

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: TWIN LAKES ACADEMY MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Jennifer Bridwell

SAC Chair: Sheena Simmons

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 11/14/2012

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	Jennifer B. Bridwell	Bachelor in English Education, Masters in Educational Leadership K-12,		8	Sixteen total years of experience in education with eight years of teaching experience in middle school. Eight total years of experience as an administrator. In the three years at Fort Caroline Middle School the school improved on the state accountability scale. 2011-2012 the school gained 14 points but dropped to a D. 2010-2011 the school maintained a school grade of a C but increased AYP to move from a correct II to a correct I. 2009-2010 the school moved 24 points on the state accountability and maintaining the schools grade of a C.
Assis Principal	Hyacinth Bohlinger	Bachelor of Elementary Education, Masters in Education Administration	10	14	Twenty four years of experience as an educator, spent working primarily in the areas of reading and language arts at the middle school level. Fourteen years of experience as an assistant principal for a middle school. Ten years of experience as an assistant principal at Twin Lakes. During this time, TLAM was an A school for a total of seven years and a B school for two years from 2003 to 2005.

Assis Principal	Nichelle Smith	Bachelor of Science in Varying Exceptionalities and Specific Learning Disabilities, Masters in Educational Leadership	4	4	Eleven years of experience as an educator. Ten years were spent teaching in exceptional education programs. Four years of experience as an assistant principal for student services. She was promoted to her current position at Twin Lakes in September 2008. During her Four years of service at Twin Lakes the school grade has remained an A.
Assis Principal	Teresa Garrett	Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education 1-6 Masters in Educational Leadership Masters in Guidance and Counseling K-12	2	2	Eleven years of experience as an educator. 5 years were spent as a 3rd grade teacher and 4 years were spent as an elementary and middle school Guidance Counselor. This is Ms. Garrett's Third year as an administrator at Twin Lakes and the school has continued in A status during this time.
Assis Principal	Tishun Gilbert	Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education, Masters in Educational Leadership		4	Seven total years of experience as an educator. 2 years spent as an elementary school teacher and the last 4 years an assistant principal. The past 3 years she served as an administrator at Fort Caroline Middle School. In the three years at Fort Caroline Middle School the school improved on the state accountability scale. 2011-2012 the school gained 14 points but dropped to a D. 2010-2011 the school maintained a school grade of a C but increased AYP to move from a correct II to a correct I. 2009-2010 the school moved 24 points on the state accountability and maintaining the schools grade of a C.

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.

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)
No data submitted				

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	Focus on the development of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) through meetings and training sessions within Early Release Days and Professional Learning Community Meetings.	Administrative Team, PDF, Department Heads	June 2013	
2	Conduct professional development training based on faculty surveys. Topics include: Oncourse, Excel, Limelight, CHAMPS and RtI	PDF & Department Heads	June 2013	
3	New teachers attend an orientation at the school prior to pre-planning. The session includes sharing school and district policies, classroom rituals and routines and providing textbooks	PDF & Administration	August 2012	
4	Provide training to teachers on use of Learning Schedule Assessments. Training will be provided during early release time. Training will focus on the use of assessments to modify instruction and provide remediation	Administrative Team, PDF, Department Heads	June 2013	
5	Team Meetings will be held quarterly to discuss concerns and challenges. Teams will work with administration to problem solve and create strategies for teacher and student success.	Administrative Team, Guidance Counselors	June 2013	

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
10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will participate in E.S.O.L training 2. Teachers will participate in Gifted Certification training 3. Teachers will participate in the P.L.C process to learn best teaching practices 4. Teachers will participate in professional development activities directed to areas that are in need of improvement.

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
75	6.7%(5)	25.3%(19)	52.0%(39)	16.0%(12)	33.3%(25)	76.0%(57)	8.0%(6)	0.0%(0)	24.0%(18)

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
Jennifer Flanagan	Jackie Villaronga	Second year with mentor, carry over from year one	Ongoing meetings with mentor Attend monthly MINT meeting Support workshops with cadre
Gabrielle Fudge	Joy Griffin	Share common subject certification	Ongoing meetings with mentor Attend monthly MINT meeting Support workshops with cadre
Tracy Ambuehl	Natalie Edirmanasinghe	Share common subject certification	Ongoing meetings with mentor Attend monthly MINT meeting Support workshops with cadre
Deborah Fowler	Elizabeth Vitkov	Share common subject certification	Ongoing meetings with mentor Attend monthly MINT meeting Support workshops with cadre
Glen Stroman	Jhan Shaaber	Share common subject area	Ongoing meetings with mentor Attend monthly MINT meeting Support workshops with cadre
			Ongoing meetings with

Cheryl Bond	Rachel Hineman	Share common subject area	mentor Attend monthly MINT meeting Support workshops with cadre
Alana Anderson	Anna Behinfar	Share common subject area	Ongoing meetings with mentor Attend montly MINT meeting Support workshope with cadre

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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Mrs. Bridwell, Ms. Ambuehl, Ms. Crumbly, Ms. Bryan, Ms. Gilbert, Ms. Garrett, Ms. Smith, and Ms. Bohlinger

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 leadership team meets Quarterly with individual teams to review universal screening data and link instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on this information the team will identify professional development and resources needed to support students and teachers. The team will collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team is responsible for building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation of the problem solving team. Ms. Bridwell holds quarterly team meetings to implement problem solving for Tier 1-3 with support from grade level leadership and identified teachers for each team. Team meetings are on a three week rotation to facilitate time for inventions to be implemented and reviewed. Instructional teams (such as professional learning communities, small learning communities, grade level teams and/or content area teams) continue to work with smaller groups of students. The academic and behavioral work begins with Tier 1 (core), continues with Tier 2 (supplemental instruction/intervention):

- Identifying and analyzing patterns of student need
- Identifying appropriate evidence-based differentiation and intervention strategies
- Implementing and overseeing progress monitoring
- Analyzing progress monitoring data to determine next steps.

Tier 3 interventions will be modeled after the Target team structure and will be used collaboratively with the instructional teams (PLC, grade level team, and/or content area teams) to provide classroom support to students.

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 Department Chairs and Administrative team lead the faculty in a review of data and develops the initial draft of the School Improvement Plan utilizing the template provided. The draft SIP is shared with the School Advisory Council for input. The SIP is then finalized and used as a guiding document for our school.

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: Inform, Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), District Benchmark Assessments as appropriate, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Behavior is monitored by individual teachers; IEPs are consulted for strategies and initial interventions where appropriate to establish baseline information.

Midyear: FAIR, District Benchmark and Formative Assessments as appropriate, SRI. Behavior issues are brought to the team level after several interventions have been utilized without success. Further interventions may be sought via the RtI Team if it becomes apparent that the student may fall within our Tier III.

End of year: FAIR, FCAT, SRI

Ongoing Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FAIR (ongoing formative assessments), District Writing Assessments, Write Score and Benchmark Testing.

Frequency of data review: PLCs meet twice a month for data analysis and progress monitoring. In addition, our school's Data Team reviews school-wide data after each major assessment to monitor progress.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All teachers will attend refresher training, in a small group setting, during September. Small group trainings will focus on various topics under the realm of behavioral and academic expectations.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Jennifer Bridwell, Alana Anderson, Crystal Johnson, Jessica Cason, Linda Pafford, Kim Lisenby and Shannon Parish

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets each nine weeks or as needed to generate strategies to improve literacy across the school. The reading department, which is the core of the LLT meets every week to address issues within the intensive reading program and generate intervention strategies throughout the school.

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

To effectively utilize FAIR data, SRI data and Benchmark data to create an effective, individualized intervention program that increases the number of students identified as proficient by the 2012-2013 FCAT and to support the District reading initiative (Read It Forward Jax)

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.

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Our former Standards Coach is maintaining responsibility for the PMRN database. She has given all reading teachers access to the reports and all Social Studies teachers have classes created as resource teachers. They are to print these reports and share them with their team. In addition, the coach generated a spreadsheet for all rising 6th-8th grade students who were tested in FAIR that identifies the reading strategies and activities that correlate with their FAIR scores. This data has been placed on the school share drive. Ongoing training is taking place on how to incorporate these differentiated reading strategies into core instructional programs as evidenced in lesson plans and 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?

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	64% of students will score an FCAT level 3 or higher in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%: 879/1490	64%: 889/1390

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 who are currently low level 3's may drop down to the level 2 area. In addition high level 2 students will need support to increase their proficiency	1.1. Use of various student engagement strategies such as Compass Odyssey, Small group instruction, and other adopted curriculum resources Develop and implement common assignments and assessments	1.1. Teachers Department Chairs Administration assigned to ELA and Reading	1.1. Students' progress based on FAIR and Informal Assessments Monitoring student progress through the PLC Process	District Benchmark Exam Ongoing Teachers' Assessment
2	Limited time for student instruction	Increased implementation of technology in the classroom to engage students in learning	Administration	Teacher informal assessments Learning Schedule Assesments	District Benchmarks State Standardized Exams
3	Limited time in the classroom to promote reading activities	Reading strategies implemented into all core area subject lesson plans	PLC administrators and teachers	Students' ability to read and utilize fiction and nonfictionn text.	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0
4	Limited time in the classroom to promoted reading activities	Scheduled library visits incorporated into district curriculum	Language Arts teachers	Increase in books recorded in student reading log	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	35% of students will score an FCAT level 4 or 5 in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% : 402/1,490	35%: 486/1,390

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 who are currently low level 4's or 5's may drop down one level	Students will receive enrichment and extension activities to challenge their learning through differentiated instruction	Teachers Department Chairs Administration assigned to ELA and Reading	Evidence during Classroom Walkthroughs Peer Observations Monitoring student progress through the PLC Process	District Benchmark Exam Pearson Assessments Ongoing Teachers' Assessments
2	Limited time in class to implement enrichment activities beyond the district curriculum	Use of higher order critical thinking questions as part of every day instruction	PLC administrators and Teachers	Learning scedule assessments Student portfolios	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0
3	Limited time in class to implement enrichment activities beyond the district curriculum	Implementation of enrichment activities during after school team up	Team up Lead Teacher	Student participation in team up enrichment	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0 State EOC exams

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	70% of students will make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63%: 938/1,490	70%: 973/1,390

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 who previously score a 4 or a 5 on the mathematics FCAT have trouble maintaining or making true learning gains	Students scoring level 4's and 5's are placed in advanced coursework taught by certified teachers. This allows for vertical articulation to share strategies. Teachers can share the effective strategies that work for them with the other teachers who have these higher level students.	General education teachers teaching gifted and high advanced classes. Math department chairs. Administrator in charge of math department	Teacher collaboration. Peer observations. Analysis of student data. Working as a professional learning community.	Baseline and Post-Test data Compass Odyssey data Benchmark data FCAT 2.0
2	Limited time in class	Use of Compass Odyssey for remediation in reading and math. This resource is available from school and home.	Administrators and Teachers	Compass Odyssey reports	Pearson Assessments District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0
3	Limited time in class	Implementation of the "Read it Forward" reading strategies as a part of regular instruction in all four common core subject areas.	Administrators and Teachers	Administrative monitoring of teacher lesson plans and instruction	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	70% of students in lowest 25% will make gains in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%: (220)	70%(261)

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	Some students in the lowest 25% are reading far below grade level	Early interventions based on initial data and ongoing teacher assessments Continued implementation of Read180, implementation of the EDGE curriculum, centers and small group instruction targeting lower level students	Administrators, Teachers Department Chairs	Monitor test scores in Compass Odyssey Peer Observations Monitoring student progress through the PLC Process	District Benchmark Exam Pearson Assessment Ongoing Teachers' Assessment, FAIR
2	Limited time in class for remediation	Use of Compass Odyssey FCAT strand for remediation in class and at home	Administrators Teachers Parents	Teacher informal assessments Knowledge Tickets	District Benchmarks Learning Schedule Assessments FCAT 2.0
3	Limited time in class to remediate students reading below grade level	Implementation of district reading strategies in all core class instruction.	Administrators and teachers	Administrator monitoring of lesson plans and instruction	District Benchmark Exams FCAT 2.0
4	Limited time in class to remediate students reading below grade level	Scheduled library and reading time as part of the language arts lesson plans	Administrators and teachers	Increase in students' entries in their reading logs Participation in Twin Lakes Academy "What are you reading" program	District Benchmark Exams FCAT 2.0

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	Reading Goal #
---	----------------

school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		5A :				
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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	There will be a 10% decrease in the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 36% (130) Black: 35% (126) Hispanic: 18% (65) Asian: 1% (23)	White: 26% (92) Black: 25% (88) Hispanic: 8% (28) Asian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited teaching time	Early intervention based on initial data and ongoing teacher assessments requiring reteaching of unmastered standards	Administrators, Teachers, Department Chairs	Monitor test scores in Compass Odyssey Teacher Assessment	District Benchmark Exam Pearson Assessment Ongoing Teachers' Assessment Compass Odyssey
2	Limited teaching time	Implementation of district reading strategies into every core area class.	Administrators and Teachers	Monitoring of teacher lesson plans and teacher instruction	District Benchmark Exam Pearson Assessments FCAT 2.0

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	There will be a 5% decrease in the number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10% (38)	9% (36)

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 fluency in English	Immersion in the English language	Administrators and teachers	Student performance on District and Teacher assessments	Benchmarks Common Assessments Learning Schedule

					Assessments
2	Limited English	Assign an ESOL paraprofessional to specific classes for additional support	Administration	FCAT and Cella Scores	District Benchmark Exam Pearson Assessments Ongoing Teachers' Assessment

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	There will be a 10% decrease in the number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (89)	44% (73)

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	Limited teaching time	Student participation in one of the following programs: Read 180, EDGE, Intensive Math Courses and Compass Odyssey	Teachers	Monitor reports quarterly	District Benchmark Exam Pearson Ongoing Teachers' Assessment
2	Allotted time for students to write and conference in the classroom	1 Utilize Common Assignments Provide small group instruction to reinforce strategies for the reading and the writing process	ELA teachers and Dept. chair	ELA department meetings and PLC groups	Common Assignments Student portfolios
3	Time in the classroom to allow for extended instruction for students with disabilities	Collaboration between core area teachers to address gaps in learning. Math and Science teachers and Social Studies working with Language Arts teachers.	Administrators and Teachers	Team Meetings, Common Planning, Shared lesson strategies	District Benchmarks Learning Schedule Assessments 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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	There will be a 10% decrease in the number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (342)	46% (262)

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	Limited teaching time	Student participation in one of the following programs: Read 180, EDGE, Agile Minds, and Compass Odyssey	Teachers	Monitor reports quarterly	District Benchmark Exam Pearson Assessments Ongoing Teachers' Assessment
2	Limited time to implement interventions with struggling students.	Utilize Common Assignments Maintain student portfolios in Language Arts and Math	Administrators, Language Arts, and Math PLC's	District coaches, focus walks, and snapshots Learning schedule assessments	District Benchmarks FCAT
3	Limited time to implement interventions with struggling students.	Encourage families and students to enroll in the team up after school program for additional reading support	Administrators, guidance counselors, and team up lead teacher	Percentage of students on free and reduced lunch that register for team up	Team up enrollment District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0

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
Use of FAIR data for content area teachers	6-8	Crystal Johnson	All content area teachers	August 2012	PLC collaboration and follow up	PLC Administrators
Reading Strategy implementation for Content area teachers	6-8	Principal	All content area teachers	October 2012	PLC administrator monitoring of lesson plans and instruction	PLC Administrators
Technology for the classroom: Student response systems, student engagement strategies	6-8	School Technology Action Team	All content area teachers	Ongoing	PLC administrator will monitor use of technology and assist as needed	PLC Administrators

Reading 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 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:			45% will be proficient in listening and speaking		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
38% (16)					
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	Limited English proficiency	Full inclusion with english speaking students	Assistant Principal of curriculum	Teacher Assessment	Cella Score FCAT 2.0
2	Limited English proficiency	participation in intensive reading curriculum	Assistant Principal of curriculum	Teacher Assessments	Cella Score FCAT 2.0

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:			25% will be proficient in reading		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
8% (4)					
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
	Limited English	Enrollment and	Administration	Teacher informal	District

1	proficiency	participation in intensive reading classes	and teachers	assessments	Benchmarks FCAT
2	Limited English proficiency	Implementation of Reading/ESOL strategies by all content area teachers	Administrators and teachers	Teacher informal assessments	District Benchmarks FCAT

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

10% will score a level 4 or higher on the FCAT writes.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

0% scored proficient in writing in 2012.

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	Limited English proficiency	Common writing plan	PLC administrators and Language Arts teachers	Teacher informal assessments District Time Writings	FCAT Writes 2.0

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

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:	62% of students will score a level 3 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%: 864/1,490	62%: 861/1,390

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 who are currently low level 3's may drop down to the level 2 area.	Teachers will identify student strengths and weakness and use the following instructional strategies. (small group instruction, Compass Odyssey, other online tutorials, etc.) to remediate and build on the student's weak strand.	Teachers, Dept. Chairs, Administrator	Knowledge Tickets Classroom observations by peers, department chairs, and/or administrators. PLC discussions amongst members	Baseline and Post-Test data Compass Odyssey data Benchmark data FCAT data
2	Students who are currently in the level 1 and low level 2 areas may have a hard time increasing their scores all the way to a level 3.	Students will be placed in an intensive math class. The 6th grade students will be using the Agile Mind curriculum provided by the district. The 7th and 8th grade students will be pre-taught each of the skills that will be learned in the core math classes. The 7th and 8th grade core math teachers will need to communicate with the IM teachers and work cohesively on improving student scores.	Teachers, Dept. Chairs, Administrator	Knowledge tickets given in both the core and intensive math classes. Classroom observations by peers, department chairs, and/or administrators. PLC discussions amongst members	Baseline and Post-Test data Compass Odyssey data Benchmark data FCAT data
3	Limited time for student instruction	Increased implementation of technology in the classroom to engage students in learning	Administration	Teacher informal assessments Learning Schedule Assessments	District Benchmarks State Standardized Exams

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	35% of students will score a level 4 or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23%: 342/1,490	35%: 486/1,390

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 who score a level 4 or 5 might be in an accelerated class where the standards tested on the FCAT do not match up with the standards for the course	Teachers will use warm-up time and/or Compass Odyssey to ensure that the standards on the test are being taught and reviewed.	Teachers, Dept. Chairs, Administrator	Classroom observations by peers, department chairs, and/or administrators. PLC discussions amongst members	Compass Odyssey data Benchmark data FCAT 2.0
2	Limited time in class to implement enrichment activities beyond the district curriculum	Use of higher order critical thinking questions as part of every day instruction	PLC administrators and Teachers	Learning schedule assessments Student portfolios	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0
3	Limited time in class to implement enrichment activities beyond the district curriculum	Implementation of enrichment activities during after school team up	Team up Lead Teacher	Student participation in team up enrichment	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0 State EOC exams

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	70% of students will make gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%: 983/1,490	70%: 973/1,390

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 ESE and ESOL students at times have developmental and language barriers which make attaining learning gains more difficult	ESE – The support facilitation ESE students have been placed on one team per grade level so that an ESE co-teacher can aid with the curriculum delivery and monitor progress. ESOL – The ESOL students have been placed on one team per grade level so that there is a more concentrated group of teachers working with these students. This way, the 6th, 7th, and 8th grade math teachers (3 total) teaching these students can share strategies.	The general education teachers who have ESE or ESOL students. The ESE teachers specializing in math. Math department chairs. Administrator in charge of math department.	Teacher collaboration. Peer observations. Analysis of student data. Working as a professional learning community.	Baseline and Post-Test data Compass Odyssey data Benchmark data FCAT 2.0
2	Students who previously score a 4 or a 5 on the mathematics FCAT have trouble maintaining or making true learning gains	Students scoring level 4's and 5's are placed in advanced coursework taught by certified teachers. This allows for vertical articulation to share strategies. Teachers can share the effective strategies that work for them with the other teachers who have these higher level students.	General education teachers teaching gifted and high advanced classes. Math department chairs. Administrator in charge of math department	Teacher collaboration. Peer observations. Analysis of student data. Working as a professional learning community.	Baseline and Post-Test data Compass Odyssey data Benchmark data FCAT 2.0
3	Limited time in class	Use of Compass Odyssey for remediation in reading and math. This resource is available from school and home.	Administrators and Teachers	Compass Odyssey reports	Pearson Assessments District Benchmarks

					FCAT 2.0
4	Limited time in class.	Differentiated instruction based on Learning schedule assessments.	PLC administrators and teachers	Student performance on post assessments Teacher informal assessments	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	64% in the bottom quartile will make gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (1,005)	64% (1,029)

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	Limited time in class for remediation	All students in the lowest 25% have scored a level 1 or 2. All level 1 students and most of the level 2 are taking intensive math this year for extra support. The math department this year is also working vertically across the grade levels focusing on high scoring students, ESOL students, ESE students, and	Math teachers. Math department chairs. Administrator in charge of math department	Teacher collaboration. Peer observations. Analysis of student data. Working as a professional learning community.	Baseline and Post-Test data Compass Odyssey data Benchmark data FCAT data

		economically disadvantaged students. Small teams will test out strategies and share out the effective ones with the entire department.			
2	Limited time in class for remediation	Use of Compass Odyssey FCAT strand for remediation in class and at home	Administrators Teachers Parents	Teacher informal assessments Knowledge Tickets	District Benchmarks Learning Schedule Assessments FCAT 2.0

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 : <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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	There will be a 10% decrease in the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 32% (124) Black: 37% (143) Hispanic: 19% (74) Asian: 12% (47)	White: 22% (82) Black: 27% (101) Hispanic: 9% (33) Asian: 2% (7)

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	Limited teaching time	Early intervention based on initial data and ongoing teacher assessments requiring reteaching of unmastered standards	Administrators, Teachers, Department Chairs	Monitor test scores in Compass Odyssey Teacher Assessment	District Benchmark Exam Pearson Assessment Ongoing Teachers' Assessment Compass Odyssey
2	Students' lack of interest with the math content because students may not see the relevance to them.	Teachers can use current cultural entertainers, musicians, athletes, etc. when creating lessons. This will result in more student buy-in since they will be able to relate more to what is being taught.	Math teachers. Math department chairs. Administrator in charge of math department	Teacher collaboration. Peer observations. Analysis of student data. Working as a professional learning community.	Baseline and Post-Test data Compass Odyssey data Benchmark data 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:	There will be a 10% decrease in the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35/71 49%	27/71 39%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of fluency in English	Immersion in the English language	Administrators and teachers	Student performance on District and Teacher assessments	Benchmarks Common Assessments Learning Schedule Assessments
2	Because of the language barrier, many ELL learners score below a level 3.	The ELL students have been placed on one team per grade level so that there is a more concentrated group of teachers working with these students. This way, the 6th, 7th, and 8th grade math teachers (3 total) teaching these students can share strategies.	The general education teachers who teach ESOL students. Math department chairs. Administrator in charge of math department	Teacher collaboration. Peer observations. Analysis of student data. Working as a professional learning community	Baseline and Post-Test data Compass Odyssey data Benchmark data 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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	There will be a 10% decrease in the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% (87/165)	43% (71/165)

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	Limited teaching time	Student participation in one of the following programs: Read 180, EDGE, Intensive Math Courses and Compass Odyssey	Teachers	Monitor reports quarterly	District Benchmark Exam Pearson Ongoing Teachers' Assessment
	Time in the classroom to allow for extended instruction for students with disabilities.	The support facilitation ESE students have been placed on one team per grade level so that an ESE co-teacher can aid with the curriculum	General Education and ESE math teachers. Math department chairs.	Teacher collaboration. Peer observations. Analysis of student data.	Baseline and Post-Test data Compass Odyssey data

2		delivery and monitor progress. The inclusion gen. ed. math teachers in each grade collaborates with each other about effective strategies	Administrator in charge of the math department	Working as a professional learning community.	Benchmark data FCAT data
3	Time in the classroom to allow for extended instruction for students with disabilities	Collaboration between core area teachers to address gaps in learning. Math and Science teachers and Social Studies working with Language Arts teachers.	Administrators and Teachers	Team Meetings, Common Planning, Shared lesson strategies	District Benchmarks Learning Schedule Assessments 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 subgroup:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	There will be a 10% decrease in the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (372)	51% (311)

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	Limited teaching time	Student participation in one of the following programs: Read 180, EDGE, Agile Minds, and Compass Odyssey	Teachers	Monitor reports quarterly	District Benchmark Exam Pearson Assessments Ongoing Teachers' Assessment
2	Limited time to implement interventions with struggling students.	Utilize Common Assignments Maintain student portfolios in Language Arts and Math	Administrators, Language Arts, and Math PLC's	District coaches, focus walks, and snapshots Learning schedule assessments	District Benchmarks FCAT

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:	75% of the students taking the Algebra 1 EOC will score a level 3 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

66% (195)			75% (222)		
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	Limited time for student instruction	Increased implementation of technology in the classroom to engage students in learning	Administration	Teacher informal assessments Learning Schedule Assesements	District Benchmarks State Standardized Exams
2	Limited Teaching time	Implementation of Agile Mind curriculum for those students with partial standards proficiency in math	Administration	Program Assessments	Program Assessments Algebra EOC
3	Limited Teaching time	Use of learning schedule assessments to measure student learning	PLC administrator and teachers	Baseline assessments Post assessments	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:	Increase by 2% the percentage of students scoring a level 4 or higher on the Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (38)	15% (44)

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 who score a level 4 or 5 might be in an accelerated class where the standards tested on the FCAT do not match up with the standards for the course	Teachers will use warm-up time and/or Compass Odyssey to ensure that the standards on the test are being taught and reviewed.	Teachers, Dept. Chairs, Administrator	Classroom observations by peers, department chairs, and/or administrators. PLC discussions amongst members	Compass Odyssey data Benchmark data FCAT 2.0
2	Limited time in class to implement enrichment activities beyond the district curriculum	Use of higher order critical thinking questions as part of every day instruction	PLC administrators and Teachers	Learning scedule assessments Student portfolios	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0
3	Limited time in class to implement enrichment activities beyond the district curriculum	Implementation of enrichment activities during after school team up	Team up Lead Teacher	Student participation in team up enrichment	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0 State EOC exams

* 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:	95% of students passing the Geometry State EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89% (43)	95% (45)

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	Limited time for student instruction	Increased implementation of technology in the classroom to engage students in learning	Administration	Teacher informal assessments Learning Schedule Assesments	District Benchmarks State Standardized Exams
2	Limited time in class for remedial instruction	Common Baseline and Post assessments given by teachers to monitor student progress and learning.	Administrator and teachers	Teacher Common Assesments	Geometry 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 Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	95% scoring a level 4 or higher on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89% (43)	95% (45)

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	Limited time in class to implement enrichment activities beyond the district curriculum	Implementation of enrichment activities during after school team up	Team up Lead Teacher	Student participation in team up enrichment	District Benchmarks FCAT 2.0 State EOC exams
2	Limited time for remediation during class instruction	Implementation of common teacher baseline and post assessments	Administrators and teachers	Baseline Knowledge tickets/exit slips Post assessments	State EOC exam

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
Technology for the classroom: Student response systems, student engagement strategies	6-8 School	Technology Action Team	All content area teachers	Ongoing	PLC administrator will monitor use of technology and assist as needed	PLC Administrators
Agile Minds training	6-8	Math PLC administrator	Agile Minds Teachers	Ongoing	PLC administrator and district support	PLC administrator
Use of Learning Schedule Assessments	6-8	Principal and PLC administrator	All content area teachers	Ongoing	PLC administrator	PLC administrator

Mathematics 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 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.	57% of students will score a level 3 or higher.

Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
52%: 254/490		57%: 279/490			
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 Instructional Time	Use of 5 E instructional model and small group instruction	PLC Administrator	District Benchmarks and Learning Schedule Assessments	FCAT
2	Lack of Instructional Time	Use of Student Response Systems facilitate student engagement and monitor understanding	PLC Administrator	District Benchmarks and Learning Schedule Assessments	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.		NA			
Science Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
NA		NA			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.		15% of students will score a level four or above in science			
Science Goal #2a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
12%: 58/490		15%: 74/490			
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	Lack of Instructional Time	Use of 5 E instructional model and small group instruction	PLC Administrator	District Benchmarks and Learning Schedule Assessments	FCAT
2	Lack of Instructional Time	Use of Student Response Systems facilitate student engagement and monitor understanding	PLC Administrator	District Benchmarks and Learning Schedule Assessments	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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
5E Instructional Model	6-8	District Science support	6-8 Science teachers	Ongoing	PLC administrator will monitor lesson plans and instruction	PLC administrator
Technology for the classroom: Student response systems, student engagement strategies	6-8	School Technology Action Team	All content area teachers	Ongoing	PLC administrator will monitor use of technology and assist as needed	PLC Administrators

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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:		52% of all students will achieve a level 4 or higher in Writing			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
47%: 233/496		52%: 258/496			
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	Insufficient class time for students to complete writing assessments	Utilize Common Assignments in ELA classes Integrate writing strategies into the Social Science and Science classes Administer 5 District Timed Writings and student revision	ELA teacher Dept. chair District Literacy Coach	1.1. ELA department meetings and PLC groups Meeting with district coaches and evaluation of averaged scores	1.1. Dept. Head and ELA teachers meeting and evaluating assignment results Pearson Assessments District Prompts and Write Score FCAT Writes
	Not all teachers have fully implemented	Continue the utilization of Write Score, grades	Principal and ELA teachers	Write Score evaluation of 7th and 8th grade	Write Score results from timed

2	differentiated instruction	7 and 8 Differentiate instruction in Writing and Revision strategies and conferencing with students	District Literacy coaches ELA teachers and students	timed writings District coaches, focus walks and snap shots	writings Student portfolios
3	Lack of implementation	Implementation of school wide writing plan	PLC administrator and Language Arts teachers	District Timed Writings Write Score	FCAT Writes

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Plan	6-8 Content Area Teachers	Language Arts Dept.	All content area teachers	Ongoing	Administrators will monitor writing instruction in classrooms	Administrators

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	
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
1	Limited time for student instruction	Increased implementation of technology in the classroom to engage students in learning	Administration	Teacher informal assessments Learning Schedule Assesments	District Benchmarks State Standardized Exams

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:
Improve student attendance rate by 2% .

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Lower the number of students with excessive absences by 2%. Lower the number of students with excessive tardies by 1%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94% 1400/1490	96% 1334/1390
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
65/1,490 4%	28/1,390 2%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
75/1,490 5%	42/1,390 3%

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	Accurate phone numbers	Use of a program that calls parents automatically when students are absent.	House administrators	Attendance reports will be analyzed each month.	Oncourse and Genesis attendance reports
2	Up to date contact information	House Offices will alert parents via phone once student has three unexcused absences and in writing on the 5th absence	House Administrators, Guidance.	Attendance reports will be analyzed each month. AIT meetings set for any student with five or more unexcused absences.	Oncourse attendance reports. AIT meetings reports
3	Teacher buy-in	Implementation of school-wide locker schedule to avoid excessive tardies	Administrators, Teachers	Tardy reports will be analyzed each month	Oncourse attendance reports Administrators' tardy 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
Oncourse	6-8	Principal	All teachers	Ongoing	Grade level Administrators will monitor attendance in Oncourse	Administration Team

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 in and out of school suspensions by 20%
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
891	713
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
323	258
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
245	196
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
151	121

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	Enough manpower to supervise over 1,400 students	Maintain morning holding areas for each grade level Implementation of facilitated movement to increase supervision during class transitions	Administrators, Teachers	Weekly Administrators monitoring	Weekly Discipline reports
2	Consistent implementation	Grade level assemblies as needed (at least semi-annual)	Administrators	Offer question/answer period for students	Collect and analyze data quarterly or as specific problems arise
3	Consistent implementation	Foundations lesson incorporated in daily lessons during the first week of school and revisited as needed	Teachers/ Administrators	Conference with teachers experiencing classroom management difficulties , provide assistance and CHAMPs training and monitor to insure implementation	Discipline reports, classroom visit results

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
Foundations/CHAMPs	6-8	Principal	All teachers	August 2012	Ongoing monitoring of proper procedures	Administration Team
Opening of School lessons	6-8	Principal	All teachers	August 2012	Grade Level administrator	Administrative Team
CHAMP's training for all new teachers	6-8	District staff	All new teachers	Ongoing	Grade Level administrator	Administrative Team
Code of Conduct Assemblies	6-8	Grade Level Administraotr	School Wide	September 2012	Grade Level administrator	Administrative Team

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	There will be a 10% increase in the number of new parent volunteers, PTSA membership and School Advisory Council participation. There will be an increase in parental involvement via parent conferences and attendance to Parent Information Night
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Membership: PTSA: 115 SAC: 5 Volunteers hours-31 hours Mentors- 17	Membership: PTSA- 150 SAC-6 Volunteers hours-35 Mentors- 19

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Up to date parent contact information	Parents will be informed of all upcoming events and important dates via the Parent Link communication line and the school's website	PTSA, SAC, Teachers, Administrators, Family & Community Action Team	School Climate Survey	Survey results
2	Lack of time and participation due to falling economy	Parents will be invited to attend a variety of Informational experiences (Math and Science Night, Rising 6th Graders' Night, Open House, Orientation etc.) At each, PTSA and SAC will provide literature and solicit members	PTSA, SAC, Teachers, Administrators, Family & Community Action Team	Monitor attendance through monthly rosters	Membership rosters TLAMs Information Day/Night Survey results

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
Volunteer training for teachers	6-8	Principal	school wide	October 2012	Volunteer Coordinator will monitor proper procedures	Principal and volunteer coordinator

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		Improve the number of students that are enrolled in advanced math and science course work.			
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 not at proficiency	Review all student performance data for proper placement	Principal/Assistant principal of curriculum	Increase in number of students enrolled in advanced coursework	Enrollment
2	Students not at proficiency	Recruit attendance area students to attend neighborhood school.	Principal	Decrease in number of students enrolled in academic magnet programs	Enrollment
	Students not at	S.T.E.M. Night that	Math and Science	Increase in student	Enrollment

3	proficiency	engages students and parents in activities based in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math.	P.L.C.'s	enrollment in advanced coursework
---	-------------	---	----------	-----------------------------------

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
Instructional Technology in the classroom	6-8 Math and Science	School Technology Action Team	6-8 Science and Math teachers	Ongoing	PLC administrator will monitor instruction	Administration Team

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:	To implement a CTE certification program
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 certified teachers	Teachers are attending training to gain necessary certification	Principal	Teacher certification acquisition	Program implementation

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
Microsoft Certification	6-8 Computer teachers	District Based Staff	3 elective teachers	Ongoing	District support staff will follow up with training and equipment	Principal

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)

Fights will decrease by 10% Goal:

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. Fights will decrease by 10% Goal Fights will decrease by 10% Goal #1:			Fights will decrease by 10%		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
63 fights			57 or lower		
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	Enough manpower to supervise over 1,400 students	Maintain morning holding areas for each grade level Implementation of facilitated movement to increase supervision during class transitions	Administrators, Teachers	Weekly Administrators monitoring	Weekly Discipline reports
2	Enough manpower to supervise over 1,400 students	Implementation of staggered dismissal procedures	Administrators, Teachers	Weekly Administrators monitoring	Weekly Discipline reports
3	Enough manpower to supervise over 1,400 students	Implementation of ID policy procedures	Administrators, Teachers	Weekly Administrators monitoring	Weekly Discipline reports
4	Enough manpower to supervise over 1,400 students	Teachers have assigned positions to monitor during class change.	Administration, Teachers	Weekly Administrators monitoring	Weekly Discipline reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CHAMP's lessons and Foundation lessons	6-8	Principal	All faculty and staff	August 2012	Lessons will be reviewed in January when students return. Bi-weekly discipline dashboards will be created for monitoring	Principal

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 Fights will decrease by 10% Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/8/2012)

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
Teacher materials to support student engagement and achievement.	\$2,000.00
Additional technology to support student engagement and achievement.	\$5,000.00
Upgrade of security system to promote a safe and civil environment.	\$2,000.00
Student incentives for academics and behavior.	\$1,000.00

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

The Twin Lakes Academy School Advisory Council will support the vision of the principal and faculty. In addition, they will provide resources and support to help the school achieve all the culture and achievement goals set forth in the state school improvement plan.

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District TWIN LAKES ACADEMY MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	66%	78%	54%	269	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%	65%			126	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?	67% (YES)	67% (YES)			134	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					529	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District TWIN LAKES ACADEMY MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	70%	65%	90%	49%	274	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	62%	68%			130	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?	60% (YES)	68% (YES)			128	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					532	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested