
	1B.1. The anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of	1B.1. Provide direct instruction using real life materials and	1B.1. APC Program Specialist	1B.1. Administration and teacher observation of student responses	1B.1. Formative: 6-8 Functional / Modified Science

1	students who score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	activities involving plants and people. Provide professional development for teachers regarding Access Points instruction.	SPED Teachers	within small groups and individually as outlined in lesson plans.	Curriculum Summative: 2013 FAA 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:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment indicate that 4% (12) of 8th grade students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 6% (18).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4% (12)	6% (18)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. The area where students experience the most difficulty was Category 1: The Nature of Science. Students need more opportunities to design and carry out scientific inquiry based, independent investigations. Students need to analyze and interpret data displaying results in table and graph form; then draw conclusions from the analysis.	2A.1. Provide opportunities to design and carry out scientific inquiry based independent investigations with emphasis on the components of the scientific method. Students will communicate their findings by preparing and delivering a presentation to peers	2A.1. APC, Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson	2A.1. Data from school-based assessments, District Baseline and Interim assessments will be analyzed and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal. Adjustment to instructional focus will be made as appropriate.	2A.1. Formative: School based assessments, District Baseline and Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science

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:	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
1	2B.1. The anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students who score at or above Level 7 in science are scientific critical thinking with the identification of the states of matter	2B.1. Provide direct instruction using real life materials and activities involving plants and people. Provide professional development for teachers regarding Access Points instruction.	2B.1. APC Program Specialist SPED Teachers	2B.1. Administration and teacher observation of student responses within small groups and individually as outlined in lesson plans.	2B.1. Formative: 6-8 Functional / Modified Science Curriculum Summative: 2013 FAA Assessment

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	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
1	1.1. Students may not be exposed to as many labs/hands-on activities necessary to gain the knowledge needed to pass the Biology EOC. More hands on activities are needed to address deficiencies in the three reporting categories: Molecular and Cellular Biology; Classification, Heredity and Evolution; Organisms, Populations and Ecosystems.	1.1. Develop professional learning communities of science teachers to research, discuss, design, and implement strategies to increase lab usage. Provide opportunities for students to participate in Biology enrichment activities such as the Fairchild Challenge. Provide all students the opportunity to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze, and explain biological concepts during laboratory activities and classroom discussions.	1.1. APC, Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson, and Science Teachers	1.1. Progress monitoring using the District Baseline and Interim Assessments Classroom walkthroughs Data chats with teachers and students	1.1. Formative: Baseline Assessments Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Biology 1 EOC Assessment

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

Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	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
1	2.1. The anticipated barrier is students needing more opportunities to carry out inquiry-based laboratory activities in Biology.	2.1. Provide inquiry-based hands-on laboratory activities in biology that that allow students to make connections to real-life experiences; explain and write about their results and experiences.	2.1. APC, Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson, and Biology teachers	2.1. Progress monitoring using the District Baseline and Interim Assessments Classroom walkthroughs Data chats with teachers and students	2.1. Formative: Baseline Assessments Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Biology 1 EOC Assessment
2	2.2. Securing teachers to serve as sponsors for the Fairchild Challenge, school science fair and South Florida Regional Science and Engineering Fair.	2.2. Incorporate the Fairchild Challenge, school science fair and South Florida Regional Science and Engineering Fair	2.2. APC, Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson, School site Science Fair Liaison, and Biology teachers	2.2. Science Fair Competition Results Utilize rubrics to evaluate projects	2.2. Formative: Baseline Assessments Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Biology 1 EOC Assessment

---

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Active Learning Strategies	All Science Teachers	Science Teachers	Science Coach	September2012 – May2013 Twice monthly on Fridays	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration and Science Coach
Biology Content and Pacing II Quarter 4	9th & 10th grade	Juan Sebastian Oddone	Biology Teachers	February 1, 2013	Written Reflection Lab activity addressing NGSSS benchmarks	Administration
Fairchild Challenge and South Florida Science and Engineering Fair orientations	NA	District Science and Fairchild Gardens staff	Competition sponsors	August 2012 November 2012	Evidence of school science fair projects and Fairchild Challenge projects	Administration and Science Coach

Advanced Explore Learning (GIZMOs) Training	All Science Teachers	Explore Learning staff and Science coach	Science teachers	October2012 – Science Coach November 2012– science teachers	Completion of GIZMOs by students	Administration, Science Coach, science teachers
Biology Content and Pacing II Quarter 3	9th & 10th grade	Juan Sebastian Oddone	Biology Teachers	November 6, 2012	Written Reflection Lab activity addressing NGSSS benchmarks	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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
Incorporate the South Florida Regional Science and Engineering Fair and other science competitions.	South Florida Regional Science and Engineering Fair Registration Fees	School	$300.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
			Grand Total: $300.00

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT indicate that 67 % (183) of students scored level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring a level 3 to 70% (192) increasing by 7percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (183)	70% (192)

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
	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.

1	According to the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 results, an area in need of improvement are conventions including sentence structure, mechanics, usage and common words being misspelled.	Expose students to authentic writing by explicitly going through all the steps of the Writing Process, utilizing the steps of the six traits of writing and model the use of rubric scoring with students to increase the quality of student writing.	Reading and Writing Coach Assistant Principal for Curriculum	EssaySmart grading with teacher feedback Teacher/student conferencing Peer/student conferencing	Formative: Students' holistic scores on quarterly writing assessments Students' scores on monthly standard language conventions' assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	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
1	1B.1. The anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students who score at 4 or higher in writing is in the area of singular and plural nouns and end punctuation specifically periods and question marks.	1B.1. Use continuous repetition and practice when learning writing concepts. Use assistive technology and computer based activities for students with writing difficulties.	1B.1. APC Program Specialist SPED Teachers	1B.1. Administration and teacher observations of lesson plans that integrate written responses using technology, manipulatives, and alternative response tools.	1B.1. Formative: IEP benchmarks 6-8 Functional/ Modified Curriculum Summative: 2013 FAA Annual IEP 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

Refresher: Holistically Scoring Students' Writing using the FCAT Writes Rubric	7th-9th grade	Reading and Writing Coaches	Language Arts Teachers	October 26, 2012	Administration, Reading and Writing Coaches will meet to determine effectiveness of writing program	Administration, Reading Coach, and Writing Coach

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	Based on the 2013 M-DCPS Baseline data, our goal is to have 10% (31) of students score at a level 3 on the Civics EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (31)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students lack real world exposure and connections to our government policies and how it affects them as	1.1. Institute regular, on-going common planning sessions for Civics teachers to ensure that the Civics curriculum is	1.1. Social Studies Dept. Chair APC	1.1. Ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of topic of instruction;	1.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim

	citizens.	taught with fidelity and is paced so as to address all State and District Benchmarks and curricular requirements.		incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments	Assessments; Student authentic work Summative: EOC Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	Based on the 2013 M-DCPS Baseline data, our goal is to have 10% (31) of students score at or above a level 4 and 5 on the Civics EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (31)

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	2.1. Students lack real world exposure and connections to our government policies and how it affects them as citizens.	2.1. Provide opportunities for students to utilize print and non-print resources to research specific issues related to government/civics; help students provide alternate solutions to the problems researched.	2.1. Social Studies Dept. Chair APC	2.1. Ongoing classroom projects and assignments that target application of topic of instruction; incorporate on-going review and remediation of deficient materials identified using Formative assessments.	.1. Formative: Topic Assessments through Edusoft; District Interim Assessments; Student authentic work; Summative: EOC Assessment

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Social Studies Best Practices-Data Analysis	7th grade Civics	Robert Brazofsky	7th grade Civics teachaers	September 25, 2012	Lesson plan implementing the use of content and best-practice instructional strategies	Social Studies Dept. Chair and APC

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Cource (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The Goal of Centennial Middle School for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase student attendance by 0.5% and decrease student tardiness by 5%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94.21% (949)	94.71% (954)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
350	333
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
228	217

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Limited recognition for perfect attendance.	1.1 Monthly incentives at each grade level rewarding perfect attendance.	1.1 Administration/Student Service	1.1 Review daily attendance bulletin.	1.1 Attendance Report
2	1.2. Limited understanding of school’s attendance policy	1.2. Attendance policy reviewed during orientation	1.2. Administration/Student Service	1.2. Review daily attendance bulletin	1.2. Attendance Report
3	1.3. Truancy continues to be a challenge which affects the school’s attendance rate.	1.3. Truancy intervention services provided by Fresh Start Family Services	1.3. Administration/Fresh Start Family Services	1.3. Review daily attendance bulletin	1.3. Attendance Report

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Truancy Intervention Strategies	All	Administration/Student Service/Fresh Start Family Services	All Instructional Personnel	September 2012	Review and monitoring of attendance bulletin	Administration

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of outdoor suspensions by 55.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
124	112
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
87	78
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
555	500
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
274	247

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 familiar with the Student Code of Conduct and are unaware of what behaviors and actions result in suspensions.	Students will be trained at the beginning of the school year on building an understanding of the Student Code of Conduct.	Assistant Principal for Discipline, CSI teacher, and counselors.	Review and monitor individual student suspension rates.	Monthly 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
Understanding the Progressive Discipline Plan	All	CSI Teacher	All teachers	September 2012 January 2013	Review of suspension reports	Assistance Principal for Discipline

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	N/A/
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
N/A/	N/A
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	N/A
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
18%(214)	26%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

No Data Submitted

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase student knowledge of technological devices and their uses for research.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Student knowledge of graphing calculators and other technological devices used for research is limited.	1.1. Incorporating the use of probe-ware and graphing calculators in mathematics and science classes.	1.1. Mathematics and Science Dept. Chairs	1.1. Ongoing classroom projects and assignments that target application and correct use of probe-ware.	1.1. Class Assessments and Student authentic work.
2	1.2. Securing teachers to serve as sponsors for the Fairchild Challenge, school science fair and South Florida Regional Science and Engineering Fair.	1.2. Incorporate the Fairchild Challenge, school science fair and South Florida Regional Science and Engineering Fair	1.2. APC, Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson, School site Science Fair Liaison, and teachers	1.2. Science Fair Competition Results Utilize rubrics to evaluate projects	1.2. Formative: School based assessments, District Baseline and Interim assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

					Science

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Implementation of probe-ware using TI84 graphing calculators	All 8th and 9th grade Mathematics and Science teachers.	Science Dept. Chair	Math and Science teachers	September 2012	Lesson plans incorporating the use of TI84 graphing calculators	Science and Mathematics Dept. chairs and APC
Fairchild Challenge and South Florida Science and Engineering Fair orientations	N/A	District Science and Fairchild Gardens staff	Competition sponsors	August 2012 November 2012	Evidence of school science fair projects and Fairchild Challenge projects	Administration and Science Coach

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

CTE Goal #1:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Enrollment is not strong enough for student completion of CTE program.	1.1. Promote student awareness of careers in Materials and Processes Technology that include but not limited to; Welding Production Assembler Chemical Assistant Industrial Worker Industrial Machinery Repair Assistant Machinist	1.1. CTE Teacher Lead Teacher APC	1.1. APC monitors the effective implementation of lessons and timely instruction in the CTE classrooms through common planning, review of test data including baseline, practice or readiness tests. Completed articulation forms Student feedback	1.1. Report for articulation meetings from 8th grade transitioning into 9th grade.

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				$0.00
CELLA				$0.00
Mathematics				$0.00
Mathematics				$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				$0.00
CELLA				$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				$0.00
Science	Incorporate the South Florida Regional Science and Engineering Fair and other science competitions.	South Florida Regional Science and Engineering Fair Registration Fees	School	$300.00
				Subtotal: $300.00
				Grand Total: $300.00

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

Athletic Uniforms 200 Buses for academic field trips 500 Pool time for Swim Club 300	$1,000.00

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

Develop and monitor the School Improvement Plan and monitor student achievement.
Distribute FTE funds that are allocated to EESAC
Review results of District Baseline and Interim Assessments

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 CENTENNIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	48%	43%	79%	36%	206	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	61%	61%			122	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	72% (YES)	66% (YES)			138	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					466	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District CENTENNIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	52%	50%	89%	37%	228	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	64%	70%			134	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	71% (YES)	69% (YES)			140	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					502	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested