FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: HOWARD W. BISHOP MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Alachua

Principal: Michael Gamble

SAC Chair: Patricia Yancey

Superintendent: Dr. Dan Boyd

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012

Gerard Robinson, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Michael Gamble	Ed.S in Educational Leadership	3	12	2011 - 2012 Grade B, 2010-11 Grade A, AYP met. 2009-10 Grade B, AYP met. 2008-09 Grade A, AYP met.
Assis Principal	Katherine M. Ball	Ed.S in Educational Leadership. MEd in Special Education	8	10	2011 - 2012 Grade B 2010-11 Grade A, AYP met. 2009-10 Grade A, AYP met. 2008-09 Grade A, AYP met.
Assis Principal	Anyana Stokes	MEd in Educational Leadership	8		2011 - 2012 Grade B 2010-11 Grade A, AYP met. 2009-10 Grade A, AYP met. 2008-09 Grade A, AYP met.

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	Gail Billingsly		1	1	N/A

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	District Mentor Program	Principal/ APC	Ongoing	
2	Grade Level Teams for mutual support	Team Leaders, Principal, Assistant Principals	Ongoing	
3	University of Florida ProTeach Program	District Staff/Principal	Ongoing	
4	District Recruitment Fair	District Personnel and Administrative Staff	Yearly	

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
No data submitted	

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
42	7.1%(3)	7.1%(3)	40.5%(17)	45.2%(19)	64.3%(27)	100.0%(42)	14.3%(6)	4.8%(2)	7.1%(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
			Mentor will conduct observations and provide feedback. Assist with lesson planning and Professional Development

Jeanne Clark	C. Winant N. Lash P. Der	First year teachers	Plans. Mentor will work with mentees on analyzing data and intergrating technology. Mentor will model lessons and instructional activities. Mentor will also assist with developing interventions.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Student Services Team which consists of the Principal, Assistant Principal of Curriculum,Assistant Principal of Administration, Counselors, Deans, School Nurse,and School Resource Officer. In addition the school based team includes a district school psychologist and district behavioral specialist. Team Leaders and Teachers are often members of the RtI team as well.

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?

Student Services Team members and/or Individual Grade Level Teams identify students who are not making adequate progress. Key players directly involved with the students of concern, define the problem, develop an intervention plan, implement the plan, chart progress and use data to evaluate the plan. The APC provides curricular support and the APA provides behavioral support while both assist in training teachers. Both help to develop either behavior(APA)or academic (APC)interventions based on the student's needs, and supported by the data. School counselors provide training and support in the RtI process, work with teachers through the problem solving cycle; and facilitate the communication with the team leaders and /or parent(s). Team leaders and Deans assist with the training and assessment support; reviewing students rate of progress, data collection and student records.

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

The RtI leadership team will share progress data with the steering committee which consists of all team leaders. Steering Committee chaired by the Principal is responsible for implementing, supporting and evaluating the data and ensuring the process is working in conjunction with the goals of the school improvement plan.

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.

For all tiers we will utilize DOE spreadsheets of disaggregated whole group FCAT data, the districts On Track and FAIR assessments,as well as benchmark specific assessments built into the curriculum. Infinite Campus will be use to monitor behavior and attendance data. Additionally, teachers will maintain data notebooks consisting of the students on their grade level teams.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Administration has been trained by the district. The Administration, Instructional Coach, and members of the Student Support Services Team will continue to train staff during monthly faculty and Steering Committee meetings. Team members will also regularly attend grade level team meetings to provide trainings and RtI support.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Weekly steering and Student Support Services Team meetings will support the MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The literacy team consists of all members of the steering committee. This includes administrators, team leaders, and student

services personell.

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

Weekly meetings and discussion of literacy initiatives in conjunction with the language arts/reading department.

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

School wide focus calendar.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Benchmark focus calendar will be implemented school wide. Faculty will be trained in support of the school wide initiative. Teachers will be required to document reading strategies in lesson plans. Administrators will conduct frequent classroom walkthroughs looking for evidence of reading strategies instruction.

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Improve the percentage of students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 19%(114) of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading.	In 2013 25% of students will maintain or rise to proficiency (Level 3) 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	39% of students have not met or exceeded proficiency in reading	Adopt a Literacy Focus Calendar to be implemented school wide	APC	CWT documentation Lesson Plan monitoring	CWT documentation Lesson Plans
2	39% of students have not met or exceeded proficiency in reading	Implement research based instructional literacy and Kagan strategies	Administration	CWT documention Lesson Plan monitoring	CWT documentation Lesson Plan monitoring
3	39% of students have not met or exceeded proficiency in reading	Post the school wide literacy goals in a student relevant language	All Faculty	CWT documentation Lesson Plan Monitoring	CWT documentation Lesson Plan monitoring

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:	Increase % of students scoring at levels 4,5,and 6 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33%(2)of students scored at levels 4, 5, and 6 on 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment	38% of students will maintain or rise to a levels 4, 5, and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may lack experience applying knowledge across settings	Small group, differentiated, supplemental, and revision of instruction	Self Contained Teachers ESE Department Chair	Performance based assessments intergrated in curriculum. Student progress assessed towards	Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plan Documentation

			APC	individual student specific reading goals.	Performance Based Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Increase percentage of students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5) in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 41%(250) of students made a level 4 or higher on the FCAT reading	46% of students will score a level 4 or higher on the FCAT reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Making student gains out of high achieving students who are near or at the top of their scales	Literacy Focus Calendar to be implemented school wide	APC	CWT Lesson Plan Monitoring Higher Order Instructional Strategies.	Lesson Plans, data notebooks and team meeting logs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Increase % of students scoring at or above achievement level 7 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%(4) of students scored at or above achievement level 7 in reading.	70% of students will score at or above a level 7 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	Achieving gains from students who may be near or at the top of their developmental scale	Implement research based instructional strategies. Supplemental, Differentiated, and Revising Instruction	ESE Department Chair APC	Student progress assessed towards individual student's specific reading goals. Adequate progess is determined by comparing student's growth to goal stated on intervention.	Performance based assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65%(379) of students made learning gains on the FCAT reading	70% of students will make learning gains on FCAT reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	35% of students did not make learning gains on the 2012 FCAT.	Literacy Focus Calendar to be implemented school wide Read 180 and Bridges teachers will use FCAT data, fluency and SRI to develop detailed differentiated instruction and interventions for student not making adequate progress Targeted interventions will be planned for student not responding to supplemental instruction	APC	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed using FAIR testing and curriculum intergrated benchmark assessments.	Lesson plans Data notebooks monitoring FAIR and Benchmark specific mini assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	Maintain % of student making learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (5) made learning gains in reading.	100% 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	Students may lack experience transfer knowledge across settings.	Supplemental, Differentiated, and Revised Instruction.	ESE Depatment Chair ESE Teacher APC	Student progress monitoring. Adequate progress determined by comparing student's growth to student's individual goal.	Performace Based Assessments Lesson Plans CWT Data Notebook

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:	Improve percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53%(79) of lowest quartile students made learning gains in reading	60% of lowest quartile 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	41% of students in the lowest quartile failed to make learning gains in reading in 2012.	Read 180 and Bridges teachers will use FCAT data, fluency and SRI to develop detailed differentiated instruction and interventions for students not making adequate progress	Reading Teachers, and Administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed using FAIR testing Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated.	Lesson plans and data notebooks noting On Track and Benchmark specific mini assessments
2	Students in the lowest quartile may have difficulty reading and understanding grade level text due to weak basic reading skills.	Read 180 and Bridges teachers will monitor progress through mini assessment results, revising instruction and intervention small groups.	Reading Teachers, and Administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed using FAIR Testing Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated.	Lesson plans and data notebooks noting On Track and Benchmark specific mini assessment
3	Students in the lowest quartile may have difficulty reading and understanding grade level text due to weak basic reading skills.	Targeted interventions will be planned for student not responding to supplemental instruction	Reading Teachers, and Administration	Student progress is assessed weekly towards individual's specific reading goal. Adequate progress is determined by progress monitoring	Lesson Plans, data notebooks and team meeting logs

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : In six year school will reduce achievement gap by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
		66	69	73	76	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Increase % of students in sub groups (by ethnicity) making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% of Black Students made Satisfactory Progress in reading 72% of Hispanic students made satisfactory progrss in reading 90% of White students made satisfactory progress in reading 100% of Asian students made satisfactory progress in reading	36% of Black Students will make Satisfactory progess 76% of Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress 93% of White students will make satisfactory progress 100% of Asian students will make satisfactory progress

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	69% of Black students failed to make satisfactory progress in reading. 24% of Hispanic students failed to make satisfactory progress in reading.	Read 180 and Bridges teachers will use FCAT data, fluency and SRI to develop detailed differentiated instruction and interventions for students not making adequate progress	Reading Teachers, Reading Coach and Administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed using the District's On Track testing and 20 day interval mini assessments Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated.	Lesson plans and data notebooks noting On Track and Benchmark specific mini assessments
2	69% of Black students failed to make satisfactory progress in reading. 24% of Hispanic students failed to make satisfactory progress in reading.	Targeted interventions will be planned for student not responding to supplemental instruction	Team Leaders, and Administration	Student progress is assessed weekly towards individual's specific reading goal. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student's growth to goal stated on intervention.	Lesson Plans, data notebooks and team meeting logs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	
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:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Increase % of students in subgroup (Students with Disabilities) making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26%(25)of SWD scored a 3 or above on FCAT Reading.	31% of student in subgroup (SWD) will make learning gains on FCAT reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	74% of student in subgroup (SWD)failed to make satisfactory progress in Reading.	Read 180 and Bridges teachers will use FCAT data, fluency and SRI to develop detailed differentiated instruction and interventions for student not making adequate progress	Reading Teachers, Reading Coach and Administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed using FAIR testing and benchmark assessments. Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated.	Lesson plans and data notebooks noting On Track and Benchmark specific mini assessments
2	74% of student in subgroup (SWD)failed to make satisfactory progress in Reading.	Read 180 and Bridges teachers will monitor progress through mini assessment results, revising instruction and intervention small groups	Reading Teachers, Reading Coach	Lesson Plans and teacher made supplemental remediation is reviewed. Percentage of students making adequate progress specific benchmarks is calculated.	Lesson plans and data notebooks
3	74% of student in subgroup (SWD)failed to make satisfactory progress in Reading.	Targeted interventions will be planned for student not responding to supplemental instruction	Team Leaders, Reading Coach and Administration	Student progress is assessed weekly towards individual's specific reading goal. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student's growth to goal stated on intervention	Lesson Plans, data notebooks and team meeting logs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Increase the % of students in subgroup (Economically Disadvantaged) making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36%(116) of students receiving free or reduced lunch scored a 3 or above on FCAT Reading	40% of students in subgroup (Economically disadvantaged) will score a 3 or above on FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	64% of students receiving free or reduced lunch failed to make satisfactory progress in reading.	Read 180 and Bridges teachers will use FCAT data, fluency and SRI to develop detailed differentiated instruction and interventions for student not making adequate progress.	Reading Teachers, and Administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed using the District's On Track testing and 20 day interval mini assessments Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated.	Lesson plans and data notebooks noting On Track and Benchmark specific mini assessments
2	64% of student receiving free or reduced lunch failed to make satisfactory progress in Reading.	Read 180 and Bridges teachers will monitor progress through mini assessment results, revising instruction and intervention in small groups.	Reading Teachers, Reading Coach and Administration	Lesson Plans and teacher made supplemental remediation is reviewed. Percentage of students making adequate progress specific benchmarks is calculated.	Lesson plans and data notebooks Benchmark assessments intergrating into curriculum

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
Inclusion Differentiated Instruction Data Analysis	6- 8	APC District Personell	School wide	Monthly Faculty Meetings Weekly Team Meetings	Continuous Monitoring of Data	Administratiors

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Kagan CRISS Other Literacy Strategies	District Personnel SSST Members	CREATE	$300.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increase intergration of technology in curriculum.	Brightlink Projectors Laptop Carts Computer Labs Smart Boards	District Funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increase knowledge of literacy strategies. Develop consistent techniques to increase student achievement.	District Personnel Trained Staff members	CREATE SAC	$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: $400.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students 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
No Data Submitted				

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

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students 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
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Increase % of students scoring at achievement level 3 in mathmatics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15%(91)of students achieved an FCAT level 3 in mathematics	20% of students will maintain or rise to achieve an FCAT level 3 in mathematics

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	41% of students have not met satisfactory proficiency in mathmatics.	Use of District instrucitonal pacing claendars implementing math, reading/LA and Kagen strategiesto build vocabulary and comprehension for solving problems in math	Math Department Chair Administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed and monitored using the District's On Track testing assessments. Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated.	Lesson Plan, CWT data, Data Notebooks
2	41% of students have not met satisfactory proficiency in mathmatics.	Increase use of manipulatives and computer based learning to teach/reteach math concepts to encourage differentiated instruction and skill mastery	Math Dept. Chair, Tech coordinator, Math Teachers and Administration	Unit/Chapter Tests, Laptop cart utilization, Lesson plans Use of Math programs (ex. VMath)	CWT, Laptop checkout sheet, Data Notebooks

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:	Increase % of students scoring at levels 4,5, and 6 in mathmatics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83%(5)of students performed at levels 4,5, and 6 in mathmatics.	85% of students will maintain or rise to score at levels 4,5,and 6 in mathmatics.

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 lack experience applying knowledge across settings.	Revised, Differentiated, and Supplemental Instruction	ESE Teacher ESE Department Chair APC	Studetnt progress assessed towards individual student specific math goals.	Performance Based Assessments Lesson Plans

					CWT

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:	Increase % of students scoring at or above Level 4 in mathmatics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%(268) of students achieved above proficiency on FCAT scoring at levels 4 and 5	49% of students will achieve above proficiency on FCAT scoring at level 4 or 5

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may have lack of experience with application of math skills.	Increase use of applied math projects aligned with curriculum and listed in the district pacing guide.	Math Teachers Math Dept. Chair Administration	District's On Track testing assessments. Progress Monitoring	Lesson Plans CWT Data Notebooks
2	Students may have lack of experience with application of math skills	Use of national and state based math contest. (Mu Alpha Theta, Math Counts, etc.) to increase application of math skills and enthusiasm for math.	Math Dept. Chair and Administration Math Club Sponsors	Participation and Results of Competition	Data Notebooks Club Attendance Logs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Increase % of students scoring ato or above achievement level 7 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17%(1)scored at or above level 7 in mathematics.	22% of students will score at or above level 7 in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may lack experience applying skills across settings.	Revised, Differentiated, and Supplemental Instruction	ESE Teacher ESE Department Chair APC	Progress Monitoring towards students individual goals.	Performance based assessment Lesson Plans CWT

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:	Increase % of students making learning gains in mathmatics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (383) of students made learning gains in math.	70% of studens will make learning gains in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	35% of students failed to make learning gains in mathmatics.	Use of District instrucitonal pacing calendars implementing math, reading/LA and Kagen strategiesto build vocabulary and comprehension for solving problems in math	Math Dept. Chair and Administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed and monitored using the District's On Track testing assessments. Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated.	Lesson Plan, CWT data, Data Notebooks
2	35% of students failed to make learning gains in mathmatics.	Increase use of manipulatives and computer based learning to teach/reteach math concepts to encourage differentiated instruction and skill mastery	Math Dept. Chair, Tech coordinator, Math Teachers and Administration	Unit/Chapter Tests, Laptop cart utilization, Lesson plans	CWT, Laptop checkout sheet, Data Notebooks

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:	Increase the % of students making learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60%(3) of students made learning gains in mathematics.	65% of students will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may lack experience applying knowledge across settings	Implement research based instructional strategies. Revised, differentiated, and supplemental instruction.	ESE Department Chair APC	Progrss monitoring towards student's individual math goals.	Performance based assessments Data Notebook Lesson Plans CWT

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.	Increase % of students in the lowest 24% making learning

Mathematics Goal #4:	gains in mathmatics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49%(77) of lowest quartile students made learning gains in math.	55% lowest quartile students will make learning gains in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	51% of students in the lowest quartile failed to make learning gains in 2012.	Implementation of district pacing guide and instructional calendar and differentiated instruction	Math teachers and administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed using the District's On Track testing Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated.	Lesson plans and data notebooks noting On Track, chapter/unit tests and FCAT data
2	Students may have a lack of experience applying basic and new math skills.	Small group instruction, tutorials, Co-teach and paraprofessional support.	Math, ESE teachers and administration	Progress monitoring through team meetings with math teachers	Lesson plan, data notebooks, and Team meeting logs
3	Students may have a lack of experience applying basic and new math skills.	Use of VMath Software to provide remediation of previous skills and reinforcement of newly acquired skills.	Math teachers, Team leaders and administration	Progress monitoring continued and team meeting updates	Lesson plans, Student log on information

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : In six years reduce the achievement gap by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
		63	67	71	74	

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:	Increase % of students in subgroups (ethnicity) making satisfactory progress in mathmatics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% of Black students made satisfactory progress in math. 68% of Hispanic students made satisfactory progress in math 91% of White students made satisfactory progress in math 100% of Asian students made satisfactory progress in math	35% of black students will make satisfactory progress. 73% of Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress 93% of White students will make satisfactory progress 100% of Asian students will make satisfactory progress

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	70% of Black students failed to make satisfactory progress in Math. 32% of Hispanic students failed to make satisfactory progress in math.	Implementation of district pacing guide and instructional calendar. Increase differentiated instruction	Math teachers and administration	Progress monitoring through team meetings with math teachers	Lesson plan, data notebooks, and Team meeting logs
2	70% of Black students failed to make satisfactory progress in Math. 32% of Hispanic students failed to make satisfactory progress in math.	Implementation of district pacing guide and instructional calendar and differentiated instruction	Math teachers and administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed using the District's On Track testing Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated.	Lesson plans and data notebooks noting On Track, chapter/unit tests and FCAT data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Increase % of students in subgroup (SWD) who make satisfactory progress in mathmatics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%(28) students in subgroup (SWD) made satisfactory progress mathmatics.	32% of students in subgroup (SWD) will make satisfactory progress 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
	71% of students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progess on	Use of VMath (other software) to provide remediation of previous	Math teachers and administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed using the	Lesson plans and data notebooks noting On Track,

1	2012 FCAT mathmatics.	skills and reinforce newly acquired skills.		District's On Track testing Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated.	chapter/unit tests and FCAT data Student log on information.
2	71% of students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progess on 2012 FCAT mathmatics.	Small group instruciton, tutorials, Co-teach and paraprofessional support.	Math, ESE teachers and administration	Progress monitoring through team meetings with math teachers	Lesson plan, data notebooks, and Team meeting logs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Improve % of students in subgroup (Economically Disadvantaged) making satisfactory progress in mathmatics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33%(108) of students who are economically disadvantaged made satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT math.	38% of student who are economically disadvantaged will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 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	67% of students receiving free or reduced lunch failed to make satisfactory progress on 2012 FCAT math.	Implementation of district pacing guide and instructional calendar. Differentiated instruction	Math teachers and administration	Lesson Plans and students progress is assessed using the District's On Track testing Percentage of students making adequate progress towards benchmark is calculated	Lesson plans and data notebooks noting On Track, chapter/unit tests and FCAT data
2	Students may have weak basic skills and a lack of experience applying skills.	Small group instruciton, tutorials, Co-teach and paraprofessional support. Use of VMath Software	Math teachers and administration	Progress monitoring through team meetings with math teachers	Lesson plan, data notebooks, student log on information and Team meeting 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:	Increase the % of students scoring at ahievement level 3 in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%(34)of students scored an achievement level 3 in Algebra.	49% of students will score at achievement level 3 in Algebra.

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 have issues with the word problem format of the EOC.	Use of higher order questions identified in the district pacing guide. Use of sample test items from the state test item specifications and the Florida Achieves Website	Algebra Teacher Math Department Chair APC	Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	Formative Assessments Lesson Plans

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Increase % of students scoring at or above achievement level 4 in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55%(43)of students scored at or above achievement level 4 in Algebra.	60% of students will score at or above achievement level 4 in Algebra.

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 have lack of experience with application of math skills.	Increased use of applied mathematics projects aligned with curriculum and listed in the district pacing guide.	Algebra Teacher Math Department Chair APC	Progress Monitoring Classroom Walktrhough	On Track Lesson Plans

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 : In six year reduce achievement gap by 50%.			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	Decrease the % of students by subgroup (ethnicity)NOT making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6%(1)of Black students failed to make satisfactory progress in Algebra.	All student subgroups by ethnicity will achieve 0% of

0% of Hispanic, White, and Asian students failed to make satisfactory progress in Algebra.	students NOT making satisfactory progress in Algebra.

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 have lack of experience with application of math skills.	Differentiated Instruction Increase opportunity for reteaching and remediation of basic math skills.	Algebra Teacher Math Department Chair APC	Progress Monitoring On Track Testing	Formative Assessments Lesson Plans CWT

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:	Maintain % of Students with disibilities NOT making satisfactory progess in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of students with disabilities NOT making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	0% of Students with disabilities NOT making satisfactory progress in Algebra.

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 lack experience with application of math skills,	Differentiated Instruction Increased use of applied math projects aligned with curriculum and listed in the district pacing	Algebra Teacher Math Department Chair ESE Teacher APC	Progress Monitoring On Track	On Track Lesson Plans CWT

		guide.			

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:	Maintain % of students NOT making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of economically disadvantaged students did NOT make satisfactory progress in Algebra.	0% of economically disadvantaged students will NOT make satisfactory progress in Algebra.

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 lack experience with application of math skills.	Differentiated Instruction Increase opportunities for remediation and reinforcement of skills.	Algebra Teacher Math Department Chair APC	Progress Monitoring OnTrack	OnTrack Lesson Plans CWT

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
Differentiated Instruction	6 - 8	District Personnel Math Department Chair Trained Staff Members	School wide	Monthly Faculty meetings Monthly depatment meetings. Weekly Team meetings	Lesson Plan documentation CWT	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Kagan Strategies CRISS Strategies	District Personnel	CREATE	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of laptop carts Computer based assessments	Computer labs Laptop carts VMath	District	$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $200.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Inprove % of students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in Science
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

27% (54) of all tested 8th grade students scored a level 3 on FCAT Science.	32% of tested 8th graders will score a 3 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	52% of students tested failed to make satisfactory progress on 2012 FCAT Science.	Use of District instructional pacing calendars to implementScience instructional benchmarks, implement Kagen and Science inquiry strategies.	Science Dept. Chair and Administration	Progress Monitoring with On Track, Lesson Plans and CWT	On Track Results, CWT Data and Lesson Plans
2	52% of students tested failed to make satisfactory progress on 2012 FCAT Science.	Implement a vertical curriculum plan which coincides with the District pacing calendar to include frequent informal tests in order to maintain a longer period of material retention.	Science Dept Chair, Major Program Science Teachers and Administration	Progress Monitoring through On Track Testing, Brain Pop, and Classroom Walkthroughs	On Track Results, Thinklink Results in Data Notebooks and Lesson Plans
3	Students may have difficulty reading and understanding science test items due to test format and student reading levles.	Differentiated and small group instruction.	Science Dept Chair, Major Program Science Teachers and Administration	Progress monitoring through On Track testing and curriculum intergrated benchmark assessments.	Lesson Plan documentation On Track and Benchmark testing results.

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:	Increase % of students scoring levels 4,5,and 6 in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50%(1) of students scored at levels 4,5,and 6 in Science.	55% of students will score levels 4,5, and 6 in Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may lack experience with scientific processess.	Small group instruction Supplemental Instruction	ESE Department Chair APC	Student progress towards individual science specific goals Brain Pop	Performance based assessments Lesson Plans CWT Data Notebook

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:	Increase % of students achieving above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) in Science.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21%(41) of 8th grade students made a level 4 or 5 on FCAT science.	26% of students will score a level 4 or 5 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 may have lack of experience applying the scientific process.	Use instructional stategies such as Kagen and CRISS to increase student engagement. Complete Science Fair or equally rigorous inquiry projects to increase student understanding of the scientific process.	Science Dept. Chair and Administration	Progress Monitoring with On Track Assessment Data, Lesson Plans, Brain Pop and Classroom Walk Throughs.	On Track Results, CWT Data and Lesson Plan Documentation

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	Increase % of students scoring at or above achievement level 7 in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50%(1) of students scored at or above achievement level 7 in Science.	55% of students will sore at or above achievement level 7 in Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may lack experience with scientific processess.	Small Group instruction Supplemental Instruction Implement Research Based Instructional Strategies	ESE Department Chair APC	Performance Based Assessments Brain Pop Progress towards student's individual science specific goals.	Lesson Plans CWT Data Notebook

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
Inclusion Differentiated Instruction	8th grade Science	District Personnel Science Department Chair	Science Teachers	Monthly Department Meetings	Lesson Plan Documentation	Science Department Chair APC

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increase integration of technology in curriculum.	BrightLink Projectors Smart Boards Laptop Carts Computer Labs	District Funds	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Kagen Training Inclusion Training Differentiated Instruction Training	District Personnel School based trained staff	CREATE	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Increase % of students scoring a level 3 or higher on FCAT Writes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78%(156) of tested 8th graders scored a 3.0 or above on the FCAT Writes.	83% of students tested will score a 3.0 or above on the FCAT Writes.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	22% of students tested failed to score a 3.0 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Writes.	Writing process, strategies and techniques employed in all content area classes	Administrators All Teachers	Lesson Plans, Team Meeting Logs and CWT	Lesson Plan and CWT
2	22% of students tested failed to score a 3.0 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Writes.	Revisions and Editing Process explicitly taught based on results of the quarterly formative assessments Principal's Writing Contest.	Language Arts Depatment Chair, Language Arts Teachers	Lesson Plans, CWT Quarterly Score Sheets Portfolio Assessment	Lesson Plans and CWT

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:	Maintain % of students scoring level 4 or higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2) of students scored level 4 or higher in writing.	100% of students will score level 4 or higher in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may lack experience applying writing process	Small group instruction Writing process, strategies, and techniques used in all content areas.	ESE Teacher ESE Department Chair APC	Lesson Plans Student progress towards individual writing specific goals.	Data Notebook CWT Writing Assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction Inclusion	6 - 8 All Subjects	District Trainer School Based Trained Staff	School Wide	Monthly Faculty Meetings Monthly Department Meetings	Lesson Plans CWT	Language Arts Department Chair Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Kagen CRISS	District Personnel	CREATE	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increase integration of technology in curriculum.	Brightlink Laptop Carts Smart Boards Computer Labs	District Funds	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Increase overall attendance Rate Decrease number of students with excessive absences and tardies.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The overall attendance rate for 2012 was 93.75%	Increase the overall attendance rate to 97%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
162	81
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
176	88

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of motivation, Little or no parental supervision, homelessness.	Improved communication between parents,teachers, and students Improved communication between teachers and SSST/Guidance Dept.	Guidance Department School truancy officer Attendance Clerk	School truancy officer Reports Data Checks Monthly Attendance Report Review	Progress monitoring Data Review

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Student Movivation	6 - 8	Guidance Administrators SSST Members	School Wide	Monthly Faculty Meetings Weekly Steering Meetings	Progress Monitoring	Guidance Counselors APA

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Decrease the total number of suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
200 students were assigned to 834 days of in school detention.	Reduce the number of in school detention days by 10%.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
200 students were assigned to in school detention	Reduce the number of students assigned to in school detention by 10%.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
158 students were assigned to 1128 days of out of school suspension.	Reduce the number of Out of school suspension days by 15%.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
158 students were assigned to out of school suspension	Reduce the number of students assigned to out of school suspension by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Continued influx of students who lack tools to make appropriate	Continued training on PBS and RtI plan. Progress monitoring of	Deans PBS Leader Grade level teams	Monthly PBS team meetings to discuss behavior data	Infinie Campus Discipline Data

1	decisions Teacher/Staff support of the PBS Process	data monthly with the PBS and SSS teams.	Administration	SSS Team Monthly Data Reviews	Continued commitment to the PBS program

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
PBS	6 - 8	Student Support Services Team PBS Team District Personnel	School wide	Monthly	Data Review	Deans APA

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PBS PBS Reward System	District Personnel District Behavior Specialist School Based PBS Coach	Internal SAC PTA	$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Train faculty and staff on PBS	PBS school based coach SSS Team Members	CREATE Internal	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $200.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement	

Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Increase % of parents participating in parent literacy activities.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
No data available	30% of parents will participate in at least one parent literacy activity.

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	Improved communication between parents, teachers, and students	Encourage students to participate in 21st CCLC programming.	Administrative Team, Student Support Services Team,	Parent attendance	Parent sign in logs

---

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Student motivation Parents as Partners Parent/Teacher Communication	6 - 8	Administration SSST	School wide	Monthly	Parent Survey	APA

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Incentives	Business Partners	Business Partners SAC PTA	$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $200.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Kagan CRISS Other Literacy Strategies	District Personnel SSST Members	CREATE	$300.00
Mathematics	Kagan Strategies CRISS Strategies	District Personnel	CREATE	$0.00
Writing	Kagen CRISS	District Personnel	CREATE	$0.00
Suspension	PBS PBS Reward System	District Personnel District Behavior Specialist School Based PBS Coach	Internal SAC PTA	$200.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Incentives	Business Partners	Business Partners SAC PTA	$200.00
				Subtotal: $700.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Increase intergration of technology in curriculum.	Brightlink Projectors Laptop Carts Computer Labs Smart Boards	District Funds	$100.00
Mathematics	Use of laptop carts Computer based assessments	Computer labs Laptop carts VMath	District	$200.00
Science	Increase integration of technology in curriculum.	BrightLink Projectors Smart Boards Laptop Carts Computer Labs	District Funds	$0.00
Writing	Increase integration of technology in curriculum.	Brightlink Laptop Carts Smart Boards Computer Labs	District Funds	$0.00
				Subtotal: $300.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Increase knowledge of literacy strategies. Develop consistent techniques to increase student achievement.	District Personnel Trained Staff members	CREATE SAC	$0.00
Science	Kagen Training Inclusion Training Differentiated Instruction Training	District Personnel School based trained staff	CREATE	$0.00
Suspension	Train faculty and staff on PBS	PBS school based coach SSS Team Members	CREATE Internal	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $1,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/17/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

☑ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC funds are used to support the school's learning goals and initiatives. Funds are used for staff development, teacher project requests, climate surveys,parent involvement incentives,Positive Behavior support rewards,and student recognition.	$2,000.00

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

The School Advisory Committee holds meetings six times per year in which the committee reviews and oversees the school based initiatives and test data. The committee provides funding for Positive Behavior Support training, activities, and rewards. The School Advisory Committee conducts a yearly climate survey of parents, students, and staff.

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

Alachua School District HOWARD W. BISHOP MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	67%	89%	65%	293	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	64%	65%			129	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?	58% (YES)	58% (YES)			116	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					538	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Alachua School District HOWARD W. BISHOP MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	68%	68%	90%	49%	275	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	63%	69%			132	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?	63% (YES)	64% (YES)			127	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					534	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested