

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: J. H. WORKMAN MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Escambia

Principal: Juanita Edwards

SAC Chair: Tracy Mitchell

Superintendent: Malcolm Thomas

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/26/2012

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)
Principal	Juanita Edwards	B.S. English Education Florida State University M.S. School Counseling Troy State University Mod. Cert. Ed. Leadership University of West Florida	11	11	School Grade: C 2011--2012 Comparisons Percent Proficient Reading -58 % - 48% Math - 50 % - 37% Writing -85 % - 75% Science -45 % - 38% 2010-2011 Comparisons Percent Proficient Reading - 57% -58 % Math - 49% -50 % Writing -89 % -85 % Science -40 % -45 %
Assis Principal	Traci Ursrey	BA- Elementary Education University of West Florida MS- Educational Leadership University of West Florida Certification: EarlyChildhood/Elementary	4	4	School Grade: C 2011--2012 Comparisons Percent Proficient Reading -58 % - 48% Math - 50 % - 37% Writing -85 % - 75% Science -45 % - 38% 2010-2011 Comparisons

K-6 Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum Educational Leadership

Percent Proficient
 Reading – 57% -58 %
 Math – 49% -50 %
 Writing –89 % -85 %
 Science –40 % -45 %

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 Durre	B.A. Middle Grades Language Arts Social Studies Reading Certified	5	3	<p>Mrs. Durre has been a reading teacher for over 7 years at both Workman Middle School and Warrington Middle School. School Grade: C</p> <p>School Grade: C 2011--2012 Comparisons Percent Proficient Reading –58 % - 48% Math – 50 % - 37% Writing –85 % - 75% Science –45 % - 38%</p> <p>2010-2011 Comparisons Percent Proficient Reading – 57% -58 % Math – 49% -50 % Writing –89 % -85 % Science –40 % -45 %</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	New teachers will participate in the district START program and participate in a school based orientation.	K.K. Owen Juanita Edwards	ongoing	
2	Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	Juanita Edwards	ongoing	
3	Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Juanita Edwards	ongoing	
4	Utilizing Winocular to seek qualified candidates for interviews	Juanita Edwards Traci Ursrey	August 2012	
5	Soliciting referrals from current employees	Juanita Edwards	n/a	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
One teacher is teaching out of field.	He is planning to take the math subject area test within the next two months.

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
67	1.5%(1)	20.9%(14)	38.8%(26)	38.8%(26)	46.3%(31)	71.6%(48)	28.4%(19)	1.5%(1)	4.5%(3)

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
Hayden Riggs	Elizabeth Isphording	6th grade math teachers	They will collaborate during planning time. The mentee will do classroom observations of the mentee.
START Teacher	Zachary Bookout	START Program	START teacher will observe and meet with the mentee at least bi-monthly.
START Teacher	Kelly Cyr	START Program	START teacher will observe and meet with the mentee at least bi-monthly.
START Teacher	Janet Hennick	START Program	START teacher will observe and meet with the mentee at least bi-monthly.

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

The Title I total allocation of the 2012-2013 school year is \$96,993. Of that amount, \$53,928 is allotted for 1 teacher. For staff development, \$9,266 will be spent to train teachers in best strategies for teaching in the double block. Also, our teachers will begin training in how to implement Common Core standards into the curriculum. Parental involvement funds of \$4,338 will be spent in the 2012-2013 school year. These monies will be spent for planners, and food and supplies for parent/family involvement activities.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Services for migrant children are provided by the district level Title I office. After thorough checking of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system and our local student data base we have determined that there are 4 Migrant students at Workman Middle School. We are providing the following services to these students: language assistance, additional assistance in areas such as medical, housing, nutrition, and psychological services.

Title I, Part D

Services to neglected and delinquent students are provided by various district-operated programs. These services are overseen by the Title I office. Our school does not provide Title I Part D students.

Title II

Professional development is offered at both the school and district level. Please see each goal area for specific professional

development activities (inservice education). Workman has been allotted \$3800 in Title II funds.

Title III

Services for English Language Learners are provided as required by law. Several ESOL centers are provided as required by law. Several ESOL centers are provided at various key locations in the district. Students who do not attend centrally located school-based sites attend their zoned school where ESOL endorsed teachers provide services. All teachers who serve ELL identified students have ESOL endorsement on their teaching certificate. Our school is an ESOL Center and we serve 38 ELL students in grades 6-8. In addition we have two full time ESOL teachers funded through Title III monies. These teachers provide both the general education classroom teachers and the ELL student assistance.

Title X- Homeless

The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This program is overseen by the District Title I Office. At Workman Middle we have identified 19 homeless students and provide additional assistance to these students and their families.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

The total SAI budget for the 2012-2013 school year is \$32,868. Of that amount, \$10,599 was spent to fund a part time Administrative Clerk II. The remaining monies, \$22,269, were spent on computer software and supplies.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporate guest speakers, counseling, and classroom discussion. Red Ribbon Week is held in October with school-wide activities and guest speakers. Through our school's Behavior Management Plan, we provide training for faculty, staff, and students regarding bullying. The Jeffrey Johnston Stand Up for All Students Act, requires our school district to adopt an official policy prohibiting bullying and harassment of students and staff on school ground, at school-sponsored events, and through school computer networks. In addition, our district has launched the "Bullying" reporting website where bullies may be reported anonymously.

Nutrition Programs

Our school is committed to continue offering nutritional choices in its cafeteria. This includes salad bar, a la carte items, and self serve options. Our school is also a Healthier Generation Alliance School. The school follows the district's nutrition program for summer feeding at select sites. Additional programs and staff will address the obesity issue, especially in elementary age children.

Housing Programs

This is offered at the district level and overseen by the Title I District Office. This program is not applicable to our school.

Head Start

This program is offered at the district level and several Head Start programs are housed at various elementary schools in the district. This program is overseen by the Title I Prekindergarten Office.

Adult Education

Evening programs are offered at our local high schools. A "Second Chance" program is also in place for juvenile offenders. Pensacola State College also provides programs for adults over 16 years of age.

Career and Technical Education

Academy programs through Workforce Education are offered in the areas of Health, E-Commerce, and Pre-engineering.

Job Training

All students complete an E-PEP in 8th grade history classes.

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RTI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Juanita Edwards -Principal; Traci Ursrey - Assistant Principal; Jeanne Monroe- guidance counselor; Bronwyn Nickles- guidance

counselor; Nancy Durre- literacy coach; Chris Norris- science teacher; Brittany Mraz- science teacher; Hayden Riggs- math teacher; Hollye Roblyer- language arts teacher

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The RtI Focus Team meets monthly on the 3rd Wednesday morning of each month, and the principal, reading coach, and guidance counselors meet weekly to engage in the following activities:
Review screening data and link to instructional decisions; review data from progress monitoring at the grade level as well as classroom level to identify students at each tier level. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate and problem solve regularly, share effective practices, evaluate practices that are implemented, make decisions, and practice new processes. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus and making decisions about implementation.

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?

Members of the RtI met with SAC members and the principal to help develop the SIP. Information was shared on academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; data was provided on all three of the Tier targets; clear expectations for instruction, especially with regard to rigor, were presented; the development of a systemic approach to teaching, including objectives and essential questions, was facilitated; and processes and procedures were aligned.

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.

Baseline Data: FAIR testing and Florida Comprehensive Assessment (FCAT) results
Progress Monitoring: FCAT Simulation, Subject Area Tests, Fast Forward Data
Midyear: FAIR, FCAT Simulation, Subject Area Tests, Fast Forward Data
End of Year: FAIR, FCAT
Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The RtI Leadership Team received district based training. The team then trained faculty members during faculty meetings and during teachers' planning periods. Professional development will continue to occur during teachers' common planning periods throughout the year. The RtI Leadership Team will discuss and recommend additional professional development opportunities during meetings. Print resources will be given to staff.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Nancy Durre - Reading Coach; Audrey Booth - Media Specialist; Hollye Roblyer- language arts teacher, Cherie Hyder- social studies teacher, Wendi Pharis- social studies teacher, Zenda Swearingin- chorus teacher, Helen Kelchner- physical education teacher, Camille Kimmel- math teacher, Rochelle Carmichael- reading teacher, Katie Wise- math/ESE teacher, William Blankenship- science teacher, Pam Speer- language arts/gifted teacher

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly during the 4th Wednesday morning of each month. The team is led by Nancy Durre, reading and literacy coach and Hollye Roblyer, language arts department chair. The purpose of the group is to promote literacy in all subject areas. They developed and implemented a literacy plan with strategies to achieve literacy across the

curriculum. They also promote schoolwide literacy activities such as Literacy Night, Literacy Wednesdays, Drop Everything and Read, Bingo for Books family nights, and monthly Book Swaps.

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

The major initiatives for this year are:

1. Students will write weekly in all classes.
2. Language Arts, social studies and foreign language teachers will incorporate a close reading lesson into their curriculum each month.
3. Science, math, and technology teachers will incorporate a reading strategy into their curriculum each month.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/26/2012)

*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.

Not applicable

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Select content area teachers will be trained by SREB in the Literacy Design Collaborative. They will incorporate strategies learned into their IB unit plans to implement into the curriculum. Also, all content area teachers will implement a reading strategy or close reading activity into their lesson plans each month. Teachers will turn in an Accountability Folder to administration every month.

*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?

Not applicable

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?

All 6th graders are required to take Career Explorations to introduce students to the world of work and expose them to the career paths they may take. The Career Academies of Health, Pre-Engineering, and E-Commerce are offered. For each of these academies, students must complete a workforce education course each year. Workman is an International Baccalaureate World School. All IB students are required to take all core classes; language arts, math, science, and social studies, as well as courses in the arts, physical education, language B (Spanish or Chinese), and technology.

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](#)

Not applicable

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:	Mastery on the 2012 FCAT Reading Test will increase by one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 48% of 930 students in grades 6-8 achieved proficiency on the 2010 FCAT Reading Test. In 2011, 58% (563) of students in grades 6-8 achieved proficiency on the 2011 FCAT Reading Test	In 2013, 49% of students in grades 6-8 will achieve proficiency 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	Teachers are not teaching reading strategies in all subject areas.	All teachers will turn in a monthly lesson plan that involves a reading activity. Language Arts, Foreign Language, and Social Studies will implement a close reading activity. Mathematics, Science, and technology will incorporate a reading strategy into a lesson.	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach	Principal and Assistant Principal will visit classrooms and view student work to determine effectiveness.	Lesson Plans turned into the appropriate administrator every month.
2	Students who are not successful in the classrooms in reading need to be identified and given small group instruction.	The RtI Focus Team will determine which students will be identified to receive additional help.	RtI Focus Group Leader and Team Leaders in Grade Levels	Classroom Teachers and RTI team will assess students regularly.	Assessments in class and small groups
3	Content area teachers are not comfortable teaching reading strategies.	All content area teachers will be trained in close reading strategies to improve reading skills.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Monthly accountability folders with a reading activity will be turned into administration.	Accountability folder
4	Teachers do not know how to incorporate Common Core standards into the curriculum.	Select content area teachers will participate in the Literacy Design Collaborative provided by SREB.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Analysis of IB Unit plans/modules by the SREB coach. Classroom visits by the SREB coach.	SREB coaching notes.

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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 2012, the number of students scoring a level 4 or 5 will increase by one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2010 27% (251) achieved a level 4 or 5 on FCAT Reading. >In 2011, 25%(234) of students achieved above proficiency on FCAT Reading.	In 2012 the expected level of performance in achieving above proficiency is 26% or higher.

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 need to be given more rigorous assignments.	Teachers will use IB strategies to teach reading.	Literacy Coach and IB MYP Coordinator	Data from FCAT reading scores will be reviewed.	FCAT Reading
2	Content area teachers need to incorporate reading strategies into the curriculum.	All content area teachers will be trained in close reading strategies.	Literacy Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal	Analyze student work. Analyze close reading lesson plans.	Accountability folder.

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	n/a	n/a	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:		In 2013 the number of students making learning gains on FCAT reading will increase by one percentage point.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2011, 61%(592) of students made learning gains in reading. In 2012, 64% of 930 students made learning gains in reading.		In 2012, at least 65% of students will make 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	Levels 1 and 2 students have difficulty in making learning gains.	Voyagers/ Journeys materials provided by SRA will be used with students scoring level 1 or 2 on FCAT 2.0.	Reading Coach	Learning gains data will be analyzed.	FCAT Reading for 2013
2	Content area teachers are not comfortable teaching reading strategies.	All content area teachers will be trained in how to implement close reading activities.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	Student work analyzed. Lesson plans analyzed.	Accountability folders.

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:		N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		N/A			

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

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 2012, the number of students in the lowest 25% who make learning gains on FCAT reading will increase by one percentage point.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2011, 66% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. In 2012, 67% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.		At least 68% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in 2013.			

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 in the lowest 25% are well below grade level and have difficulty catching up to their peers.	Teachers will use Journeys/Voyagers materials provided by SRA.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	Weekly report analysis.	Weekly report.

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 2013 Workman middle will make the targeted AMO goal.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	48	56	60	65	69	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2013 all ethnic sub-groups will meet AMO goals.
---	--

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

In 2012, 58% of Asian students were proficient in reading; 26% of African American students were proficient in reading; 48% of Hispanic students were proficient in reading; and 75% of white students were proficient in reading.	In 2013, Asian students will 58% or higher proficiency in reading; 30% of African American students will be proficient in reading; 50% of Hispanic students will be proficient in reading; and 77% of white students will be 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	Students lack the ability to apply reading skills while reading in the content area.	The literacy team will teach content area teachers how to incorporate reading strategies into their course content.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Monitoring FAIR testing results	FAIR testing
2	Students lack strategies to successfully deconstruct text.	Select content area teachers will be trained by SREB in the Literacy Design Curriculum.	Principal, Assistant Principal	SREB coaching input; IB Unit/Module plans	IB Unit plans; SREB coaching notes.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	In 2013, ELL students will make AMO goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In 2012 13% of ELL students were proficient in reading.	In 2013, ELL students will maintain or improve 13% proficiency.
---	---

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students do not have the reading skills necessary to become proficient readers.	Content area teachers will be trained in different reading strategies through SREB.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Report card grades, FCAT 2.0	Report cards, FCAT 2.0
2	ELL students lack the language skills necessary to become proficient readers.	ELL teachers will collaborate with content area teachers to ensure students are given the needed support.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Collaboration notes, master schedule.	Collaboration notes, master schedule.

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 2012, the number of students with disabilities that are proficient in reading will increase by one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2010, 31% of students with disabilities were proficient in reading. In 2011, 25% of students with disabilities were proficient in reading.	In 2012, 26% of students with disabilities will make AYP 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	Students do not have sufficient reading skills.	Implementation of RtI strategies	RtI team and Guidance Counselors	RtI team will monitor progress of students.	RtI Assessments
2	ESE students need more support to be successful in the general education classroom.	ESE students that need extra support will be serviced by a teacher certified in ESE and the content area. Also, a support facilitator will be available in many classes.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE behavior coach	Analyze student schedules	TERMS- student schedules

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 2012, economically disadvantaged students will meet their AMO goal.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 34% of economically disadvantaged students were proficient in reading.	In 2013 39% of economically disadvantaged students will be 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	Students may not have resources for reading at home.	Book swaps will be held twice a month during lunches, where students may use Jag bucks to receive a book or magazine, or students may bring a book to swap.	IB MYP Coordinator PBS team	Analyze data from FAIR testing and FCAT Reading.	FAIR testing and FCAT Reading results
2	Students may not have resources for reading at home.	Family reading night, such as Bingo for Books, will provide students will reading material to take home.	Literacy Coach, Literacy Focus team	Family participation at reading family nights.	Sign In sheets for parent family nights.

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
Literacy Design Collaborative	Various content area teachers	Literacy Coach	Various content area teachers	Pre-scheduled dates throughout the school year.	SREB coaching days	Principal, Assistant Principal
Literacy Focus Group	Varied	Literacy Coach	A variety of teachers in different grade levels and content areas.	Monthly	Meeting notes, FCAT results	Principal, Assistant Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Materials for Level 1 and 2 readers	Voyagers	District General Revenue	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Training for 5 teachers and 2 administrators	Literacy Design Collaboration through SREB	District Title II	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Supplemental Reading Materials	Library Books	Regular Operations	\$956.00
Supplemental Reading Materials	Library Books	Instructional Materials - Library	\$2,044.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:		The students use responsive listening skills and speak for various occasions, audiences, and purposes, including conversation, discussions, projects, and presentations.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
Currently, 43% of the students are proficient in listening/speaking.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in silent period	Listening for meaning	English as Second Language Teacher	Comprehension Checks	Teacher Made Assessments

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:		Students will use the reading processes effectively. They will demonstrate consistent and effective use of vocabulary; use strategies to clarify meaning, locates, organizes and interprets written information; and check validity and accuracy of information from research.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
Currently, 26% of the students are 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	The majority of ELL students are level 1 and 2 students.	The following resources will be used: Journeys, Direct Instruction, and Fast Forward.	ESOL Teacher is responsible.	Comprehension and fluency activities will be given.	Evaluation tools will include computer, curriculum, and teacher based assessments, as well as state mandated assessments.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		The students use the writing processes effectively. They			

CELLA Goal #3:	select and use appropriate formats for writing.				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					
Currently, 28% of the students are proficient in writing.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students can write in their native language.	They read, write, and think, using CRISS and hamburger strategies.	The ESOL teacher is responsible.	The Escambia and FCAT Writes practices are used.	Teacher made and state mandated assessments are used for evaluation.

CELLA Budget:

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	In 2013, the number of students proficient in mathematics will increase by one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 50% (486) of the students were proficient in mathematics. In 2012 37% of 930 students were proficient in mathematics.	In 2013, 38% of the students will be proficient 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	Numeracy is not incorporated across the curriculum	Every teacher will be asked to incorporate a numeracy lesson or strategy each month.	Principal Assistant Principal Math Department Chair	Lessons will be analyzed by the principal and assistant principal.	Accountability folder.
2	Students are weak in basic math skills.	Teachers will use the supplemental materials offered with the math textbooks to remediate students weak areas.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Department Chair	FCAT simulation scores.	FCAT End of Course exams
3	Students are not proficient in higher order thinking required to successfully do mathematics.	Select math teachers will be trained in the Math Design Collaborative provided by SREB.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Monthly coaching visits provided by SREB. Lesson provided by SREB-Classroom Collaboratives	SREB coaching notes

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:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In 2013, the number of students who score a 4 or higher on FCAT mathematics will increase by one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 18%(162) of students scored a 4 or higher in mathematics. In 2012 5% of 908 students scored a 4 or higher in mathematics.	In 2013, 6% of students will score a 4 or higher on FCAT 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	Rigor in the curriculum	IB MYP unit plan implementation	Principal IB MYP coordinator Math Department Chair	End of 9 week test.	End of 9 weeks test.
2	Availability of higher level classes	Incorporate as many advanced level classes into the curriculum as possible	Principal Assistant Principal	Review of master schedule; addition of advanced level sections as needed	Master schedule
3	Students are not proficient in higher order thinking required to successfully do mathematics.	Select math teachers will be trained in the Math Design Collaborative provided by SREB.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Monthly coaching visits provided by SREB. Implementation of Classroom Collaboratives.	SREB coaching notes

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:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2013, the number of students who make learning gains on FCAT math will increase by one percentage point.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 57% (553) students made learning gains in mathematics. In 2012, 47% of 908 students made learning gains in mathematics.	In 2013, 48% of the 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	Students lack basic math skills	Use supplemental materials offered with the math series effectively in the math classroom.	Principal Math Department Chair	End of 9 weeks district test.	End of 9 weeks district test.
2	Students are not proficient in higher order thinking required to successfully do mathematics.	Select math teachers will be trained in the Math Design Collaborative provided by SREB.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Monthly coaching visits provided by SREB. Implementation of Classroom Collaboratives.	SREB coaching notes
3	Students do not make the connection between math and real life applications.	Numeracy across the curriculum.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Analysis of monthly numeracy lesson in each subject area.	Accountability folder.
4	Students do not make the connection between math and real life applications.	Numeracy across the curriculum.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Analysis of monthly numeracy lesson in each subject area.	Accountability folder.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2012, the number of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains in mathematics will increase by one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In 2010, 63% of the students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in mathematics. In 2011, 64% of the students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in mathematics.	In 2012, 65% of the students in the lowest quartile 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	Students lack basic math skills	Those students in the lowest quartile will be placed in a 30 minute Compass class daily to work with a math teacher on basic skills.	Principal, Assistant Principal	End of 9 weeks district test.	District test.
2	Students need extra time and help to successfully learn material	Continue the Success is the Only Option program to offer students the extra time and help needed to complete assignments.	Principal, Grade level chairpersons	Failure rates	Report card data
3	Students lack basic math skills and do not perservere when problem solving.	Select math teacher attend SREB training in the Math Design Collaborative and learn how to move students through "Productive Struggle."	Math Department Chair, Principal, Assistant Principal	SREB coach observes in the classroom	SREB coaching notes.

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 2013, Workman Middle school will meet the targeted AMO goals.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	37	48	54	59	64	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In 2013, Workman Middle School will meet the targeted AMO goals for each ethnic sub-group.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 50% of Asian students were proficient in mathematics; 17% of African American students were proficient in mathematics; 31% of Hispanic students were proficient in mathematics; and 62% of white students were proficient in mathematics.	In 2013, 60% of Asian students will be proficient in mathematics; 24% of African American students will be proficient in mathematics; 39% of Hispanic students will be proficient in mathematics; and 65% of white students will be proficient 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	Students lack the ability to apply math skills in real life situations	Continued use of the SREB Success is the Only Option program.	Principal Assistant Principal	Weekly meetings during team collaboration time to discuss student	Student report card grades

				failures.	
2	Students lack basic math skills.	Select math teachers will be trained in the SREB Math Design Collaborative.	Principal, Assistant Principal	FCAT 2.0 scores	FCAT 2.0
3	Students lack the ability to apply math skills in real life situations.	Incorporate numeracy across the curriculum strategies.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Analyze monthly lesson plans that incorporate numeracy into all content areas.	Accountability folders.

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 2013, J.H. Workman Middle School will meet the targeted AMO goals for ELL students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 17% of ELL students were proficient in mathematics.	In 2013, 20% of ELL students will be 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	ELL students do not have basic math skills.	Select math teachers will be trained by SREB in the Math Design Collaborative.	Principal, Assistant Principal	FCAT 2.0 scores, SREB coaching feedback.	FCAT 2.0, SREB coaching notes.
2	ELL students cannot connect math skills to real life situations.	All ELL students will be taught in a regular math class with a ESOL endorsed/content certified teacher.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Master schedule, student schedules.	Master schedule, TERMS- student schedules

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 2013, students with disabilities will meet the targeted AMO goal.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 12% of students with disabilities will be proficient in mathematics.	In 2013, 18% of students with disabilities will be proficient 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	Students lack the ability to apply math skills in a real world environment	Incorporate SWD into the general education classes. Students will be placed with a teacher certified in ESE and content area certification if needed.	Principal Assistant Principal ESE department chair.	Continual monitoring of SWD in the general education class.	Number of students that successfully stay in the general education classes Report Card grade for SWD

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 2012 the number of economically disadvantaged students who are proficient in math will increase by one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2010, 31% of the economically disadvantaged students were proficient in mathematics. In 2012, 33% of the economically disadvantaged students were proficient in mathematics.	In 2012, the number of economically disadvantaged students who are proficient in math will increase to 34%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inability of students to apply math skills in real life situations	Implementation of the IB MYP unit plan	Principal Assistant Principal	Evaluations of the IB MYP unit plans	IB MYP unit plans
2	Lack of basic math skills	Select teachers will be trained by SREB in the Math Design Collaborative.	Principal, Assistant Principal	FCAT 2.0, SREB coaching feedback	FCAT 2.0, SREB coaching logs.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	In 2013, we will maintain our proficiency level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 100% of students taking the Algebra EOC were proficient.	In 2013 we will maintain 100% of students proficient.

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	All students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 are taking Algebra this year.	Students scoring a low level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will be assigned to a 30 minute Compass class daily. The class will be taught by an Algebra teacher to offer extra time and help with skills and strategies.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Algebra EOC	Algebra EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	In 2013, the percentage of students scoring a level 4 or higher on the Algebra EOC will increase by 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 54% of students scored a level 4 or higher on the Algebra EOC.	In 2013, at least 55% of students will score a level 4 or higher on the Algebra EOC.

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 lack the ability to successfully persevere and complete complex mathematics problems.	Teachers will be trained in "Productive Struggle" through the SREB Math Design Collaborative.	Math Department chair, Principal, Assistant Principal	Algebra EOC, 9 week grades	Algebra EOC results, report card grades

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making	
--	--

satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Geometry Goal #

3A :

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3B:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Design Collaborative through SREB	6th, 7th & 8th	Math Department Chair	Select math teachers	Pre-scheduled dates throughout the school year.	SREB coaching days	Principal, Assistant Principal

Numeracy Across the Curriculum focus team	Various	Jon Tinney, Hayden Riggs-math department chair	Various teachers in different content areas	Monthly	End of 9 weeks district test.	Principal, Assistant Principal
---	---------	--	---	---------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Math Software	Accelerated Math	n/a	\$0.00
math website for teachers	shellmath.org	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Training for 3 teachers and 2 administrators	SREB Math Design Collaboration	District Title II Funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Math Coach	SREB	District Title II Funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		The number of eighth grade students proficient in science will increase one percentage point in 2013.			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2011, 45% of eighth grade students were proficient in science. In 2012, 38% of eighth grade students were proficient in science.		In 2013, 39% of eighth grade students will be proficient 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	Students lack basic science knowledge	Implement SREB Failure is Not an Option plan	Principal Assistant Principal	Monitor student progress on FCAT simulation and end of course exams	FCAT simulation End of course exams
	Students lack the	Implement IB MYP unit	Principal	IB MYP unit plan	IB MYP unit plans

2	ability to apply science concepts to real world events	planning	IB MYP coordinator	evaluations Implementation of IB MYP unit plans	
3	Students lack motivation to learn science concepts	Use FCAT mini-labs in the eighth grade science classes.	Principal, Science Department Chair	FCAT science scores	FCAT

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:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 2012, the number of students who score a level 4 or higher on FCAT science will increase by one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2010, 13%(36)of eighth grade students at Workman Middle scored a level 4 or higher on FCAT science. In 2011, 10%(27)of eighth grade students at Workman Middle scored a level 4 or higher on FCAT science.	In 2012, 11% of students will score a level 4 or higher on FCAT 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	Students lack of ability to apply science skills to real life	All 6th and 7th grade students will be required to complete a science project.	Principal Assistant Principal Science Department Chair	Evaluate student participation and completion of a science project.	Grading rubric for Science project.
2	Students lack knowledge concerning the Nature of Science.	Implement IB MYP unit plans	Principal IB MYP Coordinator Assistant Principal	Upload unit plans to the common K drive at school.	Unit plan evaluations

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.	n/a				
Science Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
n/a	n/a				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science department meetings.	6th, 7th & 8th grades	Science department chair.	All science teachers	Monthly- all grades meeting together Daily- grade level teachers meet	IB Unit plans, end of 9 week district science test.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Science department chair
Bioscopes	7th, & 8th grade	District training	7th grade science teacher, 8th grade science teacher	Summer 2012	District 9 week test	Science department chair, principal, assistant principal

Science Budget:

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

science lab materials	supplies	Science Lab Materials	\$885.00
			Subtotal: \$885.00
			Grand Total: \$885.00

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 2013, the number of students scoring a level 3.0 or above on FCAT writes will increase by one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 98%(278) of all eight grade students scored a level 3.0 or above on FCAT writes. In 2013, 75% of 273 eighth grade students scored a level 3.0 or above on FCAT 2.0 writing.	In 2013, the number of students scoring a level 3.0 or above on FCAT writes will increase to 76%.

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 lack basic writing skills.	Implement strategies learned in the IB MYP unit planning workshop.	Principal IB MYP coordinator	Evaluate practice writing tests throughout the year	FCAT writing scores
2	Students are unable to successfully write based on common core standards.	Teachers will implement writing activities aligned to the common core standards as learned in the Literacy Design Collaborative	Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, Language Arts department chair.	Analyze IB unit plans/modules	IB unit plans.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Language Arts department meetings	6th, 7th and 8th	Language Arts department chair	All language arts teachers	Monthly- all grade levels meet Daily- grade level teachers collaborate	FCAT 2.0 writing scores Papers written as part of an IB Unit plan/module	Principal, Assistant Principal, Language Arts department chair, literacy coach
SREB Literacy Design Collaborative	6th, 7th & 8th	SREB trainer	Select language arts teachers	Pre-scheduled dates throughout the school year.	IB Unit plans/modules	Principal, Assistant Principal
District training for writing using the Common Core standards	6th - 8th	District Language Arts Specialist, District Reading Specialist	Language arts teachers	Professional development days, District Pre-planning	Selected writing assignments	Selected writing assignments

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$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. | J.H. Workman Middle School will set an achievement in |
|---|---|

Civics Goal #1:		Civics EOC when data become available.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
J.H. Workman Middle School did not field test the Civics EOC. No data available.		J.H. Workman Middle School will participate in Civics EOC testing. No data will be available, except for upper middle and lower thirds performance.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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.		J.H. Workman Middle will set an achievement in Civics EOC when data become available.			
Civics Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
J.H. Workman Middle did not participate in Civics EOC field testing. No data is available.		J.H. Workman Middle will participate in the Civics EOC testing. No data will be available except lower, middle and upper thirds.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Additional IB training.	Grade 6-8	IB Coordinator	7th grade teachers	Professional development days Summer, 2013	True North Logic Pre-test/ Post-test	IB Coordinator, Principal, Assistant Principal

Civics Budget:

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

Current Civics base and supplemental materials	Provided by the district	General Revenue Funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Online Civics components	Provided by the district	General Revenue Funds	\$0.00
End of Course Testing Training IT assistance	Provided by the district	General Revenue Funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
District-wide Civics EOC training. Technology training	Provided by the district	General Revenue funds Title II funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$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		The attendance goal is to have a daily attendance rate of 95% or higher.			
Attendance Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
The ADA in 2012 was 94.2%. The ADA in 2011 was 93.3%.		The expected ADA in 2013 is 95%.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
There were 372 students who had excessive absences in 2012. In 2011, 413 students had excessive absences.		In 2013, 371 students or less 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)			
In 2012, 113 students had 10 or more tardies. In 2011, 90 students had excessive tardies.		In 2013, 112students or less 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	Excessive absences and tardies of students	PBS team will address tardies and absences.	Dean Intervention Specialist Guidance	Attendance records	Attendance records

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
Grade levels will discuss excessive absences/tardies during collaborative planning.	All	Grade level chairperson	All teachers	Monthly	Grade level chair gets with guidance/ attendance to report students of concern.	Guidance counselors.
Leadership team will meet weekly to discuss absenteeism.	6th - 8th	Principal	Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselors, Dean, Behavior Coach, Literacy Coach, Technology Coordinator, SRO, Media Specialist	Weekly	Friday Focus notes	Principal

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$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:	The goal is to lower the number of out of school suspensions by five percent.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
In 2011 the total number of in-school suspensions was 107. In 2012 the total number of in-school suspensions was 508.	In 2013 the expected number of in-school suspensions is 507 or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
In 2011 the total number of students suspended in school was 95. In 2012 the total number of students suspended in school was 266.	In 2013 the expected of students suspended in school is 265 or less.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
In 2011 the total number of out-of-school suspensions was 461. In 2012 the total number of out-of-school suspensions was 328.	In 2013 the expected number of out-of-school suspensions is 327 or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
In 2012, the total number of students suspended out of school was 157. In 2011 the total number of students suspended out of school was 214.	In 2013, the expected number of students suspended out of school is 156 or less.

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 will have excessive referrals and will be suspended.	PBS team will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the school-wide behavior plan and implement new strategies when needed.	Dean and Intervention Specialist	Monthly meetings by PBS team to review discipline data	Discipline data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Monthly meetings with the district PBS coach.	All	Behavior coach	PBS team made up of a cross section of teachers	Monthly	Data generated in TERMS	Tom Horne, behavior coach
Leadership team will meet weekly to discuss absenteeism.	6th - 8th	Principal	Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselors, Dean, Behavior Coach, Literacy Coach, Technology Coordinator, SRO, Media	Weekly	Friday Focus notes	Principal

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PBS reward program- JAG Bucks	Prizes for students to redeem tokens for good behavior	Fundraising and donations	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$500.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		The parent involvement goal is to have fifty-two percent of parents in attendance at parent involvement activities.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
Approximately 51% of parents attended parental involvement activities in 2012.		The 2013 expected level of parent involvement is 52%.			
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	Economically disadvantaged students' parents will not have a high rate of attendance at parent involvement activities, due to transportation or	Provide child care and transportation for parents.	IB MYP Coordinator and Guidance Counselors	Attendance rate at parent activities	Attendance data from meetings for parent activities

	child care issues.				
2	Economically disadvantaged students' parents will not have a high rate of attendance at parent involvement activities because they are not comfortable in the traditional school setting.	Provide parental involvement activities that make parents feel comfortable and eager to participate.	IB MYP coordinator	Attendance rate at parent activities	Sign in sheets from meetings

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
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Communication	Student Planners	Title I Parent Involvement Funds	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Family Involvement Activities	Food and Supplies	Title I Parent Involvement Funds	\$1,338.00
			Subtotal: \$1,338.00
			Grand Total: \$4,338.00

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	J.H. Workman needs to improve the number of students

STEM Goal # 1:		scoring at a proficient level on FCAT 2.0 math and 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	Students are not able to apply math and science skills to real world problems.	Pre-engineering academy classes	Principal, District technology director, Steve Harrell	FCAT 2.0, Successful completion of pre-engineering academy classes	FCAT 2.0, report card data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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
New computers to support Pre-engineering software; Laptops	Hardware needed for the Pre-engineering classes	Technology budget and fundraising	\$7,500.00
			Subtotal: \$7,500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$7,500.00

End of 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:		J. H. Workman needs to increase the number of students who pass the industry certification exam offered by 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	Students are not proficient in the content needed to pass the certification test.	Enroll students in IIT and Hospitality Management	District specialist in e-commerce (Michelle Taylor) and Family and Consumer Science (Aisha Adkison).	Number of students who pass the various industry certification tests.	Industry Certifications test.

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
Textbooks for Microsoft Office	Paid with district funds	CTE funding	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Media equipment for E-commerce classes	Paid with district funds	CTE funding	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Training for Culinary Arts teacher	Paid with district funds	CTE funding	\$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

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Materials for Level 1 and 2 readers	Voyagers	District General Revenue	\$0.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Science	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Writing	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Civics	Current Civics base and supplemental materials	Provided by the district	General Revenue Funds	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	PBS reward program-JAG Bucks	Prizes for students to redeem tokens for good behavior	Fundraising and donations	\$500.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Communication	Student Planners	Title I Parent Involvement Funds	\$3,000.00
CTE	Textbooks for Microsoft Office	Paid with district funds	CTE funding	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$3,500.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	Math Software	Accelerated Math	n/a	\$0.00
Mathematics	math website for teachers	shellmath.org	n/a	\$0.00
Science	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Writing	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Civics	Online Civics components	Provided by the district	General Revenue Funds	\$0.00
Civics	End of Course Testing Training IT assistance	Provided by the district	General Revenue Funds	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
STEM	New computers to support Pre-engineering software; Laptops	Hardware needed for the Pre-engineering classes	Technology budget and fundraising	\$7,500.00
CTE	Media equipment for E-commerce classes	Paid with district funds	CTE funding	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$7,500.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Training for 5 teachers and 2 administrators	Literacy Design Collaboration through SREB	District Title II	\$0.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	Training for 3 teachers and 2 administrators	SREB Math Design Collaboration	District Title II Funds	\$0.00
Science	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Writing	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Civics	District-wide Civics EOC training. Technology training	Provided by the district	General Revenue funds Title II funds	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00

CTE	Training for Culinary Arts teacher	Paid with district funds	CTE funding	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Supplemental Reading Materials	Library Books	Regular Operations	\$956.00
Reading	Supplemental Reading Materials	Library Books	Instructional Materials - Library	\$2,044.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	Math Coach	SREB	District Title II Funds	\$0.00
Science	science lab materials	supplies	Science Lab Materials	\$885.00
Writing	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Civics	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	Family Involvement Activities	Food and Supplies	Title I Parent Involvement Funds	\$1,338.00
				Subtotal: \$5,223.00
				Grand Total: \$16,223.00

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.

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/26/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

J. H. Workman Middle School's School Advisory Council meets monthly during the second Thursday of each month. They provide input for the School Improvement Plan and are given a monthly report by the Principal of the events and activities of the school, as well as curriculum updates. They plan to review the present by-laws this year. Members also attend SAC Training at the Hall Center. Minutes and agendas are provided yearly to the Director of Comprehensive Planning for the District.

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

Escambia School District J. H. WORKMAN MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	58%	50%	85%	45%	238	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	61%	57%			118	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?	66% (YES)	64% (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					486	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Escambia School District J. H. WORKMAN MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	57%	49%	89%	40%	235	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	58%	62%			120	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?	59% (YES)	63% (YES)			122	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					477	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested