

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: SEMI NOLE MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Kathryn Marlow

SAC Chair: Sarah Rappaport

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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)
		Masters in			<p>Seminole Middle School 2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 42% Writing Mastery: 87% Reading Learning Gains: 63% Math Learning Gains: 73% Reading Lowest 25% Making Gains: 61% Math Lowest 25% Making Gains: 76% AMO Progress: Only Asian students met AMO for Reading; Hispanic, Black and ED students met AMO for Math</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 73% Writing Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 47% AYP Data: Total students, Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Total students, Black, Hispanic, ED and</p>

Principal	Kathryn Marlow	<p>Educational Leadership</p> <p>Professional Certificate</p> <p>History 6-12</p> <p>Ed. Leadership (K-12)</p>	3	11	<p>SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>Stranahan High</p> <p>2009-2010- Grade: B Reading Mastery: 35% Math Mastery: 69% Science Mastery: 34% Writing Mastery: 78% AYP: Total students, Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged students did not make AYP in both Reading and Math</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade: C Reading Mastery: 42% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 33% Writing Mastery: 87% AYP: Black and Economically Disadvantage did not make AYP in Reading</p> <p>2007-2008 Grade: D Reading Mastery: 38% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 35% Writing Mastery: 88% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math.</p>
Assis Principal	William DeKlavon	<p>Bachelor's in Religious Studies</p> <p>Master's Degree in Educational Leadership</p> <p>Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels)</p> <p>Mathematics (Grades 5-9)</p>	10	10	<p>2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 42% Writing Mastery: 87% Reading Learning Gains: 63% Math Learning Gains: 73% Reading Lowest 25% Making Gains: 61% Math Lowest 25% Making Gains: 76% AMO Progress: Only Asian students met AMO for Reading; Hispanic, Black and ED students met AMO for Math</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 73% Writing Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 47% AYP Data: Total students, Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Total students, Black, Hispanic, ED and SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 74% Science Mastery: 47% Writing Mastery: 92% AYP: Did not make AYP in Reading for ELL and Black; Did not make Math AYP in ELL, Black and SWD</p> <p>2008-09 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 67% Math Mastery: 70% Science Mastery: 40%. AYP: Total students, Black, Hispanic, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Reading. AYP: Total students, Black, Hispanic, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: B, Reading Mastery 68% Math Mastery 68% Science Mastery 37% AYP: Black, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Reading AYP: Black, Hispanic, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade B Reading Mastery: 62% Math Mastery 66%. Science Mastery 34% AYP % Black, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Black, FRPL, ELL, SWD</p>

					did not make AYP in Math.
Assis Principal	Jill Fiorentino	<p>Bachelor's Degree in English Education 6-12</p> <p>Master's Degree in Educational Leadership</p> <p>Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels)</p> <p>ESOL Endorsement</p> <p>English (6-12)</p>	5	9	<p>2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 42% Writing Mastery: 87% Reading Learning Gains: 63% Math Learning Gains: 73% Reading Lowest 25% Making Gains: 61% Math Lowest 25% Making Gains: 76% AMO Progress: Only Asian students met AMO for Reading; Hispanic, Black and ED students met AMO for Math</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 73% Writing Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 47% AYP Data: Total students, Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Total students, Black, Hispanic, ED and SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 74% Science Mastery: 47% Writing Mastery: 92% AYP: Did not make AYP in Reading for ELL and Black; Did not make Math AYP in ELL, Black and SWD</p> <p>2008-09 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 67% Math mastery: 70% Science Mastery: 40%. AYP: Total students, Black, Hispanic, FRPL, ELL SWD, did not make AYP in Reading. AYP: Total students, Black, Hispanic, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>Indian Ridge</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: A Reading Mastery 82% Math Mastery 81 Science Mastery 37%. AYP: Black, SWD did not make AYP in Reading AYP: Black, FRPL, SWD did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade A Reading Mastery: 82% Math Mastery 83% Science Mastery 34% AYP: SWD did not make AYP in Math</p>
Assis Principal	Shantell Curry	<p>Master's Degree in Educational Leadership</p> <p>Bachelor's Degree in Chemistry</p> <p>Certification: Math Middle Grades (5-9)</p> <p>Math (6-12)</p> <p>Educational Leadership</p> <p>ESOL Endorsement</p>	2	2	<p>2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 42% Writing Mastery: 87% Reading Learning Gains: 63% Math Learning Gains: 73% Reading Lowest 25% Making Gains: 61% Math Lowest 25% Making Gains: 76% AMO Progress: Only Asian students met AMO for Reading; Hispanic, Black and ED students met AMO for Math</p> <p>2010-2011 District Instructional Facilitator working with target schools in the content area of Math.</p>

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	JoAnn Ruiz	<p>Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration/Accounting</p> <p>Certification: Elementary Education 1-6</p> <p>ESOL Endorsement</p> <p>Reading Endorsed K-12</p> <p>Middle Grades English 5-9</p>	10	4	<p>2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 42% Writing Mastery: 87% Reading Learning Gains: 63% Math Learning Gains: 73% Reading Lowest 25% Making Gains: 61% Math Lowest 25% Making Gains: 76% AMO Progress: Only Asian students met AMO for Reading; Hispanic, Black and ED students met AMO for Math</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 73% Writing Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 47% AYP Data: Total students, Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Total students, Black, Hispanic, ED and SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 74% Science Mastery: 47% Writing Mastery: 92% AYP: Did not make AYP in Reading for ELL and Black; Did not make Math AYP in ELL, Black and SWD</p> <p>2008-09 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 67% Math Mastery: 70%, Science Mastery: 40%. Total students, Black, Hispanic, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Total students, Black, Hispanic, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: B, Reading Mastery 68%, Math Mastery 68%, Science Mastery 37%. AYP %, Black, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Black, Hispanic, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 62%, Math Mastery 66%. Science Mastery 34% AYP % Black, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Black, FRPL, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2005-2006: Grade A Reading Mastery 63%, Math Mastery 67%. AYP %, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Reading and SWD did not make AYP in Math</p>

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Regular meetings of new teachers with Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
2	Partnering new teachers or teachers with less than 3 years experience with veteran staff	NESS Liaison	Ongoing	
3	High morale amongst faculty and staff	Administration	Ongoing	
4	Offer frequent support in/out of classroom and Team Collaboration	Administration	Ongoing	
5	Data driven, ongoing staff development using research-based instructional strategies	Administration Department	Ongoing	

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
1 teacher is Out-of-Filed.	The teacher is working to obtain their certification in Speech and Debate. Once he receives the certification he will be highly qualified.

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
71	1.4%(1)	25.4%(18)	39.4%(28)	33.8%(24)	59.2%(42)	0.0%(0)	31.0%(22)	7.0%(5)	90.1%(64)

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I funding is allocated as follows: \$13,575 dedicated to professional development at for all faculty members to increase their content knowledge and knowledge of teaching with research based reading strategies. A portion of our Title I allocation is dedicated to parental involvement, where faculty members will train parents in integrating essential learning strategies at home through our successful Title I Family Nights. \$3293.30 is dedicated to purchasing student agendas to promote communication from school to home. The Reading Coach position is also funded through Title I.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

Teachers participate in district and school-wide professional development in order to stay current on curricular trends and research-based teaching and learning strategies. Title I funds are also used to send some faculty members to state professional development conferences in order to learn new strategies and bring them back to the faculty.

Title III

ELL students receive reading and language arts instruction from ESOL certified teachers. All teachers incorporate ELL strategies into their daily lesson plans.

Title X- Homeless

Teachers and staff members are responsible for helping to identify homeless students and referring them to the Homeless Education Program offered by the district. The purpose of the Homeless Education Program is to identify homeless students, remove barriers to their education, including school enrollment, provide them with supplemental academic and counseling case management services as well as linkages to their school social worker while maintaining school as the students stable environment.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be utilized towards afterschool math and subject area tutoring. They are also used for Saturday FCAT Camp.

Violence Prevention Programs

Seminole Middle School implements the County Student Code of Conduct and follows the District Discipline Matrix. Our school enforces the District's Anti-Bullying Policy and has a zero tolerance for bullying and violence. Bullying prevention programs are supported through Youth Crime Watch, Peer Counseling/Conflict Mediation programs, and student assemblies.

Nutrition Programs

Physical Education Curriculum includes a focus on health and nutrition programs.

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.

The school-based RTI Leadership team consists of Mrs. Marlow, Principal, Mr. DeKlaven, Intern Principal, Mrs. Fiorentino, Assistant Principal, and Ms. Curry, Assistant Principal. The Reading Coach, Joann Ruiz and the math department head, Armando Alejo, as well as other members of the school leadership team will be involved with the RTI Leadership team. The Guidance Director, Robbie Robinson and representatives of the collaborative problem solving team are also on the RtI Leadership Team. The RtI team is facilitated by the Guidance Director, Robbie Robinson. He also serves as the school's case manager. He delegates cases to other members of the team.

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

The RTI Leadership team will meet at least twice per month to discuss reading curriculum, reading throughout all content areas and literacy learning throughout the school. They will also discuss math, writing, science and behavior during these meetings. The team will discuss areas of need and report back to the faculty and School Advisory Committee. The team uses the data points on the RtI form to determine where a student stands and what needs they have. For students that are successful at tier one the data points lead towards dismissal or to continue with their needs at tier two and three. Student data is recorded by their teacher documentations and case managers. The data is then discussed at meetings. Data trends and student data is documented through tracking forms, Super Panther, calendars, and other documentation devices, as necessary per individual student needs. Student behavior and attendance trends are documented and discussed as seen in Pinnacle, teacher observation, DMS, and TERMS. The team uses the Struggling Reader Chart and Struggling Math Chart as guidelines for student placement and support. They also use mini-assessments, Benchmark Tests, teacher-made assessments, and student work to help support their student data collection and support.

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 team will meet to develop, review and discuss the school's improvement plan. The leadership team will meet once a month with the school advisory committee in order to monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan. The RtI Leadership team will meet twice a month to discuss Tier 1 data. This data will be reviewed in the areas of reading, math, science, writing and behavior. The data will drive curriculum through discussions about necessary modifications and classroom behavior strategies. During these meetings members will look for data in order to identify at-risk students. The students who are deemed to be at-risk may be referred to the schools Collaborative Problem Solving team for discussion and review. Data will be collected thorough BAT 1 and 2, mini-bats, classroom walk-throughs, teacher inventories. Students who are in need of in-depth evaluation will also be monitored through intervention records and progress monitoring graphs and charts. Collaborative decision making will drive the action plan. The team will use data, test scores, classroom walk-throughs and observations to determine need areas. They will then track and monitor teaching using the Super Panther database.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Broward Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2 for reading, math), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
Progress Monitoring: PMRN, FAIR, and Mini Assessments in reading, math, and science.
Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), BAT 2
End of year: FAIR, FCAT
Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis
The data management systems used to summarize tiered data are MIDAS, Virtual Counselor, and a school based data system.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Our staff will be trained through staff development. Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the monthly RtI Leadership Team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS will be supported through progress monitoring and ongoing discussions between the Department Head and their administrator. The administrators will be completing an ongoing log to document progress monitoring throughout their department.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Kathryn Marlow, Principal

William Deklavon, Intern Principal
Joann Ruiz, Reading Coach
Tony Matranga, Media Specialist
Sarah Rappaport, Intensive Reading Teacher, 8th Grade
Cheryl Reep, Language Arts, 7th Grade
Armando Alejo, Math Coach
Steve Boyd, Science, 7th Grade
Mell Rupp, Social Studies, 8th Grade
Dawn McCann, ESE Specialist

Members of the Literacy Leadership Team all have strong backgrounds in reading and literacy and they demonstrate a willingness to build school literacy culture through collegiality and collaboration.

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

Under the guidance of the Principal and the Reading Coach, the team will meet at least once a month to focus on literacy initiatives, programs, data, and literacy concerns throughout the school.

The Literacy Leadership Team will regularly reflect on the focus of the group to ensure that the function and mission of the team is maintained throughout the school year.

One of the key goals of the Literacy Leadership Team will be to ensure that all schools stakeholders understand and support the work of the reading coach and obtain support for achieving the school's reading goals through a whole-school approach.

The Literacy Leadership Team will disseminate information through Department Meetings, Team Meetings and Departmental PLC's. The members of this team are responsible for bringing back any concerns of their respective departments and teams as they pertain to literacy.

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

- * Engage in regular, ongoing, literacy professional development
- * Participate in Professional Learning Communities and Study Groups
- * Use data to analyze the effectiveness of instruction and redesign instruction and resources to meet the student's instructional and intervention needs.
- * Implement the Comprehensive Core Reading Programs or Comprehensive Intensive Reading Programs and scientifically based reading instruction and strategies with fidelity
- * Participate in ongoing literacy dialogue with peers
- * Create and share activities designed to promote literacy
- * Support and participate in classroom research
- * Support and participate in classroom demonstrations and modeling of research-based reading strategies
- * Mentor other teachers and present staff development
- * Reflect on practice to improve instruction
- * Create a model classroom designed to showcase best practices of reading and content area teachers
- * Word of the Day program to promote school-wide reading and literacy learning
- * PLC's focused on literacy learning and reading across the curriculum.
- * Utilizing research-based reading strategies throughout the school to strengthen students' reading abilities
- * Train content area teachers in the usage of reading strategies through their curriculum.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Reading strategies are taught to the entire staff during weekly professional development. Teachers are given a strategy calendar and expected to focus and integrate that strategy into their curriculum. Every classroom also teaches a school wide word of the day to build vocabulary skills. All classroom teachers are expected to use reading questioning stems while teaching and on assessments.

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In grades 6-8, all students who were Level 3 were enrolled in reading classes. Reading classes focused on novel study, vocabulary enrichment and critical thinking skills. Students were also offered opportunities to attend extended learning classes after school and on Saturday mornings.
---	--

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

In grades 6-8, 28%(325) of students achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grades 6-8, 33% (373) of the students will achieve mastery for reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
---	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of academic reading comprehension skills.	Teachers will infuse research based content reading strategies into their classroom.	Administration Reading Coach Department Heads	Lesson Plans Student Work Classroom Walk-throughs	Classroom Assessment FCAT BAT
2	Teachers infusing effective delivery methods that address the needs of all learners.	Implementation of weekly, specifically detailed Professional Development Opportunities centered around Differentiating Instruction. Sharing of best practices based on effective reading delivery.	Grade Level Administrators, Reading Coach,	Classroom Walk Throughs Mini Assessment Data Benchmark Assessment Data	Classroom walkthrough log and focused walkthroughs to determine frequency of higher order questions and the full implementation of differentiating instruction.
3	Content Teachers having a limited understanding of how to integrate the standards into the curriculum.	Reading Professional Learning Communities focusing on Grade Level content. Professional Development on how to integrate reading standards into content area curriculum. Teachers will follow a school-wide Instructional Focus Calendar	Reading Coach Principal Grade Level Assistant Principals	Teacher Attendance Active teacher participation Teacher Observations utilizing strategy Classroom Walk Throughs Observations Coaching	Mini BATS FCAT BEEP Mini Assessments Teacher made tests
4	Lack of higher order vocabulary skills.	Teachers will incorporate vocabulary strategies into their instruction.	Teacher Reading Coach Principal Grade Level Administrators,	Classroom Walk Throughs Observations Mini Assessments/BAT Testings	Mini BATS Teacher Made Tests Classroom Work
	The lack of daily reading instruction for proficient readers.	Increasing rigor in the content area class implementing effective	Reading Coach Principal	Benchmark Testing Mini Assessments	Teacher made tests

5	<p>reading strategies with fidelity.</p> <p>Professional Development Opportunities on Differentiated Instruction</p> <p>Teachers will follow a school-wide Instructional Focus Calendar</p>	Grade Level Administrators	BEEP mini assessments
---	---	----------------------------	-----------------------

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	In grades 6-8, self-contained ESE students are taught by in a daily reading class by an ESE trained, Reading teacher. These students work on their individualized goals, as determined by their yearly testing and IEP's. Students work in small groups, in centers and with the Teacher to meet their goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FAA, 10% (2) students scored a level 4, 5, or 6 in Reading.	In grades 6-8, 15% (3) of the students will achieve Levels 4, 5 or 6 on the Reading portion of the FAA.

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	Inadequate Vocabularies	Teachers will create and use sight word centers to build sight word vocabularies.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Lessons and walk-throughs Student sight word checklists	San Diego/DAR Student Work
2	Lack of retention	Teachers will infuse repeated readings into classroom lesson plans. They will also incorporate centers based on the repeated readings.	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom lesson plans Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work FAA
3	Students do not have adequate real-world experiences	Teachers will incorporate realia and real-world experience based learning into the classroom.	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom Lessons Classroom walk-throughs Writing and Language samples based on new experiences	Writing Samples Student Work

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In grades 6-7, Level 4 and 5 students are enrolled in reading classes. Students in grades 6-8 are also enrolled in critical thinking and research classes to build skills needed in Reading. Students read and analyze text in all content classes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 31% (361) of all students achieved a level 4 or 5 on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	In grades 6-8, 36% (421) of all students will achieve a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Reading FCAT.

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	The lack of daily reading instruction for proficient readers.	Increasing the rigor in the content area classes utilizing effective reading strategies with fidelity. Differentiated Instruction in content area classes to help with students' problem areas.	Reading Coach Principal Grade Level Assistant Principals	Mini Assessments Benchmark Testing	FCAT Reading BEEP Mini Assessments Teacher made tests
2	Lack of motivation to read during the middle school years.	Motivational incentives within the classroom, like homework passes, hands on activities, pencils and other incentives to encourage reading.	Teacher	Reading logs with reflective writing pieces	Report Cards Student Progress Monitoring System
3	Lack of metacognition skills.	Classroom teacher will infuse higher order/critical thinking strategies with their lessons.	Teacher Grade Level Administrators	Classroom observation along with minibats; Benchmarks Data Chats with students	Teacher Made Tests End of Unit Tests
4	Lack of participation in school-wide Extended Learning Opportunities.	Marketing of programs to show that they will be effective for Level 4 and 5 students.	Grade Level Administrators Curriculum Coaches	Attendance of Level 4 and 5 students in various school-wide Extended Learning Opportunities.	Attendance Student Progress

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:	In grades 6-8, self-contained ESE students are taught by in a daily reading class by an ESE trained, Reading teacher. These students work on their individualized goals, as determined by their yearly testing and IEP's. Students work in small groups, in centers and with the Teacher to meet their goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FAA 40%(8) of students scored at or above a Level 7 in Reading.	In grades 6-8, 45% (9) of the students will achieve a Level 7 or higher on the Reading portion of the FAA.

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 retention	Teachers will focus on repeated readings and repeated emphasis on important topics	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Lesson Plans Student Work Student's ability to retell a story	Student Work
2	Trouble understanding the question being asked	Teachers will incorporate test-taking strategies into the classroom; they will teach questioning techniques	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator Classroom Teacher	Student Work Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work FAA
3	Lack of real-world experiences and understanding	Teachers will incorporate the use of realia into everyday classroom experiences	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Student Work Language Experiences to guide reading and writing Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work Language experiences work samples FAA

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

of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Reading is offered to all students in all grades. Students also read and analyze text in all content areas. Reading is a school-wide focus in order to maintain learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 63% (718) of all students made learning gains on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	In grades 6-8, 68% (769) of all students will make learning gains on the 2013 Reading FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students' inability to read/understand/answer high order questions.	Teachers create high order questions in lesson plans utilizing middle school task cards and question stems.	Teacher Department Head Reading Coach	Classroom Assessments Mini Assessments	FCAT Reading BAT Testing Mini Assessments
2	The absence of academic vocabulary	Teachers will infuse research based vocabulary strategies into the classroom and class lesson and activities.	Department Head Reading Coach	Lesson Plans Classroom WalkThroughs	FCAT Reading Mini Assesements
3	Student regression after BAT 1	Provide reading enrichment throughout the year	Grade Level Administrator Reading Coach	Review student progress from mini bats and BAT 2	Mini Assessments BAT 2
4	Amount of time students are engaged in Reading	All students will be enrolled in either a reading or critical thinking class	Reading Coach Administration	FAIR, Benchmark and mini benchmark assessments	Master Schedule

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	In grades 6-8, self-contained ESE students are taught by in a daily reading class by an ESE trained, Reading teacher. Classroom lesson are based on students' individualized goals, as determined by their yearly testing and IEP's. Students work in small groups, in centers and with the teacher to meet their goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FAA, 33% (5) students made learning gains in reading.	In grades 6-8, 38% (6) students will make learning gains on the 2013 FAA.

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	Inadequate Vocabularies	Teachers will create and use sight word centers to build sight word vocabularies.	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom Lessons and walk-throughs Student sight word checklists	San Diego/DAR Student Work
2	Trouble understanding the question being asked	Teachers will incorporate test-taking strategies into the classroom; they	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Student Work Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work FAA

		will teach questioning techniques	Classroom Teacher		
3	Lack of real-world experiences and understanding	Teachers will incorporate the use of realia into everyday classroom experiences	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Student Work Language Experiences to guide reading and writing Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work Language experiences work samples FAA

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In grades 6-8, all students who were Level 1, 2, and 3 were enrolled in reading classes. Level 1 and 2 students were in 90 minutes of reading everyday. They also were provided with enrichment activities through their elective and content area classes. After school and Saturday FCAT camps were also available.
---	---

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

In grades 6-8, 61% (181) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains as measured by the Reading FCAT in 2012.	In grades 6-8, 66% (196) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains as measured by the Reading FCAT in 2013.
---	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Textbook readability.	Level 1 and 2 students will participate in fluency and comprehension building activities in reading and content area classes to increase comfortability with the textbook. CRISS strategies will be utilized throughout the curriculum.	Reading Coach Grade Level Assistant Principals	Classroom WalkThroughs Lesson Plans	Mini Assessments Reading FCAT
2	Students lack mastery of comprehension strategies	Effective comprehension strategies will be infused throughout all content areas Teachers will incorporate reading strategies as defined by the school-wide Reading IFC.	Department Chair Reading Coach Principal Grade Level Administrators	Classroom Walkthroughs Observations Lesson Plans	Mini Assessments Reading FCAT
3	Lack of listening comprehension	Reading teachers will incorporate listening centers into their lesson plans.	Reading Coach Grade Level Assistant Principals	Classroom Walkthroughs Observations	Reading FCAT Mini-Benchmarks

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 #					
	The target AMO for Reading in 2011-2012 was 62% (725) proficiency. This target was not met since we only had 59% (691) of our students at proficiency. The only subgroup that met reading proficiency was Asian. The Hispanic, ELL					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	62% (725)	66% (772)	69% (809)	73% (856)	76% (891)	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In grades 6-8, all students who were Level 1, 2, and 3 were enrolled in reading classes. Level 1 and 2 students were in 90 minutes of reading everyday. They also were provided with enrichment activities through their elective and content area classes. After school and Saturday FCAT camps were also available.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 29% (109) of White students, 41% (128) of Hispanic students, 55% (217) of Black students, 20% (8) of Asian students and 50% (2) of American Indian students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	In 2013 the number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease to 24% (90) of White students, 50% (198) of Black students, 34% (106) of Hispanic students, 10% (4) of Asian students and 25% (1) of American Indian students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of critical thinking skills	Teachers will infuse higher order thinking questions into classroom lessons.	Administration and Reading Coach	Classroom observation Student Portfolios Data Chats between mini-bats	Student Work End of Chapter Tests Benchmark Exams
2	Inadequate Vocabularies	Reading classes will use research-based vocabulary strategies to incorporate specific vocabulary instruction to all students.	Reading Coach Teachers Grade Level Administrators	Classroom Assessments will determine students' understanding of the new vocabularies	Classroom Assessments
3	Amount of time students are engaged in reading.	All students will be enrolled in either a reading or critical thinking class	Reading Coach and Administrator	FAIR, Benchmark and mini-benchmark assessments	Master Schedule
4	Lack of basic reading knowledge and skills	These students will be placed in an intensive reading program	Reading Coach Administration	BATS, FAIR, and mini-benchmark assessments	Assessment Results and Reports
5	Individualized Instruction is not delivered to strengthen areas of need	Teachers will implement differentiated instruction strategies as learned through professional learning communities based on research-based reading strategies	Grade Level Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Observation Teacher Lesson Plans Student performance and work	End of Unit Tests FAIR Student Work Sample

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	In grades 6-8, all students who were Level 1, 2, and 3 were enrolled in reading classes. Level 1 and 2 students were in 90 minutes of reading everyday. They also were provided with enrichment activities through their elective and content area classes. After school and Saturday FCAT camps were also available.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 94% (18) of English Language Learners did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	In 2013 the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in reading will drop to at least 85% (16).

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 critical thinking skills.	Infuse higher order thinking questions in classroom lessons.	Grade Level Administrators Reading Coach	Classroom observation and student portfolios with student work Classroom Walk-Throughs	Student Work Portfolios
2	Amount of time students are engaged in reading	All students will be enrolled in either a reading or critical thinking class	Reading Coach Administrator	FAIR, Benchmarks and Mini-Assessments	Master Schedule
3	Inadequate Vocabularies	Teachers will infuse research-based vocabulary strategies into classroom lessons.	Reading Coach Administrators	Classroom assessments Discussions and chats based on word usage	Vocabulary Tests and Quizzes Student Work
4	Individualized instruction is not delivered to strengthen areas of need	Teachers will implement differentiated instruction strategies as learned through professional learning communities	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Observations Teacher Lesson Plans	FAIR Mini-BATS Student Work
5	Difficulty transitioning between native language to English	Use of bilingual dictionaries for language learning Direct instruction in English language	Reading Coach ELL department Administration	Student Work Samples Classroom Observations	Student Work Mini-BATS FAIR
6	Lack of cultural experiences/background knowledge based on everyday American trends	LEA-language experience approach-to help build and introduce background knowledge and discuss shared experiences	Reading Coach Administrator	mini-bats Data Chats	Student Work Samples-writing prompts

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In grades 6-8, all students who were Level 1, 2, and 3 were enrolled in reading classes. Level 1 and 2 students were in 90 minutes of reading everyday. They also were provided with enrichment activities through their elective and content area classes. After school and Saturday FCAT camps were also available. Students with disabilities were also given one on one support through the ESE office. Support was given in and out of various classes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 74% (112) of Students with Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in reading in 2012.	In 2013 the number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decline to at least 69% (104).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of critical thinking skills	Teachers will infuse higher order thinking questions into classroom lessons. Teachers of SWD will work with mainstream teachers to collaborate and create accommodations as necessary	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Observations Student Portfolios	Student Work Samples
2	Inadequate vocabularies	Reading teachers and content area teachers will infuse vocabulary and vocabulary strategies	Reading Coach Administration	Classroom assessments will determine students' understanding of new words	Classroom Assessment

		into daily lesson plans.			
3	Amount of time students are engaged in Reading	All level 1 and 2 students will be enrolled in double reading	Administration ESE Specialist	FAIR; Benchmark Exams; Mini-Benchmarks	Master Schedule
4	Students speed of reading hurts their comprehension	Students will silently read to themselves followed by an active reading while listening to the story on tape	Reading Coach ESE Specialist	Classroom Observations Fluency Portfolios Mini-benchmarks	FAIR Timed Fluency Readings
5	Students language processing difficulties	Focus on phonemic awareness and phonics to make sure processing of words is correct through REWARDS/Wilson	Reading Coach Administration ESE Specialist	Classroom Observations REWARDS/WILSON tests and assessments	Mini-Bats FAIR Program Assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In grades 6-8, all students who were Level 1, 2, and 3 were enrolled in reading classes. Level 1 and 2 students were in 90 minutes of reading everyday. They also were provided with enrichment activities through their elective and content area classes. After school and Saturday FCAT camps were also available.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 53% (351) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading in 2012.	In 2013 the number of ED students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decline to at least 46% (302).

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	Individualized Instruction is not delivered to meet needs of students	Teachers will implement differentiated instruction strategies as learned through professional learning communities	Grade Level Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Observation Teacher Lesson Plans Student performance and work	Teacher Tests Student Work Sample
2	Lack of basic reading knowledge and skills	These students will be placed in an intensive reading program	Reading Coach Administration	BATS, FAIR, and mini-benchmark assessments	Assessment Results and Reports
3	Lack of background knowledge; prior experiences	Teachers will bring real-life examples (United Streaming, guest speakers, Discovery Learning) into the classroom	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Observation; Lesson Plans and Student work	Student work samples Teacher Tests and classroom activities
4	Lack of participation in school-wide Extended Learning Opportunities	Marketing of programs to show that they will be effective for all students to attend.	Grade Level Administrators Curriculum Coaches	Attendance of ED students in various school-wide Extended Learning Opportunities.	Attendance Student Progress

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Based Reading Strategies	6-8 All Teachers	Reading Coach Leadership Team	6-8 Content Area Teachers	Tuesday mornings before school for 20 weeks	Lesson Plans Student Work Samples Classroom Walk-Throughs	Administration Reading Coach Department Heads
Poetry	6-8 Reading Teachers	Reading Coach	6-8 Reading Teachers	4 Sessions during common plannings	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs Student Work Samples	Reading Coach Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Professional Development to Increase Content Knowledge	Stipends for Teachers	Title I	\$893.75
Departmental Professional Development	Substitutes	Title I	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,393.75
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Pull Out Teacher	Small Group Instruction	General Fund	\$5,000.00
FCAT Saturday Camp	Salaries and Materials	General Fund	\$15,000.00
			Subtotal: \$20,000.00
			Grand Total: \$23,393.75

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:	ELL students are grades 6-8 are enrolled in a Reading and Language Arts class. Therefore, they are receiving daily literacy instruction to work on spoken English. Students work with listening centers during their reading classes.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

Based on the CELLA, 40% (6) of 6th grade ELL students, 40% (4) of 7th graders, and 44% (4) of 8th graders were proficient in Listening and Speaking on the CELLA.

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 basic English acquisition skills	Teachers will use realia and labeling in their classes to help with communication and oral language skills	Administration Department Heads	Classroom Walk-Throughs Student verbal language checklists	CELLA Oral speaking checklists and inventories
2	Lack of basic English skills	Teachers will use audio centers to hear good language models	Reading Coach Administration	Lesson Plans with Listening Centers	Mini-Assessments Oral Language Inventories
3	Students struggle with assimilating into new environment	Students will be grouped with strong language models in order to assimilate and learn everyday English	Administration over ELL Department Heads Guidance	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Mini-Assessments CELLA

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:

ELL students in grades 6-8 are enrolled in a Reading and Language Arts class. Therefore, they are receiving daily literacy instruction to work on spoken English. Students work with listening centers during their reading classes.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Based on the 2012 CELLA 28% (5) of ELL 6th graders, 9% (1) of 7th graders, and 33% (3) of 8th graders are proficient on the Reading portion of the test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of fundamental skills in native language.	Daily reading instruction with the focus on small group instruction.	Reading Coach Reading/LA Administrators	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs	CELLA Mini-Assessments
2	Lack of basic vocabulary skills	Focused vocabulary instruction daily in reading and content area classrooms	Reading Coach Administration	Classroom assessments will determine students' understanding of new words	Classroom Assessment
3	Inadequate range of background knowledge	Use of realia to build background knowledge	Reading Coach Administration	Classroom walk-throughs Lesson Plans	Student Work Samples Classroom Assessments

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

ELL students in grades 6-8 are enrolled in a Reading and Language Arts class. Therefore, they are receiving daily literacy instruction to work on spoken English. Students work with teachers to create real world writing samples. Students are given writing assessments monthly.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Based on the 2012 CELLA, 28% (5) 6th graders, 22% (2) 7th graders, 11% (1) 8th grader are proficient on the writing portion of the exam.

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 basic vocabulary skills	Focused vocabulary instruction daily in reading and content area classrooms	Reading Coach Administration	Classroom assessments will determine students' understanding of new words	Classroom Assessment
2	Lack of fundamental skills in native language.	Daily reading instruction with the focus on small group instruction.	Reading Coach Reading/LA Administrators	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs	CELLA Mini-Assessments
3	Lack of basic grammar skills	Teachers will incorporate purposeful, strategic lesson development of grammar	Language Arts Department Head Administrator	Classroom assessments based on grammar standards	Common Assessments Teacher Made Assessments

CELLA Budget:

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	In grades 6-8, all students were enrolled in at least one math class. Students were assigned math classes based on test scores. They were also given opportunities to attend enrichment programs during their electives, after school and on Saturday mornings. Level 1 and 2 students were also enrolled in an intensive math class.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 35% (404) of students achieved proficiency in math on the 2012 FCAT.	In grades 6-8, 40% (469) of students will achieve proficiency on the 2013 FCAT.

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 academic reading comprehension skills.	Teachers will infuse research based content reading strategies into their classroom.	Administration Reading Coach Department Heads	Lesson Plans Student Work Classroom Walk-throughs	Classroom Assessment FCAT BAT
2	Lack of basic math skills.	Teachers will infuse data driven do-nows to reinforce deficient areas, big ideas and/or incorporating new skills.	Administrator Math Department Head	Ongoing through department meetings to discuss student achievement. Ongoing meetings to share practices as they relate to enrichment. Classroom Walk-Throughs	Teacher Made Common Assessments Project Based Assessments
3	Difficulty transitioning to the new math big ideas.	Teachers are attending and will be provided with intensive training on how to use the new standards and textbooks to better reach the needs of their students. They will also infuse new ideas and skills into their math curriculum.	Administrator Math Department Head	Weekly monitoring of common assessments Through weekly department meetings discussion of IFC's and how they relate to assessment.	Textbook and Common Assessment Data
4	Need for individualized instruction	Teachers will implement differentiated instruction strategies learned through professional learning communities	Administrators Math Department Head	Weekly discussion of strategies and implementation of differentiating instruction through PLC's	Mini-Bats Teacher Made Assessments Student Work

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:	In grades 6-8, self-contained ESE students are taught by in a daily math class by an ESE trained, math teacher. These students work on their individualized goals, as determined by their yearly testing and IEP's. Students work in small groups, in centers and with the teacher to meet their goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In grades 6-8, 25% (5) of students were proficient on the 2012 FAA.	In grades 6-8, 30% (8) of students will be a Level 4-6 on the 2013 FAA.
---	---

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	Inadequate Vocabularies	Teachers will create and use sight word centers to build sight word vocabularies.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Lessons and walk-throughs Student sight word checklists	San Diego/DAR Student Work
2	Lack of retention	Teachers will infuse repeated readings into classroom lesson plans. They will also incorporate centers based on the repeated readings.	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom lesson plans Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work FAA
3	Students do not have adequate real-world experiences	Teachers will incorporate realia and real-world experience based learning into the classroom.	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom Lessons Classroom walk-throughs Writing and Language samples based on new experiences	Writing Samples Student Work
4	Lack of understanding what is being asked	Students will be given a wide range of skills and questioning techniques for classroom use.	ESE Teacher ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom Lessons Classroom Walk-Throughs	Student Work

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In grades 6-8, all students were enrolled in at least one math class. Students were assigned math classes based on test scores. Level 4 and 5 students were enrolled in advanced math classes and GEM. These rigorous courses ensure students are critically thinking about math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 32% (375) of students achieved above proficiency in math on the 2012 FCAT.	In grades 6-8, 37% (434) of students will achieve above proficiency in math on the 2013 FCAT.

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 flexibility in the curriculum for opportunities to incorporate higher order math skills through real world application.	Provide students with project based learning opportunities based on the math skills taught within the curriculum.	Administrator Math Curriculum Leader	Ongoing discussions based on student data and best practices in math department meetings amongst advanced and GEM math teachers	Projects Student Work
2	Students lack the metacognitive skills to complete higher order thinking problems	Teachers will infuse higher order thinking teaching practices and/or higher order thinking questions when formulating assessments	Administrator Math Curriculum Leader	Teachers will infuse higher order thinking teaching practices and/or higher order thinking questions when formulating assessments	Monitoring of Data Classroom Assessments BAT
	Lack of participation in school-wide Extended	Marketing of programs to show that it will be	Administrator	Attendance at school-wide ELO's.	Student Work

3	Learning Programs.	effective for Level 4 and 5 students.	Math Curriculum Leader	Teacher Made Assessments ELO Attendance
---	--------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------	--

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	In grades 6-8, self-contained ESE students are taught by in a daily math class by an ESE trained, math teacher. These students work on their individualized goals, as determined by their yearly testing and IEP's. Students work in small groups, in centers and with the teacher to meet their goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 30% (6) of students scored at or above Level 7 in mathematics on the 2012 FAA.	In grades 6-8, 35% (7) of students will score at or above Level 7 in mathematics on the 2012 FAA.

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 retention	Teachers will focus on repeated readings and repeated emphasis on important topics	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Lesson Plans Student Work Student's ability to retell a story	Student Work
2	Trouble understanding the question being asked	Teachers will incorporate test-taking strategies into the classroom; they will teach questioning techniques	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator Classroom Teacher	Student Work Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work FAA
3	Lack of real-world experiences and understanding	Teachers will incorporate the use of realia into everyday classroom experiences	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Student Work Language Experiences to guide reading and writing Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work Language experiences work samples FAA
4	Lack of fundamental math skills	Teachers will focus on basic math skills through daily repetition and practice	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Student Work	Lesson Plans Student Work

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In grades 6-8, all students were enrolled in at least one math class. Students were assigned math classes based on test scores. They were also given opportunities to attend enrichment programs during their electives, after school and on Saturday mornings. Level 1 and 2 students were also enrolled in an intensive math class.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 74% (837) of students made learning gains in math on the 2012 FCAT.	In grades 6-8, 79% (896) of students will make learning gains in math on the 2013 FCAT.

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 fundamental math skills	Students needing extra support in math skills are pulled out of electives to focus on math enrichment.	Administrator Math Department Head	Pre and Post Diagnostic Exam will be used for progress monitoring Weekly classroom assessments Data from BAT to determine strength areas and areas for improvement	Pre and Post Diagnostic Exams, Classroom Assessment and BAT data
2	Lack of math usage in everyday life	Incorporate everyday math exposure into the math curriculum	Administrator Math Department Head	Classroom Assessments and BAT data will show students understanding of basic math concepts	Exams Teacher Made Tests Mini-Bats
3	Ability to reach low performing students	Training of how to teach low performing students and sharing of best practices at weekly dept. meetings in order to increase ability to reach targeted students	Administrator Math Department Head	Classroom Walk-throughs to show using new best practices.	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 3b:	In grades 6-8, self-contained ESE students are taught by in a daily math class by an ESE trained, math teacher. These students work on their individualized goals, as determined by their yearly testing and IEP's. Students work in small groups, in centers and with the teacher to meet their goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 38% (6) of students made learning gains in math on the 2012 FAA.	In grades 6-8, 43% (7) of students will make learning gains in math on the 2013 FAA.

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	Inadequate Vocabularies	Teachers will create and use sight word centers to build sight word vocabularies.	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom Lessons and walk-throughs Student sight word checklists	San Diego/DAR Student Work
2	Trouble understanding the question being asked	Teachers will incorporate test-taking strategies into the classroom; they will teach questioning techniques	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator Classroom Teacher	Student Work Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work FAA
3	Lack of real-world experiences and understanding	Teachers will incorporate the use of realia into everyday classroom experiences	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Student Work Language Experiences to guide reading and writing Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work Language experiences work samples FAA
4	Lack of basic math skills	Teachers will incorporate daily practice of basic math skills into classroom instruction	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom Lessons and Walk-Throughs	Student Work

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In grades 6-8, all students were enrolled in at least one math class. Students were assigned math classes based on test scores. They were also given opportunities to attend enrichment programs during their electives, after school and on Saturday mornings. Level 1 and 2 students were also enrolled in an intensive math class.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 76% (226) of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT.	In grades 6-8, 81% (241) students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains in math on the 2013 FCAT.

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 technology to enhance basic math skills through the curriculum.	Students will be granted access to the use of various technology resources to include : ConnectED, Promethain Board activities, Compass Learning Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, wireless carts, First In Math (check and see if available)	Math Department Head Administrator Technology Head	Ongoing assessments and progress reports taken from various software databases-data used to drive instruction (FCIM)	computer-based software assessments
2	Lack of basic math skills	Teachers will infuse basic math skills into the curriculum through repetition and review of missing skills.	Math Department Head Teachers Administrator	Ongoing assessments and evaluations from classroom lessons Mini-Assessment data chats Ongoing discussions and sharing of practices/test scores of intensive math teachers to determine student data trends and needs.	Mini-Assessments Benchmark Exams Classroom Assessments
3	Amount of time students are engaged in mathematics	All level 1 or 2 students will be enrolled in an intensive math class	Math Department Head Administration	FCAT results to determine placements	Master Schedule
4	Lack of academic vocabulary	Math teachers will infuse reading strategies into their curriculum to increase student vocabularies. Teachers will also support the school-wide Word of the Day Program.	Math Department Head Administration Reading Coach	Ongoing classroom assessment of math vocabularies Teacher-made tests that incorporate academic and testing vocabulary	Classroom Assessments FCAT Mini-Bats

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 # The target AMO for Math in 2011-2012 was 65% (762) proficiency. The actual score we achieved was 66% (774). However, only the Hispanic, Black and ED subgroups met the target AMO for Math. Asian, White and ELL maintained or					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

	66% (762)	68% (797)	72% (844)	75% (879)	78% (914)	
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

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:	Subgroups not making AYP in mathematics are Black, English language learners and students with a disability, ED, and Hispanic. In grades 6-8, all students were enrolled in at least one math class. Students were assigned math classes based on test scores. They were also given opportunities to attend enrichment programs during their electives, after school and on Saturday mornings. Level 1 and 2 students were also enrolled in an intensive math class.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 26% (98) of White students, 44% (174) of Black students, 32% (100) of Hispanic students, 23% (9) of Asian students, and 25% (1) of Indian students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT.	On the 2013 FCAT the number of students not making satisfactory progress on the math portion of the test will drop to 21%(79) of White students, 39% (155) of Black students, 27% (85) of Hispanic students, 18% (7) of Asian students and 0% (0) of Indian students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of fundamental math skills.	Students will be placed in an intensive math program	Math Department Head Administrator	Data chats and evaluation of data based on benchmark exams and mini-bats	Mini-Bats BAT
2	Lack of critical thinking skills	Infuse higher order questions into classroom lessons	Administration Math Department Head	Classroom observation and student work samples	Student Work Classroom Assessments
3	Students need more exposure to reading strategies in the math classroom.	Teachers will infuse research based effective reading strategies into their math curriculum	Reading Coach Administrators Math Department Head	Sharing of best practices through weekly department meetings and assistance from reading coach.	BAT common assessments.
4	Need for reinforcement of classroom math lessons	Students who are in need of math reinforcement will be placed in a pull-out program during their elective class in order to focus on their area of need	Math Department Head Administrators	Student work samples and scores on District and classroom assessments	BAT Mini-Bats Classroom Assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	In grades 6-8, all students were enrolled in at least one math class. Students were assigned math classes based on test scores. They were also given opportunities to attend enrichment programs during their electives, after school and on Saturday mornings. Level 1 and 2 students were also enrolled in an intensive math class.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 68% (13) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 FCAT.	In 2013, the number of students not making satisfactory progress in math will drop to 61%(11) of ELL students.

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
	Students lack of	Students will be placed in	Math Department	Data chats based on	Mini-Bats

1	fundamental math skills.	an intensive math program	Head Administrator	mini-bats and BAT testing; progress monitoring of data and areas of strength and areas of need	BAT Classroom Assessments
2	Lack of critical thinking skills	Infuse higher order questions into classroom lessons	Administrators Math Department Heads Teachers	Classroom observation and student work samples	Student Work Teacher Made Tests
3	Students need more exposure to reading strategies in the math classroom.	Teachers will infuse research based effective reading strategies into their math curriculum	Reading Coach Administrators Math Department Head	Sharing of best practices through weekly department meetings and assistance from Reading Coach.	Student Work, BAT data, common assessments
4	Students lack the basic English skills to decode word problems or written directions in math textbook.	Students will be given bilingual dictionaries to use as necessary in their math classes	Reading Coach Administration Math Department Head	Classroom Walk-Throughs focused on effective use of dictionaries Math Word Wall and activities to promote understanding of key math terms	Student Work Teacher Assessments
5	Students lack an understanding of basic math skills.	Students will attend Saturday FCAT camp to reinforce basic math skills.	Reading Coach Administration Math Department Head	Weekly assessments and projects at FCAT camp will be analyzed to determine effectiveness of strategies	Weekly Common Assessments Student Work

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In grades 6-8, all students were enrolled in at least one math class. Students were assigned math classes based on test scores. They were also given opportunities to attend enrichment programs during their electives, after school and on Saturday mornings. Level 1 and 2 students were also enrolled in an intensive math class. Students with Disabilities also received one-on-one support from an ESE support facilitator to make sure they were successful in their math classes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 66% (99) of Students with Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT.	In 2013, the number of SWD students who do not make satisfactory progress on the math FCAT will drop to 60% (90) students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of fundamental math skills.	Students will be placed in an intensive math program	Math Department Head Administrator	Data chats based on results of assessment exams	BAT Mini-Bats Teacher Assessments
2	Lack of critical thinking skills	Infuse higher order questions into classroom lessons	Administration Math Department Head Teachers	Classroom observation and student work samples	Student Work Samples Teacher Made Assessments
3	Students need more exposure to reading strategies in the math classroom.	Teachers will infuse research based effective reading strategies into their math curriculum	Reading Coach Administrators Math Department Head	Sharing of best practices through weekly department meetings and assistance from Reading Coach	Student Work BAT data, common assessments
	Students become overwhelmed by multiple	Teachers will break up problems into step-by-	Math Department Head	Student work samples	Student Work

4	parts of a single math problem	step pieces through differentiated instruction.	Administrator	Data chats to determine effectiveness of instruction based on individualized student needs	Classroom Assessments
5	Students have trouble keeping track of their assignments	Students will be given a student planner to organize work and assignments	Reading Coach Department Heads Administrator	Teacher planner checks to make sure planners are being used to organize assignments; frequency of missing homework and classwork assignments decreases	Student Work Completion of student homework

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	In grades 6-8, all students were enrolled in at least one math class. Students were assigned math classes based on test scores. They were also given opportunities to attend enrichment programs during their electives, after school and on Saturday mornings. Level 1 and 2 students were also enrolled in an intensive math class.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 43% (282) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 FCAT.	In 2013, the number of ED students who do not make satisfactory progress in math will drop to 37% (244).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are unable to attend afterschool and weekend ELO's due to transportation	Offer opportunities for pull-out and extra support to students during the traditional school day	Administration Math Department Head	Attendance in pull-out sessions	Attendance Records
2	Lack of basic math skills.	All level 1 and 2 students will be enrolled in an intensive math class.	Administrator	Benchmark Data and Mini-Assessment data	Master Schedule
3	Amount of time students are given for basic math skills	Students will be given an opportunity to attend FCAT camps to enrich basic math skills	Administrator Math Department Head	Benchmark Data; Teacher made classroom assessments	Test Scores and Data

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	In grades 6-8, advanced students are enrolled in an Algebra course. Level 4-5 students were enrolled in advanced math classes and GEM. These rigorous courses ensure students are critically thinking about math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 EOC 59% (78) of students scored a Level 3 in Algebra.	Based on the 2013 EOC 64% (85) of students will score a Level 3 in Algebra.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of prerequisite math skills	Teachers will conduct an after school EOC program to reinforce basic math skills	Math Coach Math Administrator	Student work	Lesson Plans Student Work Samples
2	Lack of participation in after school ELO opportunities	The Math Department will conduct an EOC Parent Night	Math Coach Math Administrator	Parent Link Parent Sign In Sheets	Parent Attendance Student Attendance at ELO's
3	Student discomfort with computer based assessments	Provide sample questions and computer opportunities to increase student comfort with computer-based testing	Math Coach Math Administrator	Student Work Classroom Walk-Throughs Computer Based Testing Results	Student Work Samples

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	In grades 6-8, advanced students are enrolled in an Algebra course. Level 4-5 students were enrolled in advanced math classes and GEM. These rigorous courses ensure students are critically thinking about math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Algebra EOC 32% (43) students scored at or above an Achievement Level 4.	Based on the 2013 Algebra EOC, 37% (49) students will score at or above an Achievement Level 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 prerequisite math skills	Teachers will conduct an after school EOC program to reinforce basic math skills	Math Coach Math Administrator	Student Work Lesson Plans	Student Work Samples
2	Lack of participation in after school ELO opportunities	The Math Department will conduct an EOC Parent Night	Math Coach Math Administrator	Parent Link Parent Sign In Sheets	Parent Attendance Student Attendance at ELO's
3	Student discomfort with computer based assessments	Provide sample questions and computer opportunities to increase student comfort with computer-based testing	Math Coach Math Administrator	Student Work Classroom Walk-Throughs	Computer Based Testing Results Student Work Samples

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal #					
	3A :					
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:	In grades 6-8, advanced students are enrolled in an Algebra course. Level 4-5 students were enrolled in advanced math classes and GEM. These rigorous courses ensure students are critically thinking about math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Algebra EOC, 14% (9) of White students, 0% (0) of Black students, 7% (3) of Hispanic students and 0% (0) of Asian students did not make satisfactory progress in Algebra.	In 2013, the number of students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra will drop to 7% (4) of White students and 4% (2) of Hispanic students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack some prerequisite math skills	Teachers will create an after school EOC program to reinforce basic math skills	Math Coach Math Administrator	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs	Student Work Samples BAT/mini-assessments
2	Lack of participation in after school programs/tutoring	Math Department will conduct an EOC parent night to inform parents of necessity of participating in ELO's	Math Coach Math Administrator	Attendance at ELO's	Student Work Student attendance at ELO's
3	Lack of comfort with computer-based testing	Teachers will incorporate computer based testing practice into classroom instruction	Math Coach Math Administrator	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Student Work Student attendance at ELO's

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:
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:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	In grades 6-8, advanced students are enrolled in an Algebra course. Level 4-5 students were enrolled in advanced math classes and GEM. These rigorous courses ensure students are critically thinking about math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Algebra EOC 0%(0) of SWD students were not proficient on the exam.	In 2013, we expect to again have all students make satisfactory progress on the Algebra EOC.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack some prerequisite math skills	Teachers will create an after school EOC program to reinforce basic math skills	Math Coach Math Administrator	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs	Student Work Samples BAT/mini-assessments
2	Lack of participation in after school programs/tutoring	Math Department will conduct an EOC parent night to inform parents of necessity of participating in ELO's	Math Coach Math Administrator	Attendance at ELO's Student Work	Student attendance at ELO's
3	Lack of comfort with computer-based testing	Teachers will incorporate computer based testing practice into classroom instruction	Math Coach Math Administrator	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Student Work Student attendance at ELO

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	In grades 6-8, advanced students are enrolled in an Algebra course. Level 4-5 students were enrolled in advanced math classes and GEM. These rigorous courses ensure students are critically thinking about math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Algebra EOC, 9% (4) of ED students did not make satisfactory progress in Algebra.	In 2013, the number of ED students not making adequate progress will drop to 4% (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	Students lack some prerequisite math skills	Teachers will create an after school EOC program to reinforce basic math skills	Math Coach Math Administrator	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs	Student Work Samples BAT/mini-assessments
2	Lack of participation in after school programs/tutoring	Math Department will conduct an EOC parent night to inform parents of necessity of participating in ELO's	Math Coach Math Administrator	Attendance at ELO's Student Work	Student attendance at ELO's
3	Lack of comfort with computer-based testing	Teachers will incorporate computer based testing practice into classroom instruction	Math Coach Math Administrator	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Student Work Samples

4	Lack of ability to attend ELO's due to transportation	Provide extended learning opportunities for students during the school day	Math Coach Math Administrator	Student Work Attendance at school day ELO's	Student Work Samples Student Attendance
---	---	--	----------------------------------	--	--

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:			In grades 6-8, advanced students are enrolled in a rigorous math course. Level 4-5 students were enrolled in advanced math classes and GEM. 8th graders in GEM are placed in Geometry. These rigorous courses ensure students are critically thinking about math.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Based on the 2012 Geometry EOC, 38% (16) of students scored an achievement level 3.			In 2013, 43% (18) of students will score an achievement level 3 on the Geometry EOC.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack some prerequisite math skills	Teachers will create an after school EOC program to reinforce basic math skills	Math Coach Math Administrator	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs	Student Work Samples BAT/mini-assessments
2	Lack of attendance at ELO's	Teachers will create a program and Parent Night to explain the purpose of attending ELO's	Math Coach Math Administrator	Attendance at ELO's Student Work	Student attendance at ELO's
3	Lack of comfort with computer-based testing	Teachers will incorporate computer based testing practice into classroom instruction	Math Coach Math Administrator	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Student Work Samples
4	Lack of comfort with computer-based testing	Teachers will incorporate computer based testing practice into classroom instruction	Math Coach Math Administrator	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Student Work Samples

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	In grades 6-8, advanced students are enrolled in an Algebra course. Level 4-5 students were enrolled in advanced math classes and GEM. These rigorous courses ensure students are critically thinking about math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Geometry EOC, 62% (26) of students achieved an Achievement Level 4 in Geometry.	On the 2013 EOC, 67% (28) of students will achieve an Achievement Level 4 in Geometry.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack some prerequisite math skills	Teachers will create an after school EOC program to reinforce basic math skills	Math Coach Math Administrator	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs	Student Work Samples BAT/mini-assessments
2	Lack of participation in after school programs/tutoring	Math Department will conduct an EOC parent night to inform parents of necessity of participating in ELO's	Math Coach Math Administrator	Attendance at ELO's Student Work	Student attendance at ELO's
3	Lack of comfort with computer-based testing	Teachers will incorporate computer based testing practice into classroom instruction	Math Coach Math Administrator	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Student Work Samples

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Geometry Goal #			
		3A : <input type="text"/>			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal # 3B:	In grades 6-8, advanced students are enrolled in an Algebra course. Level 4-5 students were enrolled in advanced math classes and GEM. These rigorous courses ensure students are critically thinking about math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Geometry EOC 100% of all White (19), Black (8), Hispanic (8) and Asian (5) students made satisfactory progress in Geometry. Therefore, no one did not make satisfactory progress.	In 2013, 100% of all White (19), Black (8), Hispanic(8) and Asian(5) students will pass the Geometry EOC.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack some prerequisite math skills	Teachers will create an after school EOC program to reinforce basic math skills	Math Coach Math Administrator	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs	Student Work Samples BAT/mini-assessments
2	Lack of participation in after school	Math Department will conduct an EOC parent night to inform parents of necessity of	Math Coach Math Administrator	Attendance at ELO's Student Work	Student Attendance at ELO's

	programs/tutoring	participating in ELO's			
3	Lack of comfort with computer-based testing	Teachers will incorporate computer based testing practice into classroom instruction	Math Coach Math Administrator	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Student Work Samples

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
No Data Submitted				

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	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 Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	In grades 6-8, advanced students are enrolled in an Algebra course. Level 4-5 students were enrolled in advanced math classes and GEM. These rigorous courses ensure students are critically thinking about math.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 Geometry EOC, 100% (16) of students who are ED made satisfactory progress.	In 2013, 100% (16) of students will pass the Geometry EOC.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack some prerequisite math skills	Teachers will create an after school EOC program to reinforce basic math skills	Math Coach Math Administrator	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs	Student Work Samples BAT/mini-assessments
2	Lack of participation in after school programs/tutoring	Math Department will conduct an EOC parent night to inform parents of necessity of participating in ELO's	Math Coach Math Administrator	Attendance at ELO's Student Work	Student attendance at ELO's
3	Lack of comfort with computer-based testing	Teachers will incorporate computer based testing practice into classroom instruction	Math Coach Math Administrator	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Student Work Samples

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
Literacy Skills and Strategies	6-8 All Content Areas	Leadership Team	6-8 All Teachers	Weekly Before School during PLC Time	Lesson Plans Student Work Classroom Walk-Throughs	Reading Coach Administration
Creating High Quality Common Assessments	6-8 Math	Math Coach	6-8 Math	After School Weekly	Lesson Plans Common Assessments	Math Coach
Aligning the IFC to the Common Core Standards	6-8 Math	Math Coach	6-8 Math	Weekly Department Meetings	Lesson Plans	Math Coach

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
Professional Development to Increase Content Knowledge	Stipends for Teachers	Title I	\$893.75
Departmental In-House PD Days	Substitutes	Title I Professional Development	\$2,500.00
Attend FCTM	Registration and Conference Costs	Title I Professional Development	\$1,330.00
			Subtotal: \$4,723.75
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Pull Out Teacher	Small Group Instruction	General Fund	\$5,000.00
Extended Learning Opportunities	Salaries and Materials	General Fund	\$15,000.00
			Subtotal: \$20,000.00
			Grand Total: \$24,723.75

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:		All 8th grade students are enrolled in Science courses. Students are given enrichment opportunities to take elective classes focused on Science. All students participate in the county science fair program.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 8th grade, 28% (111) of students achieved at or above level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Science Exam		In 8th grade, 33% (131) of students will achieve a Level 3 on the 2013 Science FCAT.			
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 academic reading comprehension skills.	Teachers will infuse research based content reading strategies into their classroom.	Administration Reading Coach Department Heads	Lesson Plans Student Work Classroom Walk-throughs	Classroom Assessment FCAT BAT
2	Content not covered by the IFC-6th grade and 7th grade content that needs to be revisited prior to FCAT	Infuse content needed into areas already provided by curriculum using content area reading strategies from CRISS and CAR-PD.	Science Department Head Administrators	Weekly Classroom assessments of science content. Classroom Walk-throughs to determine use of reading strategies and techniques being incorporated	Projects Quizzes Portfolios Mini-Assessments BAT Testing
3	Lack of language acquisition	Teachers will use content based reading strategies into the science classroom	Science Department Head Administrators Reading Coach	Frequent progress monitoring of classroom reading strategies Classroom Walk-	District Science mini assessments FAIR

				throughs to monitor use of reading strategies	
4	Inadequate exposure to project-based learning that connects to curriculum	Increase project based learning in science classrooms	Science Department Head Administrators	Frequent progress monitoring of classroom lessons Rubrics created and followed to determine the effectiveness of project	Portfolios with completed rubrics and projects
5	Content not covered by the IFC in 6th grade and 7th grade that needs to be revisited prior to FCAT	Create an 8th grade review to determine student need areas and cover all content from 6th-8th grade	Science Department Head Administrators	Constant classroom assessments of science content	Mini-Assessments BAT Testing
6	Lack of basic reading skills	Teachers will infuse reading strategies based on the school-wide reading IFC into their daily instruction	Science Department Head Administrators Reading Coach	Frequent progress monitoring of classroom lessons Classroom walk-throughs to monitor use of reading strategies	Mini-Assessments Classroom Observations Student Assessments
7	Insufficient content knowledge	Remediate on weakest strands of reading and science curriculums using research based reading strategies like 2-column notes, QAR, SQ3R and Anticipation Guides	Science Department Heads Administration	Ongoing assessment and progress monitoring based on teacher observation and classroom lessons	BAT FCAT

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	All 6th-8th grade ESE students are enrolled in an ESE Science course with a certified ESE teacher. They receive an alternative curriculum and work on real-life science skills.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FAA, 0% (6) students scored at a level 4, 5 or 6 in Science.	On the 2013 FAA, 10% (1) student will score at a level 4, 5 or 6 on the FAA.

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	Inadequate Vocabularies	Teachers will create and use sight word centers to build sight word vocabularies.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Lessons and walk-throughs Student sight word checklists	San Diego/DAR Student Work
2	Lack of retention	Teachers will infuse repeated readings into classroom lesson plans. They will also incorporate centers based on the repeated readings.	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom lesson plans Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work FAA
3	Students do not have adequate real-world experiences	Teachers will incorporate realia and real-world experience based learning into the classroom.	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom Lessons Classroom walk-throughs Writing and Language samples based on new	Writing Samples Student Work

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:	All 8th grade students are enrolled in Science courses. Students are given enrichment opportunities to take elective classes focused on Science. All students participate in the county science fair program.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Science assessment 13% (52) of 8th graders achieved above proficiency.	On the 2013 FCAT Science assessment 18% (71) of 8th graders will achieve above proficiency.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Insufficient enrichment courses offered in Science	Infusion of additional enrichment opportunities in the science curriculum.	Science Department Head Administrators Teachers	Frequent progress monitoring of science curriculum. Classroom Walk-Throughs to determine effectiveness of enrichment courses	Projects Classroom Assessments
2	Exposure to real world science experiences	Bring in community outreach to create real world experiences (i.e. guest speakers, theme park engineers, scientists, other people in the community who use science in their daily life).	Science Department Head Administrators	Portfolios and discussions of integration of real world science professionals and experiences	Portfolios Science Projects Project Rubrics
3	Insufficient content knowledge	Remediate on weakest strands of reading and science curriculums- using research based reading strategies like 2-column notes, QAR, SQ3R and Anticipation Guides	Science Department Head Administrators	Ongoing assessment and progress monitoring based on teacher observation and class lessons	BAT 2 and FCAT
4	Lack of ability to synthesize content knowledge	Teachers will infuse reading strategies based on the school-wide reading IFC into their daily instruction	Science Department Head Administrators Reading Coach	Classroom walk-throughs to monitor use of reading strategies Frequent progress monitoring of classroom lessons	Mini-Assessments Classroom Observations Student Assessments BAT 1 and 2 FCAT Reading

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:	All 6th-8th grade ESE students are enrolled in an ESE Science course with a certified ESE teacher. They receive an alternative curriculum and work on real-life science skills.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Based on the 2012 FAA, 67% (4) of students scored at or above achievement level 7 in science.			In 2013, 83% (5) of students will score at an achievement level 7 or higher in science.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of retention	Teachers will focus on repeated readings and repeated emphasis on important topics	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Lesson Plans Student Work Student's ability to retell a story	Student Work
2	Trouble understanding the question being asked	Teachers will incorporate test-taking strategies into the classroom; they will teach questioning techniques	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator Classroom Teacher	Student Work Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work FAA
3	Lack of real-world experiences and understanding	Teachers will incorporate the use of realia into everyday classroom experiences	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Student Work Language Experiences to guide reading and writing Classroom walk-throughs	Student Work Language experiences work samples FAA

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
Hands-On Science Activities	6-8 Science	Science Department Head Science Teachers	6-8 Science Teachers	Bi-weekly during Department Meetings	Use in classroom; observation during CWT's	Science Department Head
Literacy Strategies	6-8 Content Teachers	Reading Coach Leadership Team	6-8 All Teachers	Ongoing before school	Classroom Walk-Throughs; Lesson Plans	Reading Coach Administrators Leadership Team
Project Based Learning	6-8 Science	Science Department Head	6-8 Science	Bi-weekly during Department Meetings	Lesson plans; Classroom Walk-Throughs	Science Department Head Administration

Science Budget:

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

			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Professional Development to Increase Content Knowledge	Stipends for Teachers	Title I	\$893.75
Departmental In-House PD Days	Substitutes	Title I Professional Development	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,393.75
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,393.75

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:	All 8th grade students are enrolled in a Language Arts class. Students continually scoring low on school-based essays are enrolled in a pull-out program to enrich their writing skills. Language Arts teachers follow a monthly prompt schedule to track, discuss, and remediate based on writing trends and data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Writing Assessment 87% (351) of 8th graders scored a FCAT Level 3.0 or higher.	On the 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment 92% (371) of 8th graders will achieve a FCAT level 3.0 or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inadequate Vocabulary in writing	School-wide word of the day program to help develop strong vocabularies	Reading Coach Administrator Language Arts Department Head	Classroom assessments and projects based on vocabulary words.	Common Assessments Teacher Made Assessments
2	Lack of meta-cognition skills	Classroom teachers will incorporate higher order thinking, question stems and discussions into curriculum.	Language Arts Department Head Administrator	Differentiated assignments and projects. Rubric based grading for assignments.	Classroom Observations Rubrics
3	Lack of organization in writing	Teachers will utilize pre-writing techniques to ensure students know how to organize their thinking	Language Arts Department Head Administrator	Monthly essays will include pre-writing/organization	Monthly classroom essays
	Inadequate vocabularies in writing	Teachers will use the Springboard Vocabulary Notebooks with their	Language Arts Department Head	Classroom assessments and projects based on academic vocabularies	Common Assessments

4		students	Administrator		Teacher Made Assessments Vocabulary Notebooks
5	Lack of basic grammar skills	Teachers will incorporate purposeful, strategic lesson development of grammar based on the PreAP standards and college boards (SPRINGBOARD)	Language Arts Department Head Administrator	Classroom assessments based on grammar standards	Common Assessments Teacher Made Assessments
6	Lack of supporting details in writing	Teachers will conduct weekly mini writing assessments focused on supporting details	Language Arts Department Head Administrator	Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs	Writing Assessments

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	All 6th-8th grade students take Language Arts with an ESE certified teacher. Most of them receive language support with a Speech Teacher. Students learn real-world writing skills through daily instruction an a Pen Pal Program.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FAA, 83% (5) students scored a 4 or higher in writing.	On the 2013 FAA, 100% (6) students will score a 4 or higher in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are unable to put events in sequential order	Teachers will conduct mini lessons on sequencing of events	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs	Students Writing Samples
2	Lack of understanding parts of speech	Small group instruction will be based on grammar and parts of speech. Students will have centers built to their needs.	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Mini Assessments Student Work Samples
3	Inadequate vocabularies	Teachers will incorporate vocabulary lessons into every classroom activity	ESE Specialist ESE Administrator	Classroom Assessments Writing Samples	Writing Samples Student Work

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
------------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------------	---

Springboard	6-8 Language Arts	Language Arts Department Head	Language Arts Teachers	Preplanning Week and as needed at weekly department meetings	Writing Workshop folders and portfolios	Language Arts Department Head
Rubrics and Writing Scoring	6-8 Language Arts	Language Arts Department Head	6-8 Language Arts	1x a month at department meetings	Student Writing Folders	Language Arts Department Head
Literacy Strategies	6-8 Content Areas	Leadership Team	6-8 Content Teachers	1x a week before school	Classroom Lesson Plans CWT's	Reading Coach Leadership Team

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
Professional Development for Teachers to Increase Content Knowledge	Stipends for Teachers	Title I	\$893.75
Departmental In-House PD Days	Substitutes	Title I Professional Development	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,393.75
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Extended Learning Opportunities	Materials and Salaries	General Fund	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal: \$5,000.00
			Grand Total: \$8,393.75

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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:	The attendance rate for Seminole Middle School for 2011-2012 was 94.9%. The majority of students were not excessively tardy or absent.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The 2012 attendance rate for 6-8th grade students was 94.9%(211525).	The 2013 attendance rate for 6th-8th grade will be 98% (218,384).
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
In 6th-8th grade, 6% (80) of students had excessive absences in 2012.	In 6th-8th grade, the number of excessive absences will decrease to 4% (48) for 2013.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
In 6th-8th grade, 5% (60) of students had excessive tardies in 2011-2012.	In 6th-8th grade, the number of excessive tardies will decrease to 3% (36) in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increase in tardies due to earlier school hours	Parent Link call home reminding parents of school hours; letters home to parents of students with excessive tardies	Attendance Secretary Administrator Guidance	Attendance record reviews	Student files to show reduction of tardies and/or number of minutes tardy
2	Decrease in daily attendance rates on days after long weekends or holidays.	Continue rigor of curriculum on days near holidays; create classroom incentive for attendance on days following holidays	Administrator Teachers Guidance	Review attendance records	Student attendance files
3	Accumulation of absences, excused or unexcused	School document absences and request documentation if a pattern of absence becomes apparent. School/Parent conference for students with a pattern of non-attendance.	Administrator Guidance School Social Worker Teachers	Review attendance records	Decrease in number of students with chronic absences.

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
Hands-on, high interest classroom projects	6-8 All Teachers	Leadership Team	6-8 All Teachers	1x weekly before school with literacy standards	Classroom Lessons; Student work; CWT's	Administration
Attendance Procedures and Documentation	6-8 Teachers	Administration	6-8 Teachers	Pre-planning week	Monitoring of attendance procedures	Administration Department Heads

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	In 2012 a number of students were suspended internally and externally. The number of internal suspensions was much higher than external. The data also shows that a good amount of students were suspended multiple times.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

The 2012 total number of internal suspensions was 764.	In 2013, the total number of internal suspensions will be at 700 or lower.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
The 2012 total number of 6th-8th grade students who received internal suspension was 312.	In 2013 the total number of 6th-8th grade students who will receive an internal suspension will be 275.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
The 2012 total number of external suspensions was 117.	In 2013 the total number of external suspensions will be 100 or lower.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
The 2012 total number of 6th-8th grade students who received external suspension was 84.	In 2012 the total number of 6th-8th grade students who will receive an external suspension will be 75 or lower.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increase in discipline incidents for students who have already been disciplined	Mentor students who are habitually in trouble. Mentors should be from all areas of school staff Teachers will receive ongoing training from Guidance on building relationships with students to decrease discipline issues.	Administration Teachers	Review discipline records	Discipline records; decrease of students suspended multiple times
2	Increase of students with discipline incidents	Grade-level incentive program to promote activities for students with positive behavior Teachers will discuss best practices related to classroom management in order to decrease discipline issues.	Teachers Grade Level Administrator	Review discipline records Grade Level discussions with teachers and guidance	Discipline records
3	Students being disciplined due to cultural misunderstandings from teachers	Create a professional development that informs teachers of cultural sensitivity	Guidance Administration	Review discipline records	Discipline records

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Classroom Management and Building Student Relationships	6-8 Teachers	Guidance	6-8 Teachers	Ongoing during faculty meetings and early release days	Student Discipline Records	Guidance Administration
Parent Communication	6-8 Teachers	Guidance Director	6-8 Teachers	Pre-Planning week	Parent Conferences; CPST	Guidance Administration

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Parental involvement is key to student learning. After creating a monthly Family Night we realized we were getting a few hundred parents to each event. Students were able to showcase their work and parents were able to interact with their child's school environment.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
In 2012, 25% (310) parents attended our monthly Title I Family Nights.	In 2013, 30% (372) of parents will attend family curriculum nights, school meetings and other school events geared towards student instruction and enrichment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of communication between school and home	Students will be given student planners to record information that needs to be shared with the home.	Administration	Teachers will communicate with parents through the use of planners. They will check planners to encourage students to write in them.	Amount of parents present at school functions
2	Lack of communication between school and home	Important school information will be sent home in a quarterly newsletter	Administration Newsletter Coordinator	Sign-In sheets will be kept from school events monitoring parental involvement	Data from 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
School/Home Communication	6-8 Teachers	Guidance	6-8 Teachers	Pre-Planning Week Ongoing as needed	Parent Contact logs; Parent Conferences and Family Nights	Guidance 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
School/Home Communication	Student Agenda Books	Title I	\$3,293.30
Family Night	Refreshments	Title I	\$1,445.70
School/Home Communication and Support	Parents to attend Annual District Title I Seminar	Title I	\$80.00
			Subtotal: \$4,819.00
			Grand Total: \$4,819.00

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:	Students in 6th-8th grade are enrolled in a Science and Math class. Students also have numerous opportunities for enrichment in these areas. Support and extended help are offered through after school tutoring and pullout programs. Enrichment opportunities are offered through various course selection. Students can take classes in a variety of areas to build their interest and understanding of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math.				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of access to technology outside of school	Provide enough opportunities within the classroom for students to become proficient with technology	Administration	CWT's Lesson Plans	Student Work Samples Interest/Skills Inventories
2	Lack of exposure in extra-curricular science topics	Offer a number of science, math and technology based courses to build interest and understanding	Administration Science Department Head	Course Selection Cards CWT's	Master Schedule
3	Lack of confidence in ability to create and understand STEM topics	Build confidence through Engineering and Robotics clubs	Science Department Head Administration	Attendance at SECME Student Observation	SECME events and activities

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Competitions	6-8 Science	Competition Coordinator	6-8 Science	4x per year at Department Meetings	Participation in Science Competitions	Science Department Head Administration
PDI-Tech Based Virtual Labs	6-8 Science	Science Department Head	6-8 Science	Monthly at Department Meetings	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Science Department Head

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
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Professional Development to Increase Content Knowledge	Stipends for Teachers	Title I	\$893.75
Reading	Departmental Professional Development	Substitutes	Title I	\$2,500.00
Mathematics	Professional Development to Increase Content Knowledge	Stipends for Teachers	Title I	\$893.75
Mathematics	Departmental In-House PD Days	Substitutes	Title I Professional Development	\$2,500.00
Mathematics	Attend FCTM	Registration and Conference Costs	Title I Professional Development	\$1,330.00
Science	Professional Development to Increase Content Knowledge	Stipends for Teachers	Title I	\$893.75
Science	Departmental In-House PD Days	Substitutes	Title I Professional Development	\$2,500.00
Writing	Professional Development for Teachers to Increase Content Knowledge	Stipends for Teachers	Title I	\$893.75
Writing	Departmental In-House PD Days	Substitutes	Title I Professional Development	\$2,500.00
				Subtotal: \$14,905.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Pull Out Teacher	Small Group Instruction	General Fund	\$5,000.00
Reading	FCAT Saturday Camp	Salaries and Materials	General Fund	\$15,000.00
Mathematics	Pull Out Teacher	Small Group Instruction	General Fund	\$5,000.00
Mathematics	Extended Learning Opportunities	Salaries and Materials	General Fund	\$15,000.00
Writing	Extended Learning Opportunities	Materials and Salaries	General Fund	\$5,000.00
Parent Involvement	School/Home Communication	Student Agenda Books	Title I	\$3,293.30
Parent Involvement	Family Night	Refreshments	Title I	\$1,445.70
Parent Involvement	School/Home Communication and Support	Parents to attend Annual District Title I Seminar	Title I	\$80.00
				Subtotal: \$49,819.00
				Grand Total: \$64,724.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority

Focus

Prevent

NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The School Advisory Council will meet regularly, the first Wednesday of the month and monitor the improvement plan by breaking up into subgroups and will analyze the effectiveness of the plan as data is collected and disaggregated. The SAC will discuss how to best serve the students of Seminole Middle School.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District SEMINOLE MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	73%	90%	47%	281	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	63%	68%			131	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?	69% (YES)	68% (YES)			137	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					549	
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 SEMINOLE MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	74%	92%	47%	284	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	68%	73%			141	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)	74% (YES)			138	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					563	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested