FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: INDIAN RIDGE MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Mr. Frank Zagari

SAC Chair: Jacquelaine J. Jones & Daniel Gurtov

Superintendent: Mr. Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/12

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					Indian Ridge Middle School 2011-2012 A School 2010-2011 A School 2010-2011: Did not make AYP in Math and Reading for Black students, Hispanic students, Economically Disadvantaged students, and SWD students. Asian, American Indian and ELL students N/A. Reading Scores: White students 81%; Black students 60%; Hispanic students 73%; Economically Disadvantaged students 64%; ELL N/A; SWD 40% Math Scores: White students 83%; Black students 65%; Hispanic students 70%; Economically Disadvantaged 67%; ELL N/A; SWD 47% 2009-2010: Arthur Ashe Middle School Grade: C High Standards Reading: 43% High Standards Math: 43% High Standards Science: 28% High Standards Writing: 85% Learning Gains Reading: 57% Learning Gains Math: 56% Lowest 25% Reading: 65% Lowest 25% Math: 60%

| | Assis Principal | Elpidio Muniz | MS Educational Leadership;Bachelors Degree in Communications; History 6-12 | 2 | 9 | | AYP: 79% of criteria met – Black, ED and SWD did not make AYP in Reading or Math
2008-2009: Arthur Ashe Middle School Grade: C High Standards Reading: 46% High Standards Math: 47%
High Standards Science: 21% High Standards Writing: 97% Learning Gains Reading:61% Learning Gains Math: 65% Lowest 25% Reading: 72% Lowest 25% Math: 68%
AYP: 97% criteria met- SWD did not make AYP in Reading
2007-2008: Arthur Ashe Middle School Grade: D High Standards Reading: 26% High Standards Math: 32%
High Standards Science: 11% High Standards Writing: 94% Learning Gains Reading: 54% Learning Gains Math: 59% Lowest 25% Reading: 67% Lowest 25% Math: 66%
AYP: 72% criteria met-
HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES
List your school's highly qualified 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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). 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.
Assis Principal
Elpidio Muniz
Leadership
Bachelors Degree in Communications History 6-12
5
7
Black, ED, and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading or Math
2006-2007: Arthur Ashe Middle School Grade: F High Standards Reading: 22% High Standards Math: 33%
High Standards Science: 5% High Standards Writing: 94% Learning Gains Reading: 46% Learning Gains Math: 53% Lowest 25% Reading: 65% Lowest 25% Math: 68%
AYP: 74% criteria met- Black, ED, and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading or Math
2005-2006:Attucks Middle School Grade: B High Standards Reading: 55% High Standards Math: 55%
High Standards Writing: 81% Learning Gains Reading: 71% Learning Gains Math: 67% Lowest 25% Reading: 76% AYP: 92% criteria met-
SWD did not meet AYP in Reading Hispanic and SWD did not make AYP in Math
2004-2005:Attucks Middle School Grade: C High Standards Reading: 41% High Standards Math: 44%
High Standards Writing: 77% Learning Gains Reading: 53% Learning Gains Math: 58% Lowest 25% Reading: 66% AYP: 73% criteria met- Black, ED, and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading
Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Math |
| | | | | | | | Bennett Elementary 2000-2003: A School Indian Ridge Middle School 2003-2012: A School
2010-2011: Did not make AYP in Math and Reading for Black students, Hispanic students, Economically Disadvantaged students, and SWD students. Asian, American Indian and ELL students N/A. Reading Scores: White students 81%; Black students 60%; Hispanic students 73%; Economically Disadvantaged students 64%; ELL N/A; SWD 40%
Math Scores: White students 83%; Black students 65%; Hispanic students 70%; Economically Disadvantaged 67%; ELL N/A; SWD 47%
2009-2010: Did not make AYP in Math and |

					Reading for SWD. Reading Scores: White students 82%; Black students 72%; Hispanic students 75%; Economically Disadvantaged students 69%; ELL N/A; SWD 47% Math Scores: White students 84%; Black students 69%; Hispanic students 76%; Economically Disadvantaged 70%; ELL N/A; SWD 48% 2008-2009: Did not make AYP in Math for SWD. Reading Scores: White students 81%; Black students 61%; Hispanic students 76%; Economically Disadvantaged students 65%; ELL N/A; SWD 46% Math Scores: White students 83%; Black students 60%; Hispanic students 77%; Economically Disadvantaged 66%; ELL N/A; SWD 44% 2007-2008: Did not make AYP in Math and Reading for SWD. Did not make AYP in Reading for Black students. Reading Scores: White students 81%; Black students 54%; Hispanic students 72%; Economically Disadvantaged 59%; ELL N/A; SWD 38% Math Scores: White students 80%; Black students 54%; Hispanic students 72%; Economically Disadvantaged 59%; ELL N/A; SWD 40% 2006-2007: Did not make AYP in Math for SWD. Reading Scores: White students 79%; Black students 66%; Hispanic students 71%; Economically Disadvantaged 63%; ELL 51%; SWD 37% Math Scores: White students 80%; Black students 59%; Hispanic students 76%; Economically Disadvantaged 60%; ELL 57%; SWD 37%
Principal	Mr. Frank Zagari	MS Program Development and Evaluation BA Liberal Arts Certified Educational Leadership, VE,Elementary Ed., Primary Ed.	9	19	
Assis Principal	Ms. Patty Brown	M. Ed. Psychological Counseling; M.A. in Counseling, Certified in Ed. Leadership	13	13	Indian Ridge Middle School 2003-2012: A School 2010-2011: Did not make AYP in Math and Reading for Black students, Hispanic students, Economically Disadvantaged students, and SWD students. Asian, American Indian and ELL students N/A. Reading Scores: White students 81%; Black students 60%; Hispanic students 73%; Economically Disadvantaged students 64%; ELL N/A; SWD 40% Math Scores: White students 83%; Black students 65%; Hispanic students 70%; Economically Disadvantaged 67%; ELL N/A; SWD 47% 2009-2010: Did not make AYP in Math and Reading for SWD. Reading Scores: White students 82%; Black students 72%; Hispanic students 75%; Economically Disadvantaged students 69%; ELL N/A; SWD 47% Math Scores: White students 84%; Black students 69%; Hispanic students 76%; Economically Disadvantaged 70%; ELL N/A; SWD 48% 2008-2009: Did not make AYP in Math for SWD. Reading Scores: White students 81%; Black students 61%; Hispanic students 76%; Economically Disadvantaged students 65%; ELL N/A; SWD 46% Math Scores: White students 83%; Black students 60%; Hispanic students 77%; Economically Disadvantaged 66%; ELL N/A; SWD 44% 2007-2008: Did not make AYP in Math and Reading for SWD. Did not make AYP in Reading for Black students. Reading Scores: White students 81%; Black students 54%; Hispanic students 72%; Economically Disadvantaged 59%; ELL N/A; SWD 38% Math Scores: White students 80%; Black students 54%; Hispanic students 72%; Economically Disadvantaged 59%; ELL N/A; SWD 40% 2006-2007: Did not make AYP in Math for SWD. Reading Scores: White students 79%; Black students 66%; Hispanic students 71%; Economically Disadvantaged 63%; ELL 51%; SWD 37% Math Scores: White students 80%; Black students 59%; Hispanic students 76%;

					Economically Disadvantaged 60%; ELL 57%; SWD 37%
Assis Principal	Mr. Mike Lyons	MS Educational Leadership; BA History; Certified Social Studies	9	9	Indian Ridge Middle School 2003-2012: A School 2010-2011: Did not make AYP in Math and Reading for Black students, Hispanic students, Economically Disadvantaged students, and SWD students. Asian, American Indian and ELL students N/A. Reading Scores: White students 81%; Black students 60%; Hispanic students 73%; Economically Disadvantaged students 64%; ELL N/A; SWD 40% Math Scores: White students 83%; Black students 65%; Hispanic students 70%; Economically Disadvantaged 67%; ELL N/A; SWD 47% 2009-2010: Did not make AYP in Math and Reading for SWD. Reading Scores: White students 82%; Black students 72%; Hispanic students 75%; Economically Disadvantaged students 69%; ELL N/A; SWD 47% Math Scores: White students 84%; Black students 69%; Hispanic students 76%; Economically Disadvantaged 70%; ELL N/A; SWD 48% 2008-2009: Did not make AYP in Math for SWD. Reading Scores: White students 81%; Black students 61%; Hispanic students 76%; Economically Disadvantaged students 65%; ELL N/A; SWD 46% Math Scores: White students 83%; Black students 60%; Hispanic students 77%; Economically Disadvantaged 66%; ELL N/A; SWD 44% 2007-2008: Did not make AYP in Math and Reading for SWD. Did not make AYP in Reading for Black students. Reading Scores: White students 81%; Black students 54%; Hispanic students 72%; Economically Disadvantaged 59%; ELL N/A; SWD 38% Math Scores: White students 80%; Black students 54%; Hispanic students 72%; Economically Disadvantaged 59%; ELL N/A; SWD 40% 2006-2007: Did not make AYP in Math for SWD. Reading Scores: White students 79%; Black students 66%; Hispanic students 71%; Economically Disadvantaged 63%; ELL 51%; SWD 37% Math Scores: White students 80%; Black students 59%; Hispanic students 76%; Economically Disadvantaged 60%; ELL 57%; SWD 37%

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Ms. Jamie Ruccolo	Bachelor Degree in Special Education K-12 Master's in Reading National Board Certified		11	Center Schools: Whispering Pines and Sunset School

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. New reading teachers are assigned peer teachers as mentors and partners.	Reading Coach/Administration	On-going	
2	2. Staff development workshops are held in all subject areas.	In-service Coordinator/Department Heads	On-going	
3	3. Site based induction program	Mrs. Hale	On-going	
4	4.NESS	NESS Coordinator	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
N/A	N/A

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
101	0.0%(0)	9.9%(10)	57.4%(58)	33.7%(34)	49.5%(50)	98.0%(99)	11.9%(12)	20.8%(21)	36.6%(37)

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
Carrie Hale	None at this time.	Instructional coaches are highly qualified veteran teachers. When possible, mentees are assigned an instructional coach who teaches the same subject area.	Weekly contact between Mentor and Mentee, meet in monthly Learning Communities, sharing of Best Practices, observations of veteran teachers, Mentor observes Mentee (classroom management and Instructional Planning).

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

We are not a Title I school.

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.

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team. Frank Zagari, Principal; Chauntea Cummings, School Psychologist; Pablo Uriarte, School Social Worker; Nan Busjit, Guidance Director; Sidona Delcorral, ESE Specialist; Rose-Edith Morgan, Guidance Counselor; Jamie Ruccolo, Reading Coach; Classroom Teachers, TBA

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

The RTI Team provides resources and assistance for the instructional staff in helping to identify students requiring additional academic interventions and support in order to increase academic and behavioral progress. The team makes recommendations for implementation and monitoring of Tiered Interventions as necessary. The team does provide training as needed for instructional and administrative staff. The RTI Team meets weekly for ten months of the school year and is coordinated by Mrs. Busjit, the Guidance Director. Mr. Zagari, the Principal, attends all meetings.

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 focus of the RTI process is not only to proactively identify those students who are encountering difficulties with student achievement but also to select and recommend interventions geared towards promoting student achievement. Additionally, the team makes recommendations and generates referrals for students to be evaluated for placement into the ESE program. Tier 1 data will identify students who are in need of general interventions. Tier 2 data identifies students who require one level of intense interventions (e.g. small groups). Tier 3 data identifies students who require the most intense interventions (e. g. one-on-one support). The intensity of interventions are based upon individual student needs. Particular areas of targeted interventions included weak Reading and Math skill sets described within the SIP.

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.

The data source for summarizing data are data graphs and charts, observations, assessments, report cards, interims, attendance, and discipline records. The data source for reading, mathematics, science, and writing are student test scores and classwork/homework. These data sources are reviewed and monitored as necessary. The data source for Behavior consists of teacher, counselor, administrator, and parent observations, as well as cumulative discipline (schoolwide and classroom specific) and attendance records(historical and current year). Additional intervention records such as outside agencies involved as collaborative resources are also accessed. RTI data management system includes an electronic database of individual student files including academics, behavior, progress monitoring and attendance. The file is accessed via the school site.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Trainings for the RTI Process and implementation geared towards Instructional and Administrative staff is scheduled at the beginning of each school year. Follow up training is scheduled at the end of the school year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Within the school site, instructional, administrative, support, and clerical staff are provided varying roles within the MTSS. The school staff is charged with various aspects of support implementation, including, daily monitoring, paperwork completion, observations, providing feedback and identifying areas of need. The administrative staff along with district and community agencies are actively involved and support this end.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

The LLT includes the following: Administrators: Mr. Zagari, Mr. Lyons, Mr. Muniz, Ms. Brown. Department Heads: Ms. Bastos, Mr. Haase, Ms. Benacquisto, Ms. Swanton, Ms. Hogg, Ms. Jones. Media Specialist: Ms. Raub, Guidance: Ms. Busjit.

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

Meetings are held monthly or more frequently if necessary. The LLT will keep the staff informed of the LLT's focus and implementation of goals and objectives through faculty, departmental, grade level and administrative meetings.

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

Based upon incoming data, the LLT will fine tune existing programs (i.e., Book Swap, Ridge Reading) and implement necessary trainings through the PLC's. The Book Swap entails providing used books to our lowest 25th percentile and low income students. Ridge Reading is a school-wide initiative provides silent sustained reading once a month through core and elective classrooms. Other major initiatives will be determined as data is made available including analyzing BAT testing and FAIR testing determining instructional focus, on-going progress monitoring and supporting the implementation of the Comprehensive Intervention Reading Programs. Additionally, the LLT will create and share school-wide initiatives and activities that promote literacy.

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.

Classroom walkthroughs, on-going staff development provided by the Reading Coach implementing reading and writing strategies in the content and elective areas.

*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:	By May 2013, 32% of students will be proficient at Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (546)	32% (600)

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 new materials such as novels, computer programs for innovative programming for level 3 students.	To utilize existing basals, trade books, and supplemental materials when materials are lacking. To use technology resources as a means to create project based learning. Mentoring Daily Tutorials Small group instruction	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administrators	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On- going	Unit tests, student conferencing, teacher observation, teacher made tests

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:	By May 2013, 33% of students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (3)	33% (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
	Lack of students willingness to perform as well as the students mood in general	Maintaining a persistent calming environment Frequent breaks	SVE Teacher Administration	Classroom Observations	Teacher generated tests Unit assessments

					Diagnostic Assessment of Reading Brigance
1					

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:	By May 2013, 46% of students will be proficient at Level 4 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (812)	46% (862)

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 enrichment materials and replacement technologies for level 4 students.	Use of reading activities and wireless carts to enrich advanced student knowledge and fill in gaps for students lacking enrichment materials. Mentoring Daily Tutorials Small group instruction	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administrators	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On- going	Unit tests, Student conferencing, Teacher observation, Project based/research assessments Teacher made tests

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:	By May 2013, 33% of students will score at or above achievement level 7 in Reading on the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (3)	33% (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
1	Lack of students willingness to perform as well as the students mood in general	Maintaining a persistent calming environment Frequent breaks	SVE Teacher Administration	Classroom Observations	Teacher generated tests Units assessments Diagnostic

					Assessment of Reading
					Brigance

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:	By May 2013, 74% of students will achieve adequate reading gains on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (1287)	74% (1340)

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 before or after school tutoring programs.	Classroom teacher volunteers will provide in-house tutoring before and/or after school. Mentoring Daily Tutorials Parent Outreach Small group instruction will occur during class.	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administrators	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On- going	Unit tests FAIR Student conferencing Teacher observation Project based/research assessments Teacher made tests
2	Faculty requiring training in the area of reading strategies focusing on their particular content area.	To develop and implement staff training. Small group instruction Tutorials	Reading Coach Department Head Administration	Monitoring/On-going Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings.	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini Benchmark Assessments FAIR Diagnostic Assessment of Reading Degrees of Reading Powers DAR Word List Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in	

reading.

Reading Goal #3b:

By May 2013, 63% of students will make learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (4)	63% (5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of students willingness to perform as well as student's mood.	Maintaining a persistent calming environment Frequent breaks	SVE Teacher Administration	Classroom Observations	Teacher generated tests Unit assessments Diagnostic Assessment of Reading Brigance

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:	By May 2013, 67% of the lowest quartile students will make adequate progress on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (298)	67% (312)

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 consumable materials needed for students to utilize during reading strategies.	Students requiring specialized reading instruction based upon low performance receive formal level specific instruction daily. Indicators are FCAT results, county guidelines, and teacher input. Lower quartile students will receive reading instruction through all content area classes using specific reading strategies such as graphic organizers and other CRISS/McRel strategies Students will be provided copies of materials to utilize strategies taught.	Reading Coach Administrators	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini Benchmark Assessments Diagnostic Assessment of Reading FAIR Fluency Probes Unit Tests Mini Assessments/Weekly

		Daily Tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support			
2	Reading program has not been updated, lack of computer software, antiquated computers	Use of free on-line resources and the computer lab. Use of Promethean boards. Small group instruction Individual Support	Reading Coach Administrators	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini Benchmark Assessments Diagnostic Assessment of Reading FAIR Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # Indian Ridge Middle School will reduce the number of non-proficient students in reading by 50% in a six year period. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	80%	81%	83%	85%	85%	

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:	By May 2013, the number of student sub-groups by ethnicity not making satisfactory progress will reduce on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 24% (261) Black: 39% (46) Hispanic: 34% (186) Asian: 16% (9) American Indian: 40% (4)	White: 21% (232) Black: 36% (42) Hispanic: 31% (172) Asian: 13% (7)) American Indian: 36% (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
	Anticipated barriers will impact all sub-groups equally. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian:	Utilize existing materials and use of free technological resources as a means to enhance project based learning. Mentoring	Reading Coach Department Head Administrators	FCAT Explorer FOCUS Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings.	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini Benchmark Assessments Diagnostic Assessment of

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	American Indian: Lack of consumable materials and working technology.	Daily Tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support		Monitoring/On-going	Reading FAIR Degrees of Reading Powers DAR Word List Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing Portfolio Review
2	Students inability to adequately utilize reading strategies.	To provide tutorials and individualized reading instruction specific to student needs. Mentoring Daily Tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support Parent Night	Reading Coach Department Head Administrators	FCAT Explorer FOCUS Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini Benchmark Assessments Diagnostic Assessment of Reading FAIR Degrees of Reading Powers DAR Word List Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing Portfolio Review

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:	By May 2013, the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress will reduce on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (44)	60% (40)

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
	ELL students may require more support within the classroom setting.	All ELL students will receive reading instruction through all content area classes using specific reading strategies and graphic organizers. Students requiring specialized reading instruction based	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administrators	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini Benchmark Assessments Diagnostic Assessment of Reading

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		upon low performance receive formal level specific instruction. Small group instruction Individual support Tutorials Mentoring			FAIR Mini Assessments/Weekly Degrees of Reading Powers DAR Word List Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing
2	A1 and A2 students are not proficient enough to be mainstreamed into content area classes.	Provide peer tutoring, peer buddies, small group, differentiated instruction, and the application of ELL strategies. Small group instruction Individual support Tutorials Mentoring	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administrators	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini-Benchmark Assessments Mini Assessments/Weekly Diagnostic Assessment of Reading FAIR Degrees of Reading Powers DAR Word List Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By May 2013, the number of SWD not making satisfactory progress will reduce on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (139)	65% (132)

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
	Insufficient support staff	All SWD will receive reading instruction through all content area classes using specific reading strategies and graphic organizers (i.e. McRel and CRISS). Small group instruction	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administrators	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going	Assessment Tests Mini Assessments/Weekly Mini Benchmark Assessments

1		Individual support Tutorials Mentoring Collaboration/Accommodations			FAIR Diagnostic Assessment of Reading Degrees of Reading Powers DAR Word List Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing
2	Student's lack of grade level reading skills.	Students requiring specialized reading instruction based upon low performance receive formal level specific instruction. Small group instruction Individual support Tutorials Mentoring Collaboration/Accommodations Parent Night	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administrators	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini Benchmark Assessments FAIR Mini Assessments/Weekly Diagnostic Assessment of Reading Degrees of Reading Powers DAR Word List Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing
3	Lack of updated computer programs and computers.	Students will have access to free on-line technology based programs (i.e.,programs such as FCAT Explorer, FOCUS, Unitedstreaming) Small group instruction Individual support Tutorials Mentoring Collaboration/Accommodations	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administrators	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini Assessments/Weekly Mini Benchmark Assessments FAIR Diagnostic Assessment of Reading Degrees of Reading Powers DAR Word List Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making

satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5E:

| | By May 2013, the number of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress will reduce on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test. |

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (256)	38% (236)

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 adequate staff development in content area reading strategies.	Economically Disadvantaged students will receive specific reading instruction through content area classes utilizing CRISS and McRel strategies and the integration of technologies based upon trainings. Mentoring Daily Tutorials Small group instruction Individual support	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administrators	Mini Benchmark Assessments Benchmark assessments/Bi-annually Administration will be aware of school's focus and monitor implementation through Classroom Walkthroughs/Bi-Monthly Monitoring/On-going Re-evaluation of data through progress monitoring to target instruction focus	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini Benchmark Assessments Diagnostic Assessment of Reading FAIR Degrees of Reading Powers DAR Word List Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing Portfolio Review
2	Student lack of ability to read on level text in content area classes.	Students are enrolled in individualized programs such as IMPACT, Rewards, Wilson, Developmental and other intensive programs. Small group instruction Individual support Tutorials Mentoring Parent Night	Reading Coach Department Head Administrators	Mini-Benchmark Assessments Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going	Benchmark Assessment Tests Mini Benchmark Assessments FAIR Diagnostic Assessment of Reading Degrees of Reading Powers DAR Word List Fluency Probes Unit Tests Student Conferencing Portfolio Review

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

or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
First Quarter Activities- August Session One: Set Norms (Schedule, Location, Roles, Documentation of PLC, Assessment/Reflection, Review IFC's, Review needs based upon FCAT Data and Individual classroom teachers Virtual Counselor Reports Session Two: Review SIP Draft, Marzano Art of Science and Teaching; Establish PLC Goal; Determine Strategies based upon Data Activities- September Session One: Progression of Standards Activity Session Two: Overview of CCSS Domains and Organization of Document	6, 7, & 8 Reading	Reading Coach Department Head	Reading Department	August 30, 2012 September 6, 2012 September 20, 2012 October 4, 2012 October 18, 2012	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administration
Second Quarter Activities- November Session One: Review of CCSS Writing Standards Session Two: CCSS Appendix B (grade level samples of text complexity) Activities- December Session One: Review of CCSS Writing Standards Session Two:	6, 7, & 8 Reading	Reading Coach Department	Reading Department	November 2, 2012 November 15, 2012 December 6, 2012 December 20,	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments	Reading Coach Reading Department Head

Activities	Grade/Subject	Responsible	Department	Dates	Evaluation	Oversight
Share Best Practices relating to Writing CCSS Activities-January Session One: Review CCSS Language Standards (Conventions, Knowledge of Language, Vocab. Acquisition and Use) Session Two: Review Best Practices		Head		2012 January 10, 2013 January 24, 2013	Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Administration
Third Quarter Activities-February Session One: Detailed analysis of Speaking and Listening domain Session Two: Share Best Practices relating to Speaking and Listening CCSS Reading Activities-March Session One: Disaggregation of data for BAT- determine area of need and revise IFC to meet those needs Session Two: Discuss and determine strategies to remediate students	6, 7, & 8 Reading	Reading Coach Department Head	Reading Department	February 7, 2013 February 21, 2013 March 7, 2013 March 21, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administration
Fourth Quarter Activities-April Session One: Overview of Project-Based Learning Session Two: Best Practices Project-Based Learning Activities-May SessionOne: Review of CCSS Math as it applies to subject area Session Two: Review	6, 7, & 8 Reading	Reading Coach Department Head	Reading Department	April 4, 2013 April 25, 2013 May 2,2013 May 9, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Reading Coach Reading Department Head Administration

outcomes, reflect and evaluate PLC's						

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Florida School Book Depository 6th, 7th & 8th grade Florida Reading workbooks.	Supplemental materials	Instructional Materials operating budget	$15,525.00
Florida School Book Depository Rewards intermediate level 6th grade student workbooks.	Supplemental materials	Instructional Materials operating budget.	$715.92
Cambuim/Sopris Rewards secondary level 7th & 8th grade student workbooks.	Supplemental materials	Instructional Materials operating budget	$549.72
			Subtotal: $16,790.64
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
Impact Curriculum.	Staff development training.	Reading allocation - State - operating budget.	$4,209.00
			Subtotal: $4,209.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $20,999.64

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:	By May 2013 students scoring proficient in listening/speaking on the 2013 CELLA will increase to 41%
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
38% (31)	

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	ELL students may require more support within the classroom setting.	Small group instruction Individual support Tutorials Mentoring	Test Coordinator Administration ESOL Contact	On-going Monitoring Classroom Observations Portfolios	IPT CELLA Classroom Tests Student Conferencing

---

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:	By May 2013, students scoring proficient in reading on the 2013 CELLA will increase to 29%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

26% (21)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students may require more support within the classroom setting.	Small group instruction Individual support Tutorials Mentoring	Test Coordinator Administration ESOL Contact	On-going Monitoring Classroom Observations Portfolios	IPT CELLA Classroom Tests Student Conferencing

---

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	By May 2013, students scoring proficient in writing on the 2013 CELLA will increase to 33%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

30% (24)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students may require more support within the classroom setting.	Small group instruction Individual support Tutorials Mentoring	Test Coordinator Administration ESOL Contact	On-going Monitoring Classroom Observations Portfolios	IPT CELLA Classroom Tests Student Conferencing

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	By May 2012, 30% of students will score at Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (527)	30% (565)

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 new technologies.	Math students will utilize current technology programs and free on-line resources. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support	Department Head Administration	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going Modify instruction Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

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:	By May 2013, students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase to 36%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (3)	36% (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
1	Lack of students willingness to perform as well as the students mood in general	Maintaining a persistent calming environment Frequent breaks	SVE Teacher Administration	Classroom Observations	Teacher generated tests Unit assessments Diagnostic

					Assessment of Reading
					Brigance

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:	By May 2013, 47% of students will score Level 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (815)	47% (884)

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 enrichment materials and replacement technologies for students.	Use of math activities and wireless carts to enrich advanced student knowledge. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support	Math department Head Administration	Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

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:	By May 2013, students scoring at or above achievement level in mathematics on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase to 47%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (4)	47% (5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of students willingness to perform as well as the students mood in general	Maintaining a persistent calming environment Frequent breaks	SVE Teacher Administration	Classroom Observations	Teacher generated tests Unit assessments Diagnostic

					Assessment of Reading
					Brigance

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:	By May 2013, 74% of students will make Learning Gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (1298)	74% (1345)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of before or after school tutoring programs.	Classroom teacher volunteers will provide in-house tutoring. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support	Department Head Administration	Mini Assessments Weekly Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

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:	By May 2013, the percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics will increase to 71% on the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (4)	71% (5)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of students willingness to perform as well as student's mood.	Maintaining a persistent calming environment Frequent breaks	SVE Teacher Administration	Classroom Observations	Teacher generated tests Unit assessments Diagnostic Assessment of Reading

					Brigance

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:	By May 2013, 56% of the lowest quartile students will make adequate progress on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% (251)	56% (267)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of consumable materials and updated technologies and programs.	Use of free on-line resources and computer lab and intensive math class. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support	Department Head Administration	Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

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 : Indian Ridge Middle will reduce the number of non-proficient students in math, by 50% in a six year period.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	81%	83%	84%	86^	88%	

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:	Sub-groups will make an adequate learning gain on the 2012 FCAT Math Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 24% (261) Black: 44% (52) Hispanic: 38% (209) Asian: 11% (6) American Indian 30% (3)	White: 21% (233) Black: 41% (48) Hispanic: 35% (192) Asian: 8% (4) American Indian 27% (3)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Anticipated barriers will impact all sub-groups equally. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian Lack of consumable materials and working technology.	Utilize existing materials and use of free technological resources as a means to remediate skills. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support	Department Head Administration	Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests Mini Assessments Weekly
2	Students inability to adequately utilize math strategies.	To provide tutorials and individualized math instruction specific to student needs. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support	Administration	Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

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:	By May 2013, ELL students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (39)	54% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students may require more support within the classroom setting.	All ELL students will receive math strategies commensurate with their abilities and individualized instruction. Provide peer tutoring, peer buddies, small group, differentiated instruction and application of ELL strategies. Daily tutorials	Department Head Administration	Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

	Small group instruction Individual Support			

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:	By May 2013, SWD students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (140)	64% (134)

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 support staff.	All SWD will receive additional support through peer tutoring, support facilitators. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support Collaboration/Accommodations	Department Head Support Facilitator Administration	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests C-MAT/TOMA
2	Student's lack of grade level abilities.	Based upon test scores, SWD students will be placed in an intensive math class. Small group instruction Individual Support Daily tutorials Collaboration/Accommodatioms	Department Head Support Facilitator Administration	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests C-MAT/TOMA

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	By May 2013,Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics on the 2013 Math 2.0 FCAT Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	45% (285)		42% (263)		

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 staff development in the area of math strategies.	Provide staff development in math strategies in order to address individual needs through modeling.	Department Head Administration	Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

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:	By May 2013, students scoring at achievement level 3 in Algebra will increase to 25% on the 2013 Algebra I EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (34)	25% (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 enrichment materials and replacement technologies for students.	Use of math activities and wireless carts to enrich advanced student knowledge. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support	Math department Head Administration	Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

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:	By May 2013, students scoring at or above achievement level 4 in Algebra will increase to 81% on the 2013 Algebra I EOC.	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (123)	81% (127)

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 enrichment materials and replacement technologies for students.	Use of math activities and wireless carts to enrich advanced student knowledge. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support	Math department Head Administration	Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

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

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

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	By May 2013, student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic Asian, American Indian) will maintain current proficiency on the 2013 Algebra I EOC.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 0% (113) Black 0% (3) Hispanic 0% (28) Asian 0% (10) American Indian N/A	White 0% Black 0% Hispanic 0% Asian 0% American Indian N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Ell 0	ELL 0

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	By May 2013, Economically Disadvantaged students will maintain current proficiency on the 2013 Algebra I EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (20)	0% (20)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	By May 2013, students scoring at achievement level 3 in Geometry will increase to 3% on the 2013 Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (1)	3% (2)

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 enrichment materials and replacement technologies for students.	Use of math activities and wireless carts to enrich advanced student knowledge. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support	Math department Head Administration	Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

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:	By May 2013, students scoring at or above achievement level 4 in Geometry will increase to 100% on the 2013 Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (67)	100% (68)

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 enrichment materials and replacement technologies for students.	Use of math activities and wireless carts to enrich advanced student knowledge. Daily tutorials Small group instruction Individual Support	Math Department Head Administration	Monitoring/On-going Student Conferencing Data chats with students	Benchmark Assessment Test Mini Assessments Weekly Teacher generated tests BAT Mini-Assessments Unit Tests

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

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

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	By May 2013, student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) will maintain 100% mastery on the 2013 Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 0% (51) Black 0% (2) Hispanic 0% (7) Asian 0% (6) American Indian N/A	Maintain current percentages

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
First Quarter Activities-August Session One: Set Norms (Schedule, Location, Roles, Documentation of PLC, Assessment/Reflect Review IFC's, Review needs based upon FCAT Data and Individual classroom teachers Virtual Counselor Reports Session Two: Review SIP Draft, Marzano Art of Science and Teaching; Establish PLC Goal; Determine Strategies based upon Data Activities-September Session One: Progression of Standards Activity Session Two: Overview of CCSS Domains and Organization of Document	6, 7, & 8 Math	Department Head	Math Department	August 30, 2012 September 6, 2012 September 20, 2012 October 4, 2012 October 18, 201	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Math Department Head Administration
Second Quarter Activities-November Session One: Review of CCSS Writing Standards Session Two: CCSS Appendix B (grade level samples of text complexity) Activities-December Session One: Review of CCSS Writing Standards Session Two: Share Best Practices relating to	6, 7, & 8 Math	Department Head	Math Department	November 2, 2012 November 15, 2012 December 6, 2012 December 20, 2012 January 10, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach	Math Department Head Administration

Writing CCSS Activities-January Session One: Review CCSS Language Standards (Conventions, Knowledge of Language, Vocab. Acquisition and Use) Session Two: Review Best Practices				January 24, 2013	conferencing	
Third Quarter Activities- February Session One: Detailed analysis of Speaking and Listening domain Session Two: Share Best Practices relating to Speaking and Listening CCSS Reading Activities- March Session One: Disaggregation of data for BAT- determine area of need and revise IFC to meet those needs Session Two: Discuss and determine strategies to remediate students	6, 7, & 8 Math	Math Department	Department Head	February 7, 2013 February 21, 2013 March 7, 2013 March 21, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Math Department Head Administration
Fourth Quarter Activities- April Session One: Overview of Project- Based Learning Session Two: Best Practices Project- Based Learning Activities-May SessionOne: Review of CCSS Math as it applies to subject area Session Two: Review outcomes, reflect and evaluate PLC's	6, 7, & 8 Math	Math Department	Department Head	April 4, 2013 April 25, 2013 May 2,2013 May 9, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Math Department Head Administration

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. Science Goal #1a:	By May 2013, 43% of students will attain a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (269)	43% (289)

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	Student's reading abilities.	Use of consumable textbooks with highlighting strategies. Use morphemic analysis to promote learning new vocabulary words. Mentoring	Science Department Head Administration	Learning Strategies that focus on developing reading skills will be presented during monthly PLC/or Department Meetings and effectiveness monitored.	Benchmark Assessment Test Teacher generated tests BAT min-assessments Unit tests Weekly

		Monitoring progress			Assessments
		Individual Support			Student conferencing
		Classroom participation			Lab reports
2	Unable to replace technical equipment such as computer cords and batteries, does not allow students to access internet and enrichment programs on an individual basis in the classroom.	Students will work in small groups to make up for lack of individual technology. Increase use of LCD projectors to present material. Students will occasionally use computers available in the media center to enhance technological learning.	Science Department Head Administration	Strategies will be monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings as a means of monitoring effectiveness. Classroom participation	Virtual Lab Activities FCAT Focus Student directed research

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	By May 2013, students scoring at levels 4, 5, & 6 will increase to 42% on the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (2)	42% (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	Lack of students willingness to perform as well as the students mood in general	Maintaining a persistent calming environment Frequent Breaks	SVE Teacher Administration	Classroom Observations	Teacher generated tests Unit assessments DAR

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By May 2013, 22% of Level 4 and 5 students will maintain or increase their scores on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (130)	22% (147)

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 enrichment materials and replacement technologies.	Use of lab activities and wireless carts to enrich advanced student application of learned content towards mastery. Mentoring Individual Support	Science Department Head Administration	Weekly Assessments Strategies will be monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Classroom participation	Benchmark Assessment Test Teacher generated tests BAT min-assessments Unit tests Student conferencing Lab reports Project/research based assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	By May 2013, students scoring at or above achievement level 7 in science will increase to 22% on the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (1)	22% (2)
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 students willingness to perform as well as the student's mood.	Maintaining a persistent calming environment Frequent breaks	SVE Teacher Administration	Classroom Observations	Teacher generated tests Unit assessments Diagnostic Assessment of Reading

---

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
First Quarter						

Activities	Grade			Dates	Strategy	Responsible
Activities-August Session One: Set Norms (Schedule, Location, Roles, Documentation of PLC, Assessment/Reflection, Review IFC's, Review needs based upon FCAT Data and Individual classroom teachers Virtual Counselor Reports Session Two: Review SIP Draft, Marzano Art of Science and Teaching; Establish PLC Goal; Determine Strategies based upon Data Activities-September Session One: Progression of Standards Activity Session Two: Overview of CCSS Domains and Organization of Document	6, 7, & 8 Science	Science Department Head	Science Department	August 30, 2012 September 6, 2012 September 20, 2012 October 4, 2012 October 18, 2012	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Science Department Head Administration
Fourth Quarter Activities- April Session One: Overview of Project-Based Learning Session Two: Best Practices Project-Based Learning Activities-May SessionOne: Review of CCSS Math as it applies to subject area Session Two: Review outcomes, reflect and evaluate PLC's	6, 7, & 8 Science	Science Department Head	Science Department	April 4, 2013 April 25, 2013 May 2,2013 May 9, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Science Department Head Administration
Second Quarter Activities- November Session One: Review of CCSS Writing Standards						

Session Two: CCSS Appendix B (grade level samples of text complexity) Activities-December Session One: Review of CCSS Writing Standards Session Two: Share Best Practices relating to Writing CCSS Activities-January Session One: Review CCSS Language Standards (Conventions, Knowledge of Language, Vocab. Acquisition and Use) Session Two: Review Best Practices	6, 7, & 8 Science	Science Department Head	Science Department	November 2, 2012 November 15, 2012 December 6, 2012 December 20, 2012 January 10, 2013 January 24, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Science Department Head Administration
Third Quarter Activities-February Session One: Detailed analysis of Speaking and Listening domain Session Two: Share Best Practices relating to Speaking and Listening CCSS Reading Activities-March Session One: Disaggregation of data for BAT-determine area of need and revise IFC to meet those needs Session Two: Discuss and determine strategies to remediate students	6, 7, & 8 Science	Science Department Head	Science Department	February 7, 2013 February 21, 2013 March 7, 2013 March 21, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Science Department Head Administration

Science Budget:

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

Ancillary materials to support the science curriculum.	Consumable materials determined by science department chair person.	Science Lab allocation operating budget.	$2,630.00
			Subtotal: $2,630.00

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
Science curriculum	Staff development.	General operating budget	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,630.00

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:	By May 2013, 93% of eighth grade students will attain a Level 4 or above on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90% (608)	93% (626)

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 Supplies for printing portfolio checklists and for student portfolios	All students will maintain a writing portfolio containing writing samples throughout the year. All students will produce a final product based on rubric specifications. Follow Writing IFC	Department Chair Administration	Bi-monthly Classroom Walkthroughs Quarterly Monitoring of Student Portfolios	Rubric based grades Multi-genre writing samples
2	Lack of Supplies Antiquated computers: Unable to replace/repair	All students will be given the opportunity to use various technological applications during the writing process.	Department Chair Administration	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Weekly Monitoring	Classroom assessments Teacher monitoring Peer revisions

		Individual Support Follow Writing IFC		Writing Conferences Peer Collaboration/Conferencing	
3	Lack of Supplies Lack of consumable materials Dilapidated textbooks (10 years old) that are out of adoption, lack of funding for replacement	All students will be instructed in and use the writing process daily. The revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and seen in all student writing drafts. All students will produce a final product based on rubric specifications. Individual Support Follow Writing IFC	Department Chair Administration	Strategies will be a focus monitored and discussed at monthly Department Meetings. Weekly Monitoring Writing Conferences	Writing BAT tests Classroom assessments Teacher monitoring Peer revisions Self- reflection

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:	By May 2013, students scoring at 4 or higher in writing will increase to 69% on the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (4)	69% (5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of students willingness to perform as well as the students mood	Maintaining a persistent calming environment Frequent breaks	SVE Teacher Administration	Classroom Observations	Teacher generated tests Unit Assessments Diagnostic Assessment of Reading

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
First Quarter						

	Activities						
	Activities-August Session One: Set Norms (Schedule, Location, Roles, Documentation of PLC, Assessment/Reflection, Review IFC's, Review needs based upon FCAT Data and Individual classroom teachers Virtual Counselor Reports Session Two: Review SIP Draft, Marzano Art of Science and Teaching; Establish PLC Goal; Determine Strategies based upon Data Activities-September Session One: Progression of Standards Activity Session Two: Overview of CCSS Domains and Organization of Document	6, 7, & 8 Language Arts	Language Arts Department Head	Language Arts	August 30, 2012 September 6, 2012 September 20, 2012 October 4, 2012 October 18, 2012	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Language Arts Department Head Administration
	Second Quarter Activities-November Session One: Review of CCSS Writing Standards Session Two: CCSS Appendix B (grade level samples of text complexity) Activities-December Session One: Review of CCSS Writing Standards Session Two: Share Best Practices relating to Writing CCSS Activities-January Session One: Review CCSS Language Standards (Conventions,	6, 7, & 8 Language Arts	Language Arts Department Head	Language Arts	November 2, 2012 November 15, 2012 December 6, 2012 December 20, 2012 January 10, 2013 January 24, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Language Arts Department Head Administration

Knowledge of Language, Vocab. Acquisition and Use) Session Two: Review Best Practices						
Third Quarter Activities-February Session One: Detailed analysis of Speaking and Listening domain Session Two: Share Best Practices relating to Speaking and Listening CCSS Reading Activities-March Session One: Disaggregation of data for BAT-determine area of need and revise IFC to meet those needs Session Two: Discuss and determine strategies to remediate students	6, 7, & 8 Language Arts	Language Arts Department Head	Language Arts	February 7, 2013 February 21, 2013 March 7, 2013 March 21, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Language Arts Department Head Administration
Fourth Quarter Activities-April Session One: Overview of Project-Based Learning Session Two: Best Practices Project-Based Learning Activities-May SessionOne: Review of CCSS Math as it applies to subject area Session Two: Review outcomes, reflect and evaluate PLC's	6, 7, & 8 Language Arts	Language Arts Department Head	Language Arts	April 4, 2013 April 25, 2013 May 2,2013 May 9, 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Administration of diagnostic and assessment instruments Observations Teacher/ Coach conferencing	Language Arts Department Head Administration

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
SpringBoard Curriculum.	Staff development training.	Inservice - State - operating budget.	$4,209.00
			Subtotal: $4,209.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $4,209.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance	
Attendance Goal #1:	By June 2012, Attendance rate will increase 2% percent.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94.1% (2012)	96% (2055)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
142	135
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
97	90

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 information from the feeder schools and excessive excused	Social Worker surveys previous school's attendance concerns.	Administration Guidance Social Worker	Weekly BRIO Reports	TERMS Pinnacle Attendance Summaries
2	Lack of student compliance	File BTIP	Administration Guidance Social Worker State Attorney	Weekly BRIO Reports	TERMS Pinnacle Attendance Summaries

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
Attendance Policy	6, 7, & 8 All Subjects	Administration	School-wide	Pre-planning week	On-going: Parent/Teacher Conferences Referrals	Guidance/Social Worker

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:	By May 2013, the number of suspensions will decrease by 10%. AES is an option made available to students instead of external suspension.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
641	577
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
283	255
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
166	149
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
110	99
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	Students not being properly placed in class or school.	RTI team properly placing student.	Administration Guidance RTI Team	CWTs	TERMS DMS
2	Insufficient identification of students who need learning supports	Provide family counseling	Administration Guidance	CWTs	TERMS DMS
3	Students not following through due to transportation issues	Saturday School Internal Suspension After school detentions AES	Administration Guidance	CWTs	TERMS DMS
4	Lack of implementation of CHAMPs/behavioral strategies	CHAMPs refresher course On-going monitoring	Department Heads Administration	Classroom Observation	Student disciplinary referrals CHAMPs Rubric

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
Classroom Behavior Management Training for all Staff including effective classroom strategies and review of District s Discipline Matrix.	6, 7, & 8	School-wide	Reading and Math Teachers	Monthly Meetings	Classroom Observatioms	Administration

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Saturday detentions. Implementation of the district's discipline matrix.	Instructional staff.	Accountability/operating budget.	$10,300.00
After school. Implementation of the district's discipline matrix.	Instructional staff.	Accountability/operating budget.	$700.00
			Subtotal: $11,000.00
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: $11,000.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	By May 2013, 85% of parents will participate in decisions regarding their child's education as evidenced by attendance at parent trainings, PTA, participation in school activities, and SAC meetings.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
83% (1826)	85% (1870)

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	Parents lack of access to technology	Utilize the school website, monthly newsletter, robot dialer, SAC and PTA meetings to keep parents updated.	SAC Co-Chairs Administration Guidance Director	Sign-in Sheets	Parent Survey School Climate Survey
2	Parents lack of knowledge in subject area remediation	Interactive Reading and Math for Success Night for parents and students Community Outreach Program (Reading/Math/Study Skills Strategies provided to parents/students outside of the school and within the community	Reading and ESE teachers Dept. Heads	Sign-in Sheets	Parent Survey School Climate Survey
3	Parents lack of knowledge base concerning environmental issues that impact academic performance	Parent Counseling Training	Guidance Director	Sign-in Sheets	Sign-in Sheets

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
Reading and Math Strategies	6, 7, & 8	Reading and Math Department Heads	Reading and Math Teachers	Monthly Meetings	Data Chats	Administration

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:	Indian Ridge Middle School will increase STEM literacy for all students, including those who do not pursue STEM-related careers or additional study in the STEM disciplines.
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 sufficient funding

Parental economic costs and involvement | Donated supplies

PTA Support | Administration | Classroom Observaions | Participation in District Science and Math Competitions

Science related fieldtrips |

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

CTE Goal #1:	N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Florida School Book Depository 6th, 7th & 8th grade Florida Reading workbooks.	Supplemental materials	Instructional Materials operating budget	$15,525.00
Reading	Florida School Book Depository Rewards intermediate level 6th grade student workbooks.	Supplemental materials	Instructional Materials operating budget.	$715.92
Reading	Cambuim/Sopris Rewards secondary level 7th & 8th grade student workbooks.	Supplemental materials	Instructional Materials operating budget	$549.72
Science	Ancillary materials to support the science curriculum.	Consumable materials determined by science department chair person.	Science Lab allocation operating budget.	$2,630.00
Suspension	Saturday detentions. Implementation of the district's discipline matrix.	Instructional staff.	Accountability/operating budget.	$10,300.00
Suspension	After school. Implementation of the district's discipline matrix.	Instructional staff.	Accountability/operating budget.	$700.00
				Subtotal: $30,420.64

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
Reading	Impact Curriculum.	Staff development training.	Reading allocation - State - operating budget.	$4,209.00
Science	Science curriculum	Staff development.	General operating budget	$1,000.00
Writing	SpringBoard Curriculum.	Staff development training.	Inservice - State - operating budget.	$4,209.00
				Subtotal: $9,418.00

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: $39,838.64

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority   jn Focus   jn Prevent   jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Saturday School	$10,000.00
Tardy Detentions	$700.00

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

SAC will monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan and assist in any necessary modifications/updating. Training in interpreting data, team building activities, and information relating to CCSS, RTI and LLT will be provided throughout the year.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
INDIAN RIDGE MIDDLE SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	83%	91%	65%	322	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	73%			139	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?	65% (YES)	64% (YES)			129	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					590	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District
INDIAN RIDGE MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	84%	85%	95%	65%	329	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	70%	78%			148	3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	64% (YES)	67% (YES)			131	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					608	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested