

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: FOREST GLEN MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: James McDermott

SAC Chair: Jennifer Bates

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/2012

Last Modified on: 10/20/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 60% Science Mastery: 43% Writing Mastery: 80% Learning Gains: 70% reading / 68% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 70% reading / 57% math AYP: Black (57% reading / 58% math), Hispanic (40% reading / 39% math), ED (52% reading / 51% math), ELL (84% reading / 85% math), SWD (63% reading / 59% math) 2010-2011 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 68% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 44% Writing Mastery: 87% Learning Gains: 63% reading / 71% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 64% reading / 68% math

Principal	James McDermott	Degrees Master's English Bachelor's English Certification School Principal, English (6-12)	15	16	<p>AYP: Black (48% reading / 51% math), Hispanic (66% reading), ED (56% reading / 58% math), ELL (35% reading / 48% math), SWD (48% reading / 48% math) did not make AYP</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 72% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 51% Writing Mastery: 93% Learning Gains: 66% reading / 72% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 64% reading / 66% math AYP: Black (54% reading / 52% math), Hispanic (68% reading / 65% math), ED (58% reading / 55% math), ELL (46% reading / 42% math), SWD (45% reading / 44% math) did not make AYP in reading and math</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 74% Math Mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 54% Writing Mastery: 97% AYP: Black, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in reading and math</p>
Assis Principal	Beth Osborne	Degrees Ed. S. Ed. Leadership, Master's Social Work, BS Elem. Ed./Psychology Certification Ed. Leadership, Elementary Ed.	3	8	<p>2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 60% Science Mastery: 43% Writing Mastery: 80% Learning Gains: 70% reading / 68% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 70% reading / 57% math AYP: Black (57% reading / 58% math), Hispanic (40% reading / 39% math), ED (52% reading / 51% math), ELL (84% reading / 85% math), SWD (63% reading / 59% math)</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 68% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 44% Writing Mastery: 87% Learning Gains: 63% reading / 71% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 64% reading / 68% math AYP: Black (48% reading / 51% math), Hispanic (66% reading), ED (56% reading / 58% math), ELL (35% reading / 48% math), SWD (48% reading / 48% math) did not make AYP</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 72% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 51% Writing Mastery: 93% Learning Gains: 66% reading / 72% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 64% reading / 66% math AYP: Black (54% reading / 52% math), Hispanic (68% reading / 65% math), ED (58% reading / 55% math), ELL (46% reading / 42% math), SWD (45% reading / 44% math) did not make AYP in reading and math</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 74% Math Mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 54% Writing Mastery: 97% AYP: Black, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in reading and math</p>
					<p>2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 60% Science Mastery: 43% Writing Mastery: 80% Learning Gains: 70% reading / 68% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 70%</p>

Assis Principal	Tanya Thompson	Degrees Master's Ed. Leadership, Bachelor's Elem. Ed./Spanish Certification Ed. Leadership, Elementary Ed., Math (5-9)	4	5	<p>reading / 57% math AYP: Black (57% reading / 58% math), Hispanic (40% reading / 39% math), ED (52% reading / 51% math), ELL (84% reading / 85% math), SWD (63% reading / 59% math)</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 68% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 44% Writing Mastery: 87% Learning Gains: 63% reading / 71% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 64% reading / 68% math AYP: Black (48% reading / 51% math), Hispanic (66% reading), ED (56% reading / 58% math), ELL (35% reading / 48% math), SWD (48% reading / 48% math) did not make AYP</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 72% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 51% Writing Mastery: 93% Learning Gains: 66% reading / 72% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 64% reading / 66% math AYP: Black (54% reading / 52% math), Hispanic (68% reading / 65% math), ED (58% reading / 55% math), ELL (46% reading / 42% math), SWD (45% reading / 44% math) did not make AYP in reading and math</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 74% Math Mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 54% Writing Mastery: 97% AYP: Black, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in reading and math</p>
Assis Principal	Andre Ponder	Degrees Master's Ed. Leadership, Master's Human Resources, Bachelor's Info. Tech. Certification Ed. Leadership, ESE, Reading Endorsement	3	3	<p>2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 60% Science Mastery: 43% Writing Mastery: 80% Learning Gains: 70% reading / 68% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 70% reading / 57% math AYP: Black (57% reading / 58% math), Hispanic (40% reading / 39% math), ED (52% reading / 51% math), ELL (84% reading / 85% math), SWD (63% reading / 59% math)</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 68% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 44% Writing Mastery: 87% Learning Gains: 63% reading / 71% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 64% reading / 68% math AYP: Black (48% reading / 51% math), Hispanic (66% reading), ED (56% reading / 58% math), ELL (35% reading / 48% math), SWD (48% reading / 48% math) did not make AYP</p> <p>2009-2010 (Arthur Ashe Middle School) Grade: C / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 43% Math Mastery: 43% Science Mastery: 28% Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: Black, ED, ESE did not make AYP in reading and math</p> <p>2008-2009 (Arthur Ashe Middle School) Grade: C / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 46% Math Mastery: 47% Science Mastery: 21% Writing Mastery: 97%</p>

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Nancy Sheingold	Degrees Bachelor's El. Ed. Certification Elem. Ed. Reading Endorsed, ESOL Endorsed, English (5-9), Science (5-9)	7	7	<p>2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 60% Science Mastery: 43% Writing Mastery: 80% Learning Gains: 70% reading / 68% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 70% reading / 57% math AYP: Black (57% reading / 58% math), Hispanic (40% reading / 39% math), ED (52% reading / 51% math), ELL (84% reading / 85% math), SWD (63% reading / 59% math)</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 68% Learning Gains: 63% Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 64% AYP: Black (48% reading), Hispanic (66% reading), ED (56% reading), ELL (35% reading), SWD (48% reading) did not make AYP in reading</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 72% Learning Gains: 66% Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 64% AYP: Black (54% reading), Hispanic (68% reading), ED (58% reading), ELL (46% reading), SWD (45% reading) did not make AYP in reading</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade: A / AYP: No Reading Mastery: 74% AYP: Black, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in reading</p>
Mathematics	Sonia Kimbrough	Degrees Bachelor's Math Master's Counseling, Master's Math Education, Certification Math (5-9) Math (6-12)	8	1	<p>2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 60% Science Mastery: 43% Writing Mastery: 80% Learning Gains: 70% reading / 68% math Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 70% reading / 57% math AYP: Black (57% reading / 58% math), Hispanic (40% reading / 39% math), ED (52% reading / 51% math), ELL (84% reading / 85% math), SWD (63% reading / 59% math)</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade: A / AYP: No Math Mastery: 71% Learning Gains: 71% Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 68% AYP: Black (51% math), ED (58% math), ELL (48% math), SWD (48% math) did not make AYP in math</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: A / AYP: No Math Mastery: 71% Learning Gains: 72% Learning Gains (lowest 25%): 66% AYP: Black (52% math), Hispanic (65% math), ED (55% math), ELL (42% math), SWD (44% math) did not make AYP in math</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade: A / AYP: No Math Mastery: 76% AYP: Black, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in reading and math</p>

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Monthly meetings of new teacher with Assistant Principal for respective learning community	Grade level assistant principals	On-going	
2	2. Partnering new teachers or teachers new to the school with veteran teachers at the start of the school year; New Educator Support System meetings will take place on a bi-weekly basis throughout the year per staff development calendar	Grade level assistant principals	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
3	These three teachers are either taking the certification test or actively completing course work to fulfill certification requirements.

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
75	4.0%(3)	32.0%(24)	29.3%(22)	34.7%(26)	36.0%(27)	96.0%(72)	20.0%(15)	4.0%(3)	42.7%(32)

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
Pam Spinelli	Debbie Cerell-Weinberg	Teacher is new to Forest Glen. Mentor teaches the same subject area and has multiple years teaching experience.	New faculty members to Forest Glen meet monthly with their mentors to discuss any issues with transition, policies, and procedures.
Kay Leverett	Jordan Sawyer	Teacher is new to Forest Glen. Mentor teaches the same subject area and has multiple years teaching experience.	New faculty members to Forest Glen meet monthly with their mentors to discuss any issues with transition, policies, and procedures.

Mitchell Comiskey	Juan Ruiz	Teacher is new to Forest Glen. Mentor teaches the same subject area and has multiple years teaching experience.	New faculty members to Forest Glen meet monthly with their mentors to discuss any issues with transition, policies, and procedures.
Cassandra Brice	Susan Schwartz	Teacher is new to Forest Glen. Mentor teaches the same subject area and has multiple years teaching experience.	New faculty members to Forest Glen meet monthly with their mentors to discuss any issues with transition, policies, and procedures.
Mattias Hubsch	Anthony Zoeller	Teacher is new to Forest Glen. Mentor teaches the same subject area and has multiple years teaching experience.	New faculty members to Forest Glen meet monthly with their mentors to discuss any issues with transition, policies, and procedures.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I funds provide additional teachers to assist students, particularly low performing students. Staff Development funds are used to develop a comprehensive professional training program to improve delivery of instruction through a variety of workshops designed to move teachers to mastery and improve student achievement. Parental Involvement Funds are utilized to fund monthly academic parent nights that provide parents with new skills to support student learning at home. Improving the frequency and quality of family participation and increasing family literacy are also goals of our parental involvement component. Monies are used to purchase food, supplies/materials and provide stipends for teacher presenters. Extended learning opportunities are supported with district Title I funds.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Collaboration with community agencies will take place to ensure that needed services such as health and nutrition are provided. Remediation and tutoring services will be provided as needed.

Title I, Part D

Not applicable

Title II

Not applicable

Title III

Not applicable

Title X- Homeless

Not applicable

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds, if funded, will be used to provide additional instructional support during the school day, primarily through the Mathematics Coach, assisting in classrooms with students in AYP subgroups working below grade level.

Violence Prevention Programs

Not applicable

Nutrition Programs

Not applicable

Housing Programs

Not applicable

Head Start

Not applicable

Adult Education

Not applicable

Career and Technical Education

Not applicable

Job Training

Not applicable

Other

Not applicable

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

James McDermott, Principal
Tanya Thompson, Assistant Principal
Beth Osborne, Assistant Principal
Andre Ponder, Assistant Principal
Nardia Corridon, Guidance Director
Valerie Brace, ESE Specialist
Audrey Wong, School Psychologist
Cathy Sheridan, School Social Worker

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 RTI Leadership Team meets weekly to discuss students who have been identified by the Collaborative Problem Solving Team as needing additional interventions and to discuss the progress of students already receiving interventions.
- The team analyzes data that reflects the student's problem behavior and formulates a goal for positive replacement behavior. At this time, a student's placement on the Tiered system is determined, based on the severity of the student's problem behavior.
- The team collaborates to develop interventions based on the student's problem behavior.
- A team member is assigned to monitor the progress of the student and the success of interventions. Data is collected which will either support the use of the intervention or identify the need for a different intervention.
- Members report back to the team the progress of the monitored students. Changes to interventions are discussed if necessary.

Unique Roles/Functions by Title

Administration: provide insights on students' patterns of behavior and discipline history

Guidance Counselors: monitor progress of intervention implementation and provide emotional support for students

ESE Specialist: serve as a consultant for topics related to special needs students

School Psychologist: serve as a consultant for topics related to psychological testing and students with special needs

School Social Worker: serve as resource for information about outside agencies that can assist individuals or families in need

Representative Academic Teacher: implement interventions in the classroom setting and collect data regarding the student's

response to the interventions

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 team worked collaboratively throughout the summer to contribute to the development of the School Improvement Plan. Key RtI team members examined assigned sections of the school improvement plan, facilitated dialogue with their departments, gained consensus on goals and objectives, and submitted input for review by the Principal, Leadership Team, and School Improvement Committee.

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.

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.

Tier 1 Data Sources for Reading, Math, Writing, and Science: Benchmark Assessment Test data and teacher interventions accessible via BASIS.

Baseline data: 2012 FCAT and September 2012 administration of the Benchmark Assessment Test

Monitoring data: December 2012 administration of the Benchmark Assessment Test and periodic content-area mini-benchmark assessments

Summative data: 2013 FCAT

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Forest Glen guidance counselors will train faculty and staff during scheduled morning inservice time.

Tier 1: Staff will be trained on BASIS throughout the year;

Tier 2 & Tier 3: Teacher teams will be trained on a case by case basis

Work in collaboration with CPST to work on interventions specific to each case.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

James McDermott, Principal
Andre Ponder, Assistant Principal
Beth Osborne, Assistant Principal
Tanya Thompson, Assistant Principal
Nancy Sheingold, Reading Coach
Patrick Auger, Guidance Counselor
Ella Hightower, Reading Teacher / Intensive & Developmental
Delisabel Rosario, Language Arts Teacher / ESOL
Michael Powell, Math Teacher / Gifted
Joann Johnson, ESE Teacher
Linda Williams, Media Specialist
Natasha Pugh, Social Studies Department Chair
Christopher Walsh, Science Department Chair

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

The Literacy Leadership team will meet on a monthly basis per the staff development calendar for the purpose of school-wide critical issue discussion, FCAT/benchmark data analysis, review of respective instructional focus calendar implementation, as well as planning/review of on-going staff development opportunities. The Leadership team will also work to develop

model/demonstration classrooms that promote literacy.

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

The major initiative for 2012-2013 will be training in, and implementation of understanding the needs of subgroups and differentiated instruction in the classroom. The team has contracted with various guest speakers to work with faculty and staff during designated planning and early release days, including pre-planning week in August 2012.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/14/2012)

*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.

- Teacher leaders from sixth, seventh and eighth grades in the content areas of mathematics, science, social studies, and language arts will complete the coursework necessary for the reading endorsement.
- The Reading Coach will provide on-going school-wide training emphasizing instructional strategies for reading and active teaching techniques used in both content-area classrooms as well as reading classes. The instructional strategies for reading will be based on the nine high yield strategies with a strong emphasis on the top three.

*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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:	In grades 6-8, 29% of students will score at level 3 on the 2013 FCAT reading test
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (362) of students achieved a level 3 on FCAT reading.	29% of students will achieve a level 3 on FCAT reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Teacher's lack of familiarity with Common Core State Standards	1A.1. Reading teachers will participate in on-going professional development in Common Core State Standards and reading strategies aligned to NGSSS FCAT 2.0 test specifications, FAIR, and CCSS.	1A.1. Reading coach, reading/writing/social studies department chairs.	1A.1. Analysis of frequency and type of teacher questions regarding scope and format of FCAT 2.0 and CCSS during Professional Development.	1A.1. Reading/writing/social studies department agendas and minutes.
2	1A.2. Many students lack the ability to apply basic reading skills to their various content areas.	1A.2. Students will receive and apply effective reading strategies in all of their content area classes. The Reading Coach will meet with and collaborate with teachers to incorporate effective reading strategies into their daily lessons.	A.2. Reading coach, reading department chair, classroom teachers	1A.2. Analysis of county Benchmark Assessment and Mini-Benchmark Assessment results during DATA chats.	1A.2. Mini-BAT, FAIR, BAT, DAR, SRI, Portfolios, Impact pre/post
3	1A.3. Students belonging to one or more subgroups may require intensive assistance in multiple strand areas	1A.3. Plan targeted intervention for students utilizing the FAIR assessment toolkit to continually monitor progress in fluency, word recognition, and comprehension.	1A.3. Reading coach, reading department chair	1A.3. Classroom teachers will implement on-going progress monitoring through utilization of the FAIR toolkit between assessment periods 1, 2, and 3 in the fall, winter, and spring	1A.3. Increased achievement on FAIR assessments between administration periods 1, 2, and 3
4	1.4 Many students require remediation not available during the regular school day.	1.4. Provision of class incentives to attend Saturday School FCAT Prep program for strand-specific FCAT preparation	1.4 Classroom teachers	1.4 Maintain Saturday School Attendance logs	1.4 Saturday School attendance logs
5	1.5 Students do not have exposure to complex text on a daily basis nor the comprehension and analysis skills needed to	1.5 The Reading Coach will assist teachers with analyzing and incorporating more complex text into their daily lessons. The coach	1.5 Reading Coach, Reading Department Chair, L.A. Department Chair, and Social Studies Department Chair.	1.5 Team meetings, CWT, Student samples, implementation and follow through of modeled strategies	1.5 Mini BAT, BAT 1 and 2, FAIR, Teacher created assessments

understand this type of text.	will provide strategies to assist students when presented with more complex text.		
-------------------------------	---	--	--

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	20% of students will score at levels 4,5,and 6 on the reading Florida Alternative Assessment in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (4) of students achieved a level 4 ,5, or 6 on the Florida Alternative Assessment in reading	20% will achieve a level 4 ,5, or 6 on the Florida Alternative Assessment in reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1B.1. Student's disability in a significant way, negatively impacts grade and age expectancies.	1B.1. The classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, teacher aides, and unique aides all assist students in purposefully identifying pictures, symbols and informational text used in daily activities	1B.1. Classroom teachers and ESE specialist	1B.1. Teacher's and aide's observations	1B.1. Brigance, FAA
2	1B.2. Student's communication limitations	1B.2 Select objects, pictures, or symbols paired with words that relate to familiar stories or activities.	1B.2. Classroom teachers and ESE Specialist	1B.2. Teacher's and aide's observations	1B.2. Brigance, FAA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In grades 6-8, 35% of students will score at level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32.6% (450) of Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	32.6% (450) of Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading. 35% of Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. Sixth grade Pre-AP reading course outline does not align perfectly with the sixth grade FCAT testable items.	2A.1. Inclusion of strand-specific FCAT 2.0-style questioning into the Pre-AP instructional focus calendar	2A.1. Reading coach, reading department chair, Pre-AP course teachers	2A.1. On-going analysis of county benchmark test results during Data Chats, team meetings, and Professional Development.	2A.1. BAT, Mini-BAT, FAIR, DAR
	2A.2. Seventh and eighth	2A.2. . Sustained silent	2A.2. Reading	2A.2. Maintain Saturday	2A.2. Saturday

2	grade students achieving level 3 or above do not receive reading instruction in a dedicated reading class	reading will be scheduled two times per quarter marking period rotating through Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science	coach, reading department chair	School attendance log	School attendance log
3	2A.3. Seventh and eighth grade students achieving level 3 or above do not receive reading instruction in a dedicated reading class	2A.3. Incorporate reading strategies into core academic classes (Language Arts, Social Studies, Science, and Math)	2A.3. Reading coach, math coach, language arts, math, science, and social studies department chairs	2A.3. On-going monitoring of student's follow-up reading product; incentives will be awarded to the best product in each class period as selected by the classroom teacher	2A.3. Teacher observation
4	2A.4. Students need to be challenged on a regular basis.	2A.4. Teachers will present high level instruction using complex text. Students will be provided with experiences and opportunities to read and analyze complex text through novels and high interest articles.	2A.4. Reading Coach, Reading Department Chair, LA Department Chair, SS Department Chair	2A.4. Classroom walkthroughs, on-going monitoring of county reading assessments; Lesson Plans	2A.4. BAT, Mini-BAT, FAIR, BAT 1 and 2, Teacher created assessments

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	45% of students will achieve a level 7 on the Florida Alternative Assessment in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (9) of students achieved a level 7 on the Florida Alternative Assessment in reading	45% of students will achieve a level 7 on the Florida Alternative Assessment in reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2B.1. Student's disability negatively impacts grade and age expectancies in a significant way.	2B.1. Teachers and aides will assist students in identifying persons, objects, actions, or events in read aloud, narrative and informational text used in daily activities.	2B.1. Classroom teachers and ESE specialist.	2B.1. Teacher's and aide's observations.	2B.1. Brigance, FAA
2	2B.2. Student's communication limitations	2B.2. Teachers and aides will assist students in identifying persons, objects, actions, or events in read aloud, narrative and informational text used in daily activities.	2B.2. Classroom teachers and ESE specialist.	2B.2. Teacher's and aide's observations.	2B.2. Brigance, FAA

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	In grades 6-8, 71% of students will demonstrate learning
--	--

Reading Goal #3a:	gains on the 2013 FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70.2% (935) of students making learning gains in reading.	71% students making learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3A.1. Level 1 and level 2 students need more intense help in reading.	3A.1. Students will receive instruction in an intensive reading class.	3A.1. Reading coach, reading department chair, support staff	3A.1. On-going progress monitoring of county assessment results through team meetings (reading, language arts, science, social studies, math, electives)	3A.1. BAT, Mini-BAT, FAIR, Portfolios
2	3A.2. . Students must learn to apply the strategies learned in reading classes to their content areas classes.	3A.2. Students will participate in small pull-out groups with instruction based on areas of weakness. 3A.2. During team meetings, teachers will share best practices on how to incorporate reading strategies into their specific content area. 3A.2. The Reading Coach will collaborate with team teachers. 3A.2 Reading IFC will be created quarterly to reflect the needs of the students at each grade level.	3A.2. Reading coach, reading department chair	3A.2. Monitor sharing of best practices during reading/writing/social studies Professional Development sessions.	3A.2. BAT, Mini-BAT

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:	68% of students will make learning gains on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (13.2) of students made learning gains on the Florida Alternative Assessment in reading	68% of students made learning gains on the Florida Alternative Assessment in reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3B.1. Student disabilities can have a significant negative impact on grade and age expectancies.	3B.1. The student will identify information included in text features (e.g.,	3B.1. Classroom teachers and ESE specialist.	3B.1. Teacher's and aide's observations.	3B.1. Brigance, FAA

	illustrations, title, table of contents, headings) to complete assigned tasks	
--	---	--

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In grades 6-8, 72% of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69.7 (245.4)% of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	72% of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4A.1. Students belonging to one or more subgroups may require intensive assistance in multiple strand areas.	4A.1. Plan targeted intervention for students utilizing the FAIR assessment toolkit to continually monitor progress in fluency, word recognition, and comprehension.	4A.1. Reading coach, Reading department chair, Reading teachers, Language Arts teachers	4A.1. Classroom teachers will implement ongoing progress monitoring through utilization of the FAIR toolkit between assessment periods 1, 2, and 3.	4A.1. Increased achievement on FAIR assessments between administration periods 1, 2, and 3.
2	4A.2. Struggling readers frequently lack motivation.	4A.2. A recognition program for improvement in classroom grades and assessment scores.	4A.2. Reading coach, Reading department chair, Reading teachers, Guidance Dept.	4A.2. Monitoring of grades and assessment results, pinnacle grade data.	4A.2. Pinnacle grade data; county mini-benchmark assessments
3	4A.3. Struggling readers are affected by inconsistent attendance	4A.3. Increased communication between classroom teachers and school social worker	4A.3. Classroom teachers, school social worker, guidance counselors, grade level administrators	4A.3. Review of attendance report by school social worker, guidance counselors, and grade level administrators	4A.3. Pinnacle attendance data; data warehouse attendance reports (reports folder)

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	In grades 6-8, 79% of students will be proficient (3,4,5) when administered standardized assessments in reading. (3.5% increase per year).					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	59%	65%	68%	72%	76%	

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.	In grades 6-8, student subgroups by ethnicity predicted to make satisfactory progress in reading (Based on 2012 AMO Report) are: White: 78% Black: 51%
--	--

Reading Goal #5B:	Hispanic: 65% Asian: 84% American Indian: N/A%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Student subgroups by ethnicity making satisfactory progress in reading. (Based on 2012 AMO Report). White: 75% Black: 44% Hispanic: 60% Asian: 71% American Indian: 71%	Student subgroups by ethnicity predicted to make satisfactory progress in reading (Based on 2012 AMO Report). White: 78% Black: 51% Hispanic: 65% Asian: 84% 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	Students belonging to one or more subgroups may require intensive assistance in multiple benchmark areas in reading.	5B.1. FCAT Saturday Camp 5B1.1. Small Group pull-out sessions in reading.	5B.1. Administrator's, ESE specialist, Reading coach, Guidance 5B.1.1 Administrator's, Reading Coach, LA department chair,	5B.1. Attendance Logs 5B.1. On-going teacher observations	5B.1. Teacher generated assessments, FCAT 2.0 5B.1. Teacher generated assessments, FCAT 2.0
2	5B.2. Struggling readers frequently lack motivation.	5B.2. A recognition program for improvement in classroom grades and assessment scores.	5B.2. Reading coach, Reading department chair, Reading teachers, Guidance Dept.	5B.2. Monitoring of grades and assessment results, pinnacle grade data.	5B.2. Pinnacle grade data; county mini-benchmark assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	In grades 6-8, 42% of English Language Learners (ELL) will make satisfactory progress in reading (based on the 2012 AMO report).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (19) of English Language Learners (ELL) made satisfactory progress in reading.	42% of English Language Learners (ELL) will make satisfactory progress in reading (based on the 2012 AMO report).

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. Many students need additional remediation in reading.	5C.1. FCAT Saturday Camp 5C.1. Small group pull-out sessions in reading.	5C.1. Administrators, Reading coach, ESOL Coordinator, Guidance	5C.1. Attendance Logs	5C.1. Teacher generated assessments, FCAT 2.0 5C.1. Teacher

			5C.1. Administrators, Reading Coach, ESOL Coordinator, Guidance		generated assessments, FCAT 2.0
2	5C.2. Second language learners may lack vocabulary necessary for success.	5C.2. Students will be provided bilingual dictionaries and instructed in how to use them effectively.	5C.2. School-based ESOL coordinator, classroom teachers	5C.2. Continuous monitoring of student utilization of dictionaries during classroom assignments and testing. Continuous monitoring of	5C.2. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In grades 6-8, 49% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) made satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (66) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) made satisfactory progress in reading.	49% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) made satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Students may require extended learning opportunities to achieve proficiency.	5D.1. Students will be given opportunities to attend twice-weekly after-school tutoring (budget permitting), beginning in December 2011/January 2012, as well as Saturday school program for strand-specific FCAT preparation.	5D.1. Title I coordinator, classroom teachers	5D.1. Principal designee and classroom teachers will monitor participation levels in the after school tutoring and Saturday school programs	5D.1. After school tutoring and Saturday school attendance logs
2	5D.2. Seventh and eighth grade students place out of reading based on sixth grade reading FCAT score of level 3, 4, or 5	5D.2. Sustained silent reading will be scheduled three times per quarterly marking period rotating through Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science	5D.2. Reading coach, Reading department chair	5D.2. On-going monitoring of student after reading product; incentives will be awarded to the best product in each class period as selected by the classroom teacher	5D.2. Teacher observation

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In grades 6-8, 56% of economically disadvantaged (ED) students will score at or above level 3 on the 2012 FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% (403) of economically disadvantaged (ED) students scored at or above level 3 on the 2012 FCAT reading test.	56% of economically disadvantaged (ED) students will score at or above level 3 on the 2012 FCAT reading test.

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. Students may require extended learning opportunities to achieve proficiency.	5E.1. Students will be given opportunities to attend twice-weekly after-school tutoring (budget permitting), beginning in December 2011/January 2012, as well as Saturday school program for strand-specific FCAT preparation.	5E.1. Title I coordinator, classroom teachers	5E.1. Principal designee and classroom teachers will monitor participation levels in the after school tutoring and Saturday school programs	5E.1. After school tutoring and Saturday school attendance logs
2	5E.2. Seventh and eighth grade students place out of reading based on sixth grade reading FCAT score of level 3, 4, or 5	5E.2. Sustained silent reading will be scheduled three times per quarterly marking period rotating through Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science	5E.2. Reading coach, Reading department chair	5E.2. On-going monitoring of student after reading product; incentives will be awarded to the best product in each class period as selected by the classroom teacher	5E.2. Teacher observation

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teaching Informational Text	6, 7, 8	Language Arts Department Chair &/or Reading Coach	All faculty except Math	1st Quarter	Lesson plan monitoring; Classroom Walkthroughs; BAT 1 &2 results	Language Arts Department Chair, Reading Coach, & Grade Level Administrator
Teaching Text Complexity	6, 7, 8	Language Arts Department Chair &/or Reading Coach	All Faculty	1st Quarter	Lesson plan monitoring; Classroom Walkthroughs; BAT 1 &2 results	Language Arts Department Chair, Reading Coach, & Grade Level Administrator
Utilizing Literary Text	6, 7, 8	Language Arts Department Chair &/or Reading Coach	All faculty except Math	2nd Quarter	Lesson plan monitoring; Classroom Walkthroughs; BAT 1 &2 results	Language Arts Department Chair, Reading Coach, & Grade Level Administrator
Creating Text Dependent Questions	6, 7, 8	Language Arts Department Chair &/or Reading Coach	All Faculty	2nd Quarter	Lesson plan monitoring; Classroom Walkthroughs; BAT 1 &2 results	Language Arts Department Chair, Reading Coach, & Grade Level Administrator
True Power in Academic Vocabulary	6, 7, 8	Language Arts Department Chair &/or Reading Coach	All Faculty	2nd Quarter	Lesson plan monitoring; Classroom Walkthroughs; BAT 1 &2 results	Language Arts Department Chair, Reading Coach, & Grade Level Administrator

Reading Budget:

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

Improved word analysis	REWARDS	Budget	\$0.00
Increased vocabulary and comprehension skills	READ XL	Budget	\$0.00
Improved decoding and encoding through systematic phonics instruction	WILSON	Budget	\$0.00
Develop vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension	Visions Developmental Language Program	Budget	\$0.00
Supplemental academic instruction (all students)	FCAT Saturday School	Accountability Funds (SAC)	\$3,344.50
			Subtotal: \$3,344.50
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Skill support	FCAT Explorer	Budget	\$0.00
Adaptive skills remediation	Successmaker	Budget	\$0.00
Lesson development and instructional support	BEEP	Budget	\$0.00
Diagnosis of reading skills	FAIR	Budget	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Cultural Sensitivity – Understanding Needs of AYP Subgroups	Professional books/materials	Budget	\$0.00
Using Reader's Theatre and Literature Circles	Instructor created packets	Budget	\$0.00
Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) & Common Core Standards.	Sample documents	Budget	\$0.00
Differentiated Instruction: Develop Novel Study Units	Novels	Budget	\$0.00
FAIR Training	Sample FAIR document	Budget	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Improve vocabulary and comprehension through novel study	Novels	PTA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,344.50

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.		39% of students will score proficient in listening/speaking.			
CELLA Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
37% of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.					
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	1.1. Lack of vocabulary skills	1.1 Use of graphic organizers such as V.I.S. to aid with vocabulary comprehension and retention.	1.1. Classroom teacher	1.1. student/teacher checklist; teacher monitoring of use of vocabulary on assignments and assessment.	1.1. Written assignments and assessments
2	1.2. Lack of fluency	1.2. Oral recitation	1.2. Classroom teacher	1.2. Recording/Listening	1.2. Student self-assessment; teacher monitoring
3	1.3. Poor pronunciation	1.3. Word substitution; practice speaking slowly	1.3. Classroom teacher	1.3. Recording/Listening	1.3. Comparative analysis

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:	23% of students will score proficient in reading.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

21% of students scoring proficient in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of vocabulary skills	2.1. Interactive word walls	2.1. Classroom teacher	2.1. Question/answer sessions	2.1. Vocabulary quizzes & test; monitoring use of vocabulary in written assignments/assessments.

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	25% of students will score proficient in writing.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

22% of students scored proficient in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Lack of writing structure	3.1. Graphic organizers, charts, pre-writing planning	3.1. Classroom Teacher	3.1. Application of planning to writing	3.1. Writing samples

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	In grades 6-8, 28% of students will score at achievement level 3 on the 2013 FCAT mathematics test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25.5% (359) of Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	28% of students will score at Achievement level 3 in mathematics.

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. Teacher lack of familiarity with Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS), FCAT 2.0 format, and common core standards.	1A.1. Mathematics teachers will participate in on-going professional development and FCAT item-specification training	1A.1. Mathematics department chair, mathematics professional learning community chair	1A.1. Analysis of frequency and type of teacher questions regarding scope and format of FCAT 2.0 during professional learning community meetings; course-specific team collaboration during professional learning community meetings	1A.1. Mathematics professional learning community agendas and minutes
2	1A.2. Student lack of familiarity with Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) and FCAT 2.0 format, and common core standards application	1A.2. Mathematics teachers will incorporate FCAT-style questioning, including gridded response, into classroom assessments, as well as county assessments, into the course instructional focus calendars	1A.2. Mathematics department chair, classroom teachers	1A.2. Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings	1A.2. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS

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:	On Florida Alternative Assessment, 38% of Students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36.4% (8) of Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics on the Florida Alternative Assessment.	38% of Students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics on the Florida Alternative Assessment.

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. Student disabilities significantly negatively impact grade and age expectancies.	1B.1. Usage of hands on manipulative tools to enhance learning	1B.1. ESE Specialist/ ESE Teacher	1B.1. Teachers and aides observation	1B.1. Brigance Assessment tool
---	--	--	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In grades 6-8 37% of Students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT mathematics test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34.6% (486) of Students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	37% of Students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.

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. Sixth, seventh and eighth GEM course content (Pre-Algebra, Honors Algebra I and Honors Geometry) does not align perfectly to the sixth, seventh and eighth grade FCAT testable items	2A.1. Implementation of strand-specific FCAT-style questioning, including gridded response, into the GEM course instructional focus calendar	2A.1. Mathematics department chair, classroom teachers	2A.1. Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings	2A.1. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS
2	2A.2. Sixth, seventh and eighth GEM course content (Pre-Algebra, Honors Algebra I and Honors Geometry) does not align perfectly to the sixth, seventh and eighth grade FCAT testable items	2A.2. Provision of classroom incentives to attend Saturday School program for strand-specific FCAT preparation; Saturday camps scheduled to not conflict with the high school camps.	2A.2. Classroom teachers	2A.2. Maintain written record of student attendance	2A.2. Saturday school attendance log

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	In grades 6-8, 30% of Students will score at or above Level 7 in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27.3% (6) of Students scored at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	30% of Students will score at or above Level 7 in mathematics.

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
	2B.1. Student disabilities	2B.1. Usage of hands on	2B.1. ESE	2B.1. Teachers and aides	2B.1. Brigance

1	significantly negatively impact grade and age expectancies.	manipulative tools to enhance learning	Specialist/ ESE Teacher	observation	Assessment tool
---	---	--	-------------------------	-------------	-----------------

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In grades 6-8, 70% of students made learning gains on the 2013 FCAT mathematics test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67.9% (922) of students made learning gains in mathematics	70% of students made learning gains in mathematics

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. Students belonging to one or more subgroups may require intensive assistance in multiple benchmark areas	3A.1. . Identify students belonging to one or more AYP subgroups for placement in supplemental instruction program; closely monitor progress of the students, revise instruction and remediate as indicated by student progress	3A.1. Mathematics coach, Mathematics department chair, classroom teachers	3A.1. Maintain written record of identified students and strategies/interventions utilized in supplemental instruction program	3A.1. Increased achievement between assessments in supplemental instruction program
2	3A.2. Student lack of familiarity with Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) and FCAT 2.0 format, and the Common Core standards.	3A.2. Mathematics teachers will incorporate FCAT-style questioning, include gridded response, into classroom assessments, as well as county mini-benchmark assessments into the course instructional focus calendars	3A.2. Mathematics coach, Mathematics department chair, classroom teachers	3A.2. Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings	3A.2. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS
3	3A.3. Students with deficiencies in reading comprehension skills may have increased difficulty with NGSSS word problem situations	3A.3. Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core instruction plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving strategies in Florida FCAT Coach and NGSSS supplemental problem-solving program	3A.3. Mathematics coach, Mathematics department chair, classroom teachers	3A.3. Classroom teachers will review results of county assessment data during mathematics learning community meetings	3A.3. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	In grades 6-8, 60% of students will make learning gains in mathematics on the Florida Alternative Assessment
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

52% (10.4) of students making learning gains in mathematics.			60% of students will make learning gains in mathematics.		
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. Student disabilities significantly negatively impact grade and age expectancies.	3B.1. Usage of hands on manipulative tools to enhance learning	3B.1. ESE Specialist/ ESE Teacher	3B.1. Teachers and aides observation	3B.1. Brigance Assessment tool

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In grades 6-8, 62% of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT mathematics test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56.6% (203) of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics.	62% of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4A.1. Students belonging to one or more subgroups may require intensive assistance in multiple benchmark areas	4A.1.a: Identify students in the lowest quartile belonging to one or more subgroups for placement in supplemental instruction program; 4A.1.b: Closely monitor progress of the students via mini benchmark assessments and revise instruction and provide remediation as necessary	4A.1. Mathematics coach, Mathematics department chair	4A.1. Maintain written record of identified students and strategies/interventions utilized in supplemental instruction program	4A.1. Increased achievement between assessments in supplemental instruction program
2	4A.2. Student lack of familiarity with Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS), FCAT 2.0 format, and Common Core Standards	4A.2. Mathematics teachers will incorporate FCAT-style questioning, include gridded response, into classroom assessments, as well as county mini-benchmark assessments into the course instructional focus calendars	4A.2. Mathematics coach, Mathematics department chair	4A.2. Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings	4A.2. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics
3	4A.3. Students with deficiencies in reading comprehension skills may have increased difficulty with NGSSS word problem situations	4A.3. Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core instruction plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving strategies in Florida FCAT Coach and NGSSS supplemental problem-solving program	4A.3. Mathematics coach, Mathematics department chair, classroom teachers	4A.3. Maintain written record of identified students and strategies/interventions utilized in supplemental instruction program	4A.3. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # In grades 6-8, 80% of students will be proficient on standardized assessment in math (3.3% increase per year)				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	60%	67%	70%	74%	77%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In grades 6-8, student subgroups by ethnicity predicted to make satisfactory progress in mathematics (based on the 2012 AMO report) are. White: 82% Black: 53% Hispanic: 67% Asian: 87% American Indian: N/A%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Student subgroups by ethnicity making satisfactory progress in mathematics (based on the 2012 AMO report). White: 76% (312) Black: 42% (216) Hispanic: 61% (224) Asian: 82% (54) American Indian: 28.6% (2)	Student subgroups by ethnicity predicted to make satisfactory progress in mathematics (based on the 2012 AMO report). White: 82% Black: 53% Hispanic: 67% Asian: 87% 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	5B.1. Students belonging to one or more subgroup may require intensive assistance in multiple benchmark areas	5B.1. Identify students belonging to one or more AYP subgroups for placement in supplemental instruction program; closely monitor progress of the students and revise instruction as indicated by student progress	5B.1. Mathematics coach, Mathematics department chair	5B.1. Maintain written record of identified students and strategies/interventions utilized in supplemental instruction program	5B.1. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS
2	5B.2. Student lack of familiarity with Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS), FCAT 2.0 format, and Common Core Standards	5B.2. Mathematics teachers will incorporate FCAT-style questioning, include gridded response, into classroom assessments, as well as county mini-benchmark assessments into the course instructional focus calendars	5B.2. Mathematics coach, Mathematics department chair	5B.2. Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings	5B.2. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based

					on NGSSS
3	5B.3. Students with deficiencies in reading comprehension skills may have increased difficulty with NGSSS word problem situations	5B.3. Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core instruction plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving strategies in Florida FCAT Coach and NGSSS supplemental problem-solving program	5B.3. Mathematics coach, Mathematics department chair, classroom teachers	5B.3. Classroom teachers will review results of county assessment data during mathematics learning community meetings	5B.3. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS

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:	In grades 6-8, 48% of English Language Learners (ELL) will make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT (based on 2012 AMO report).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (18) of English Language Learners (ELL) were proficient in mathematics (based on 2012 AMO report).	48% of English Language Learners (ELL) will make satisfactory progress in mathematics (based on 2012 AMO report).

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. Students may require sheltered English language instruction, or other accommodations in academic classes, to achieve proficiency.	5C.1. A teacher assistant will push-in/pull-out ELL bi-weekly to build vocabulary and fluency. A plan/schedule for the teacher aide will be developed.	5C.1. School-based ESOL coordinator	5C.1. Following initial placement, an annual review will be conducted with Principal designee, ESOL coordinator, classroom teachers, parents, and student. The annual review will be used to determine whether self-contained or inclusion classroom placement is most appropriate and whether or not continued participation in the ESOL program is necessary.	5C.1. FCAT scores, CELLA scores, IPT scores, grades, student progress update per parent/teacher conferencing
2	5C.2. . Teacher lack of familiarity with instructional strategies for second language learners in instructing Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS)	5C.2. Teachers and teacher aides will receive training on available supplemental instructional materials that align to strand-specific FCAT 2.0 benchmarks.	5C.2. School-based ESOL coordinator, Mathematics coach, classroom teachers	5C.2. Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings.	5C.2. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012, periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS
3	5C.3. Students may require extended learning opportunities to achieve proficiency.	5C.3. Students will be given opportunities to attend twice-weekly tutoring, beginning in December 2012/January 2013 (budget permitting), as well as Saturday school programs for strand-specific FCAT preparation.	5C.3. Title I coordinator, classroom teachers	5C.3. Principal designee and classroom teachers will monitor participation levels in the tutoring and Saturday school programs	5C.3. After-school tutoring and Saturday school attendance logs

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In grades 6-8, 50% of students with disabilities (SWD) will make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT (based on 2012 AMO report).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (73) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) made satisfactory progress in mathematics (based on 2012 AMO report).	50% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make satisfactory progress in mathematics (based on 2012 AMO report).

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. Students with individual education plans (IEP) scheduled into mainstream academic classes may require more individualized, targeted instruction to achieve proficiency	5D.1. ESE-certified personnel will provide additional services, including remediation and alternative, supplemental lesson delivery	5D.1. ESE specialist, ESE support facilitators	5D.1. Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings	5D.1. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS
2	5D.2. Lack of communication between general education teachers and ESE support facilitators	5D.2. General education teachers and ESE support facilitators will collaborate on analyzing data from the CMAT in order to determine appropriate math interventions that support Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS)	5D.2. Classroom teachers, ESE support facilitators	5D.2. Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings	5D.2. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	In grades 6-8, 58% of economically disadvantaged (ED) students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT (based on 2012 AMO report).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (416) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	58% of economically disadvantaged (ED) students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT (based on 2012 AMO report).

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. Students may require targeted, supplemental academic instruction to achieve proficiency.	5E.1. Students will be given opportunity to attend twice-weekly after school tutoring (budget permitting) beginning in December	5E.1. Title I coordinator, classroom teachers	5E.1. Principal designee and classroom teachers will monitor participation levels in the tutoring and Saturday School programs	5E.1. After school tutoring and Saturday School attendance log

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:	20% of students taking the Algebra EOC will score at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20.6% of Students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	20% of Students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 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. Application of the Common Core Standards in the curriculum	1.1. Mathematics Learning Community, professional development	1.1. GEM teachers Math Department Chair	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs via principal or principal designee, Course-specific team collaboration during PLC meetings	1.1. Benchmark Assessments

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	80% of students will score at Achievement Level 4, or 5 in Algebra 1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79.4% of Students scored at Achievement Level 4, or 5 in Algebra 1.	80% of Students will score at Achievement Level 4, or 5 in Algebra 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	2.1. Application of the Common Core Standards in the curriculum	2.1. Mathematics Learning Community, professional development	2.1. GEM teachers Math Department Chair	2.1. Classroom walkthroughs via principal or principal designee, Course-specific team collaboration during PLC meetings	2.1. Benchmark Assessments

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 : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	100% of all students taking the Algebra EOC will pass with a level 3 or more.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students in the following subgroups made satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. White: 100% Black: 100% Hispanic: 100% Asian: 100% American Indian: 100%	Students in the following subgroups will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. White: 100% Black: 100% Hispanic: 100% Asian: 100% American Indian: 100%

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 It is very difficult to continually challenge students already working above grade level	3B.1.Math competitions and academic games are available after school	3B.1.Math Dept. Chair	3B.1.County benchmarks or PLC made assessments should be taken on FCAT standards in addition	3B.1. Teacher made or PLC made assessments.

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	100% of students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	100% of students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 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
	3C.1. Students may require sheltered English language instruction, or other accommodations in academic classes, to achieve proficiency.	3C.1. A teacher assistant will push-in/pull-out ELL bi-weekly to build vocabulary and fluency. A plan/schedule for the teacher aide will be developed.	3C.1. School-based ESOL coordinator	3C.1. Following initial placement, an annual review will be conducted with Principal designee, ESOL coordinator, classroom teachers, parents, and student.	3C.1. FCAT scores, CELLA scores, IPT scores, grades, student progress update per parent/teacher conferencing

1				The annual review will be used to determine whether self-contained or inclusion classroom placement is most appropriate and whether or not continued participation in the ESOL program is necessary.
---	--	--	--	--

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:	In grades 7-8, 100% of students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of Students with Disabilities students did not make satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	100% of Students with Disabilities students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 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	3D.1. Students with individual education plans (IEP) scheduled into mainstream academic classes may require more individualized, targeted instruction to achieve proficiency	3D.1. ESE-certified personnel will provide additional services, including remediation and alternative, supplemental lesson delivery	3D.1. ESE specialist, ESE support facilitators	3D.1. Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings	3D.1. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS

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:	In grades 7-8, 100% of students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	100% of Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 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	3E.1. Students may require targeted, supplemental academic instruction to achieve proficiency.	3E.1. Students will be given opportunity to attend twice-weekly after school tutoring (budget permitting) beginning in December 2012/January 2013, as	3E.1. Title I coordinator, classroom teachers	3E.1. Principal designee and classroom teachers will monitor participation levels in the tutoring and Saturday School programs	3E.1. After school tutoring and Saturday School attendance log

well as Saturday School program for strand-specific FCAT preparation

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:	In grade 8, 0% of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7% (4) of Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	0% of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.

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. Application of the Common Core Standards in the curriculum	1.1. Mathematics Learning Community, professional development	1.1. GEM teachers Math Department Chair	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs via principal or principal designee, Course-specific team collaboration during PLC meetings	1.1. Benchmark Assessments

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	In grade 8, 100% of students will score at Achievement Level 4 or 5 in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92% (52) scored at Achievement Level 4 or 5 in Geometry.	100% of students will score at Achievement Level 4 or 5 in Geometry.

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	2.2.1 It is very difficult to continually challenge students already working above grade level	2.2 .Math competitions and academic games are available after school	2.2 Math Dept. Chair	2.2 County benchmarks or PLC made assessments should be taken on FCAT standards in addition	2.2 Teacher made or PLC made assessments.

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 : <input type="text"/>			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	100% of all subgroups will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Student subgroups by ethnicity making satisfactory progress in Geometry. White: 100% Black: 100% Hispanic: 100% Asian: 100% American Indian: 100%	Student subgroups by ethnicity expected to make satisfactory progress in Geometry. White: 100% Black: 100% Hispanic: 100% Asian: 100% American Indian: 100%

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	3.B.1 It is very difficult to continually challenge students already working above grade level	3.B.1.Math competitions and academic games are available after school	3.B.1Math Dept. Chair	3.B.1County benchmarks or PLC made assessments should be taken on FCAT standards in addition	3.B.1Teacher made or PLC made assessments.

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	100% of students will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	100% of (ELL) English Language Learners are expected to make satisfactory progress in Geometry.

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. Students may require sheltered English language instruction, or other accommodations in academic classes, to	3C.1. A teacher assistant will push-in/pull-out ELL bi-weekly to build vocabulary and fluency. A plan/schedule for the	3C.1. School-based ESOL coordinator	3C.1. Following initial placement, an annual review will be conducted with Principal designee, ESOL coordinator,	3C.1. FCAT scores, CELLA scores, IPT scores, grades, student progress update per

1	achieve proficiency.	teacher aide will be developed.		classroom teachers, parents, and student. The annual review will be used to determine whether self-contained or inclusion classroom placement is most appropriate and whether or not continued participation in the ESOL program is necessary.	parent/teacher conferencing
---	----------------------	---------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------

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:	100% of students will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	100% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) are expected to make satisfactory progress in Geometry.

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. Students with individual education plans (IEP) scheduled into mainstream academic classes may require more individualized, targeted instruction to achieve proficiency	3D.1. ESE-certified personnel will provide additional services, including remediation and alternative, supplemental lesson delivery	3D.1. ESE specialist, ESE support facilitators	3D.1. Analysis of county benchmark assessment test (BAT) results, as well as county mathematics assessment results during professional learning community meetings	3D.1. County benchmark assessment test (BAT) administrations in September and December 2012; periodic county mathematics assessments based on NGSSS

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:	100% of Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in Geometry.	100% of Economically Disadvantaged students are expected to make satisfactory progress in Geometry.

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
	3E.1. Students may require targeted, supplemental academic instruction to achieve	3E.1. Students will be given opportunity to attend twice-weekly after school tutoring	3E.1. Title I coordinator, classroom teachers	3E.1. Principal designee and classroom teachers will monitor participation levels in	3E.1. After school tutoring and Saturday School attendance log

1	proficiency.	(budget permitting) beginning in December 2012/January 2013, as well as Saturday School program for strand-specific FCAT preparation		the tutoring and Saturday School programs	
---	--------------	--	--	---	--

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
Adapting Materials/Curriculum	6, 7, 8	Math Department Chair/Math Coach	All Mathematics teachers	10/31/12; 11/21/12	Lesson Plan review/classroom walkthroughs	Administration &/or Department Chair &/or Math Coach
Common Core	6, 7, 8	Math Department Chair/Math Coach	All Mathematics teachers	Quarterly	Lesson Plan review/classroom walkthroughs	Administration &/or Department Chair &/or Math Coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Supplemental academic instruction (all students)	FCAT Saturday School	Accountability Funds (SAC)	\$3,344.50
Supplemental academic instruction (targeted AYP subgroups, inclusive of ELL and ED)	Twice-weekly after school tutoring, beginning December 2012/January 2013; school day supplemental instruction by mathematics coach	Title I / budget	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$3,344.50
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: \$3,344.50

End of 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.O: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In grades 6-8, 32% of students will score level 3 on the 2013 FCAT science test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30.7% (152) of Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	32% of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Students are not tested by the State of Florida on the next generation sunshine state standards until the end of the eighth grade year, making data monitoring more difficult for classroom teachers.	1A.1.a: Use of district funded interactive online programs such as Gizmos and IMACS to remediate according to Benchmark Assessment Test and mini-benchmark assessment data. 1A.1.b: . Eighth grade students will be given the opportunity to receive supplemental academic instruction through FCAT Science Pull-Out in winter 2012 (budget permitting).	1A.1. Science department chair, classroom teachers	1A.1. Science mini-benchmark data review during science professional learning community meetings, as well as lesson plan documentation and classroom walkthroughs	1A.1. Benchmark Assessment Test administrations in September and December 2012; teacher-generated assessments; County mini-benchmark assessments
2	1A.2. Students do not take the FCAT until the end of their eighth grade year therefore making retention of 6th grade and 7th grade material difficult leading to possible low proficiency,	1A.2.a: Monitor through use of mini benchmark assessments and remediate as necessary throughout 6th, 7th, and 8th grade. 1A.2.b: Pull out/Push in camps on early release days (Success Days) to review and remediate benchmarks.	1A.2. Science department chair, science professional learning community chair	1A.2. Science mini-benchmark data review during science professional learning community meetings	1A.2. Benchmark Assessment Test administrations in September and December 2012; teacher-generated assessments; County mini-benchmark assessments
3	1A.3. Students may require alternative lesson delivery methods on some concepts to achieve proficiency	1A.3. All students in grades six through eight will complete essential hands-on labs and/or alternative inquiry-based activities weekly	1A.3. Science department chair, classroom teachers	1A.3. Science mini-benchmark data review during science professional learning community meetings, as well as lesson plan documentation and classroom walkthroughs	1A.3. Benchmark Assessment Test administrations in September and December 2012; teacher-generated assessments; County mini-benchmark assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	In grades 6-8, 25% of students will score at levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
20% (1) of Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			25% of students will score at levels 4, 5, and 6 in science		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1B.1. Student disabilities significantly negatively impact grade and age expectancies.	1B.1. Usage of hands on manipulative tools to enhance learning	1B.1. ESE Specialist/ ESE Teacher	1B.1. Teachers and aides observation	1B.1. Brigance Assessment tool

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:			In grades 6-8, 14% of students will score level 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT science test.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
11.9% (59) of Students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			14% of Students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. 2.1. Students are not tested by the State of Florida on the next generation sunshine state standards until the end of the eighth grade year, making data monitoring more difficult for classroom teachers.	2A.1. Increase long-term memory through school-wide review sessions implemented on early release days (Success Days).	2A.1. Science department chair, classroom teachers	2A.1. Science mini-benchmark data review during science professional learning community meetings	2A.1. Benchmark Assessment Test administrations in September and December 2011; teacher-generated assessments; County mini-benchmark assessments
2	2A.2. Students are not tested by the State of Florida on the next generation sunshine state standards until the end of the eighth grade year, making data monitoring more difficult for classroom teachers.	2A.2. Eighth grade students will be given the opportunity to receive supplemental academic instruction through FCAT Science Pull-Out in winter 2012, budget permitting	2A.2. Science department chair, science professional learning community chair	2A.2. Science department chair, science professional learning community chair	2A.2. Benchmark Assessment Test administrations in September and December 2011; teacher-generated assessments; County mini-benchmark assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.			In grades 6-8, 65% of students will score at or above level 7 in science.		

Science Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
60% (3) of Students scored at or above Level 7 in science.		65% of students will score at or above level 7 in science			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2B.1. Student disabilities significantly negatively impact grade and age expectancies.	2B.1. Usage of hands on manipulative tools to enhance learning	2B.1. ESE Specialist/ ESE Teacher	2B.1. Teachers and aides observation	2B.1. Brigance Assessment tool

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
Cultural Sensitivity – Understanding Needs of Diverse Students	6, 7, 8 / all faculty	Office of Preventative Programs	School-wide	First quarter 2012	Classroom walkthroughs; Referral monitoring	Science professional learning community chair; Administration
Inquiry Labs	6, 7, 8 / all science teachers	Science department chair	Science professional learning community	First quarter 2012	Lesson plan monitoring during PLC meetings	Science professional learning community chair
Next Generation Sunshine State Standards	6, 7, 8 / all science teachers	Science department chair	Science professional learning community	First quarter 2012	Lesson plan monitoring during PLC meetings	Science professional learning community chair

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
BrainPop (2 year membership paid for in year 2011-2012)	Online student/teacher interactive website subscription (2nd year)	Recognition funds (approved by 2011-2012 staff)	\$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 Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In grade 8, 55% of Students scored at Achievement Level 3.5 and higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (269) of Students scored at Achievement Level 3.5 and higher in writing.	55% of Students scored at Achievement Level 3.5 and higher in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Students' lack of exposure to various styles of writing	1A.1.a: Incorporate various writing styles in Social Studies and Language Arts classes in grades 6, 7 and 8, 1A.1.b: FCAT Saturday Camps and push in/pull out on early release days (Success Days). 1A.1.c: Utilization of Springboard in 6th, 7th, & 8th grade L.A. classrooms	1A.1. Social Studies and /or Language Arts department chairs; writing scoring team	1A.1. In class monitoring by teachers; portfolio review by teachers and students	1A.1. Timed Writing prompts
2	1A.2. Students' lack of familiarity with FCAT writing styles and are weak in writing conventions and mechanics	1A.2. Classroom teachers will instruct students equally in persuasive and expository writing 1A.2.b: Cross curricular expectations of proper conventions and mechanics	1A.2. Language Arts department chairs, Language Arts teachers; 1A.2.b: Cross curricular teachers	1A.2. Monitor student writing portfolios; students plan, edit, and rewrite in class.	1A.2. Writing portfolios, individual conferencing
3	1A.3. Students' lack of familiarity with FCAT writing rubric	1A.3. Classroom teachers will instruct students on the scoring rubric for the FCAT	1A.3. Language Arts department chairs, classroom teachers	1A.3. Classroom teacher-directed peer revisions utilizing the scoring rubric	1A.3. Peer groups, writing portfolios

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	In grade 8, 68% of Students will score at Achievement Level 4 or higher on the FAA in writing
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (4) of Students scored at Achievement Level 4 or higher on the FAA in writing.	68% of Students will score at Achievement Level 4 or higher on the FAA in writing

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1B.1. Student disabilities significantly negatively impact grade and age expectancies.	1B.1. Usage of hands on manipulative tools to enhance learning	1B.1. ESE Specialist/ ESE Teacher	1B.1. Teachers and aides observation	1B.1. Brigance Assessment tool

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Training	6, 7, 8	Department Chair	All Language Arts Teachers	Quarterly	Lesson plan review/classroom walkthroughs	Department Chair &/or Administration
True Power In Academic Vocabulary	6, 7, 8	Reading Coach	All Faculty	3rd Quarter	Lesson plan review/classroom walkthroughs	Department Chair &/or Administration
Springboard Training	6, 7, 8	Language Arts Department Chair	All Language Arts Teachers	Quarterly	Lesson plan review/classroom walkthroughs	Department Chair &/or Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increased writing in various forms	Instructional focus calendar	Budget	\$0.00
Springboard	District wide, evidence based program	Budget	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Lesson development utilizing FCAT rubrics	District created/approved website	Budget	\$0.00
Differentiated instruction lessons	BEEP	Budget	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Middle school six traits	District websites	Budget	\$0.00
Peer revisions	Department-created FCAT rubrics	Budget	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increased writing scores utilizing a range of teaching styles	Department generated/created packets	Budget	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Grand Total: \$0.00			

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.				
Civics Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance	

Attendance Goal # 1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to have an attendance rate of 96%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95% (254632)	96%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
118 students had excessive absences.	106.2 students will have excessive absences.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
12 students had excessive tardies	8 students will have excessive tardies.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of communication between classroom teachers, guidance counselors, and school social worker regarding students who have chronic absenteeism	Implement a second collaborative problem solving team meeting per month, specifically for attendance and code of conduct issues, conducted by guidance counselors; School social worker will refer chronic attendance concerns to proper grade level administrator, who will in turn follow standard procedures to communicate with parents/guardians via phone calls and/or letters	Guidance counselors, School social worker, grade level administrators	On-going review of attendance records by school social worker, guidance counselors, and grade level administrators	Data warehouse attendance report (school reports menu)

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Student attendance	6, 7, 8 / all faculty	Guidance director	School-wide	Second quarter 2012	Share results of attendance monitoring on a quarterly basis with faculty	Guidance director

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:	In grades 6-8, the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions will decrease 10% from 2011-2012 levels.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1796	1,616
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
549	494
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
211	190
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
126	113

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Guidance department is undermanned, which affects the CPST process	1.1. Twice-monthly meetings instead of weekly meetings in order to provide meaningful time away to accomplish tasks/data collection in the RtI process	1.1. Guidance director, AP over guidance	1.1. Classroom, cafeteria, and hallway observations of habitual offenders; monitoring of referral data for reduction of disruptive incidents	1.1. Suspension and referral data accessible via BASIS and Data Warehouse.
2	1.2. Teacher knowledge of how to utilize the CPST and interventions	1.2. Provide professional development to help teachers develop/implement interventions in the classroom.	1.2. CPST, Grade level Administration	1.2. Classroom, cafeteria, and hallway observations of habitual offenders; monitoring of referral data for reduction of disruptive incidents	1.2. Intervention, suspension, and referral data accessible via BASIS and Data Warehouse.
3	1.3. Classroom Management	1.3. Review of Code of Conduct, three school-wide reminders of expected behavior	1.3. Administration	1.3. Data review with administration	1.3. Marzano Observations

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
RtI (follow-up)	6, 7, 8/ All subjects	District Personnel/Office of Prevention Programs	All faculty	1st Quarter, three sessions	BASIS monitoring	Grade level administrators; Guidance Counselors
Diversity Sensitivity Training	6, 7, 8/ All subjects	District Personnel/Office of Prevention Programs	All faculty	1st Quarter, three sessions	BASIS monitoring	Grade level administrators

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)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	By June 2013, the percentage of parents participating in school-wide and Title I activities will increase by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
29% (869) parents	31% (919) parents

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. Waning interest towards volunteering	1.1. Offer incentives to students as a result of parent participation in volunteering projects	1.1. Volunteer coordinator	1.1. Roster of active volunteers	1.1. Service hours timesheets, STAR system
2	1.2. Language [LEP parents] May feel intimidated or uncomfortable at school due to language barrier.	1.2. Publicize events in multiple venues and formats in students' home language	1.2. Title I Liaison	1.2. Attendance at trainings	1.2. Sign in sheets; parent survey

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
Having a successful Open House	6, 7, 8 / all faculty	Grade level administrators	School-wide	August 2012	Administrative walkthroughs during event	All administration

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Instructional Materials for Parents	Math for Moms and Dads; Janice VanCleave's A+ Science Fair Projects; A Parent's Guide to the Middle School Years; Totally Wired: What Teens and Tweens Are Really Doing Online; I-Safe Internet Safety Activities: Reproducible Projects for Teachers and Parents, Grades K-8; Megaskills: Building Our Children's Character and Achievement to School and Life; Introducing Middle School: Transition Guide for Parents of Children with Special Needs; Deceptively Delicious: Simple Secrets to Get Your Kids Eating Good Food	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$1,420.00
FCAT Family Nights featuring Math, Reading, Writing, and Science; FCAT Bilingual Nights (Creole; Spanish); Annual Title I Public Meeting; Volunteer Orientation; Open House; Technology Resources; Internet Safety; Health & Wellness Workshop (nutrition, exercise, childhood obesity); Parent Involvement Planning workshop; Megaskills/Active Parenting; Summer Bridge: Learning on Vacation	Salaries for teacher presenters (hourly) + 1/2 hr. planning per hour of presentation	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$1,900.00
Periodicals for school parent resource center	Scholastic Parent & Child; Parents; Parenting School Years; Working Mother; FamilyFun; KIWI; Scholastic Math; Scholastic Choices; Scholastic SCOPE; Adoptive Families; Scholastic Foreign Language Magazine (Spanish)	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$115.00
Subtotal:			\$3,435.00
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
Supplies	Workshop participant kits (replenish markers, pens, writing pads, folders, highlighters, etc.); Title One notebook/documentation (binder, tabs, labels, sheet protectors, portfolio); Parent Resource Center (white and color copy paper for flyers and correspondence); Plain envelopes; For Summer Bridge workshop: Inflatables reading literary balls, packs of journal charts, Expo pens with erasers	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$300.00
Annual Parent Seminar	Registration Fees for 2 parents	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$80.00
Paraprofessional Childcare	Childcare at workshops/trainings	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$240.00
Refreshments for Parent Trainings	Food and drink only	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$1,837.00

Subtotal: \$2,457.00

Grand Total: \$5,892.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

n/a Goal:

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						

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 n/a Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Improved word analysis	REWARDS	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	Increased vocabulary and comprehension skills	READ XL	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	Improved decoding and encoding through systematic phonics instruction	WILSON	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	Develop vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension	Visions Developmental Language Program	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	Supplemental academic instruction (all students)	FCAT Saturday School	Accountability Funds (SAC)	\$3,344.50
Mathematics	Supplemental academic instruction (all students)	FCAT Saturday School	Accountability Funds (SAC)	\$3,344.50
Mathematics	Supplemental academic instruction (targeted AYP subgroups, inclusive of ELL and ED)	Twice-weekly after school tutoring, beginning December 2012/January 2013; school day supplemental instruction by mathematics coach	Title I / budget	\$0.00
Science	BrainPop (2 year membership paid for in year 2011-2012)	Online student/teacher interactive website subscription (2nd year)	Recognition funds (approved by 2011-2012 staff)	\$0.00
Writing	Increased writing in various forms	Instructional focus calendar	Budget	\$0.00
Writing	Springboard	District wide, evidence based program	Budget	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	Instructional Materials for Parents	Math for Moms and Dads; Janice VanCleave's A+ Science Fair Projects; A Parent's Guide to the Middle School Years; Totally Wired: What Teens and Tweens Are Really Doing Online; I-Safe Internet Safety Activities; Reproducible Projects for Teachers and Parents, Grades K-8; Megaskills: Building Our Children's Character and Achievement to School and Life; Introducing Middle School: Transition Guide for Parents of Children with Special Needs; Deceptively Delicious: Simple Secrets to Get Your Kids Eating Good Food	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$1,420.00
Parent Involvement	FCAT Family Nights featuring Math, Reading, Writing, and Science; FCAT Bilingual Nights (Creole; Spanish); Annual Title I Public Meeting; Volunteer Orientation; Open House; Technology Resources; Internet Safety; Health & Wellness Workshop (nutrition, exercise, childhood obesity); Parent Involvement Planning workshop; Megaskills/Active Parenting; Summer Bridge: Learning on	Salaries for teacher presenters (hourly) + 1/2 hr. planning per hour of presentation	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$1,900.00

Vacation				
Parent Involvement	Periodicals for school parent resource center	Scholastic Parent & Child; Parents; Parenting School Years; Working Mother; FamilyFun; KIWI; Scholastic Math; Scholastic Choices; Scholastic SCOPE; Adoptive Families; Scholastic Foreign Language Magazine (Spanish)	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$115.00
				Subtotal: \$10,124.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Skill support	FCAT Explorer	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	Adaptive skills remediation	Successmaker	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	Lesson development and instructional support	BEEP	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	Diagnosis of reading skills	FAIR	Budget	\$0.00
Writing	Lesson development utilizing FCAT rubrics	District created/approved website	Budget	\$0.00
Writing	Differentiated instruction lessons	BEEP	Budget	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Cultural Sensitivity – Understanding Needs of AYP Subgroups	Professional books/materials	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	Using Reader's Theatre and Literature Circles	Instructor created packets	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) & Common Core Standards.	Sample documents	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	Differentiated Instruction: Develop Novel Study Units	Novels	Budget	\$0.00
Reading	FAIR Training	Sample FAIR document	Budget	\$0.00
Writing	Middle school six traits	District websites	Budget	\$0.00
Writing	Peer revisions	Department-created FCAT rubrics	Budget	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Improve vocabulary and comprehension through novel study	Novels	PTA	\$0.00
Writing	Increased writing scores utilizing a range of teaching styles	Department generated/created packets	Budget	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	Supplies	Workshop participant kits (replenish markers, pens, writing pads, folders, highlighters, etc.); Title One notebook/documentation (binder, tabs, labels, sheet protectors, portfolio); Parent Resource Center (white and color copy paper for flyers and correspondence); Plain envelopes; For Summer Bridge workshop: Inflatables reading	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$300.00

		literary balls, packs of journal charts, Expo pens with erasers		
Parent Involvement	Annual Parent Seminar	Registration Fees for 2 parents	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$80.00
Parent Involvement	Paraprofessional Childcare	Childcare at workshops/trainings	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$240.00
Parent Involvement	Refreshments for Parent Trainings	Food and drink only	Title I Funds – Parental Involvement	\$1,837.00
				Subtotal: \$2,457.00
				Grand Total: \$12,581.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
FCAT Saturday School – funds will be allocated to teacher stipends, pre-testing and testing supplies, and student refreshments for the final session of Saturday School. The 2013 Saturday Camps are scheduled for February 9th, 23rd, March 3rd, 10th, and 17th . (Accountability Funds)	\$6,689.00

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) intends to increase parent involvement in implementation and monitoring the School Improvement Plan through quarterly sub-committee meetings devoted to discussion of Forest Glen's academic objectives and assessment data. SAC also intends to solicit greater parent and community feedback and suggestions for use of the A+ money through an afternoon forum open to the public. Meetings of the SIP sub-committees and A+ money forum will be publicized through the school marquee, newsletter, and parent link phone calls. Finally, the School Advisory Council will provide updates on its differentiated accountability status at all meetings, including review of applicable school-wide benchmark data, updates to Title I funded parent involvement events, and publicized invitations to on-going discussions regarding the Forest Glen Parent Involvement Plan.

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

Broward School District FOREST GLEN MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	68%	71%	87%	44%	270	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	63%	71%			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?	64% (YES)	68% (YES)			132	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					536	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District FOREST GLEN MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	71%	93%	51%	287	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	72%			138	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?	64% (YES)	66% (YES)			130	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					555	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested