

# 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: CORKSCREW MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Collier

Principal: Dennis Snider

SAC Chair: Calvin Boggess

Superintendent: Dr. Kamela Patton

Date of School Board Approval: Draft ~9~Sept

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.*

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dennis Snider	B. A. in Social Studies; Harding University  M. Ed. History; Clemson University  M. Ed. School Administration; Harding University  Educational Leadership	12	17	According to statute, the Superintendent has the authority to strategically place administrators within the school district. The school has been an "A" school for the past 11 years.
Assis Principal	Lon Clay	B. S. in Education; Ohio Dominican College  M. Ed., Educational Leadership; University of	8	17	According to statute, the Superintendent has the authority to strategically place administrators within the school district.

		South Florida Educational Leadership Math 6-12 ESE K-12			The school has been an "A" school for the past 11 years.
--	--	--	--	--	--

### 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	Yolande Ramsay-Sinclair	B. S. Elementary Education; M. S. Reading Elem 1-6; ESOL; Reading K-12; Language Arts 5-9	4	3	Has a history of academic excellence as a teacher. Has a history of academic excellence as a reading teacher and reading coach.
PBS/RTI/ESE	Karen Columbus	B. S. in Pre-Med; M. S. in Pre-Med	12	13	Has a history of academic excellence as a teacher. Has a history of excellence as an ESE Teacher.

### EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular [weekly] Professional Learning Community meetings; discuss CTEM, Webb's DOK, Writing success strategies, RTI/PBS, Lesson Study, analysis of student achievement data [baseline, quarterly progress monitoring]. CTEM strategies/tools used by CTEM team [administrators, CTEM Teacher Coaches] used to support pedagogy and struggling teaching moments.	Principal Assistant Principal CTEM Teacher Coaches	On-going	
2	2. Weekly meetings with school-based RTI/PBS and Literacy Team to discuss: use of Webb's DOK across all curricular areas, Writing process, student success motivation strategies. CTEM strategies/tools used by CTEM team [administrators, CTEM Teacher Coaches] used to support pedagogy and struggling teaching moments.	Principal Assistant Principal Guidance Counselors Reading Coach PBS/RTI Coach	On-Going	

### Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
1	Teacher is in 2nd year of teaching. CMS will assist with accessing ELL training as it arises.

## 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
46	0.0%(0)	13.0%(6)	52.2%(24)	37.0%(17)	50.0%(23)	97.8%(45)	19.6%(9)	0.0%(0)	97.8%(45)

## 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

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

#### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal: Dennis Snider  
Assistant Principal: Lon Clay  
School Counselors: Lynn Thiewes, Connie Brown  
Reading Coach: Yolande Ramsay-Sinclair  
Intervention Support Specialist [InSS]: Karen Columbus

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?

Team meets weekly [Monday] at 1:30 p.m. Team will discuss on going issues of Differentiation, RTI/PBS. Team will develop action plans for students rising to RTI Level 3.

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 assists with the development of the plan; will monitor Plan implementation on a quarterly basis; will monitor PLC Level 1 actions.

#### 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.

Data Sources: FAIR, quarterly reading benchmarks, quarterly math benchmarks, EOCs, FCAT all used for universal tier one sources. CMS does this for each tier.

##### Data Management Systems:

Data Warehouse, a district program, is used to house multiple forms of student assessment information. It includes universal data as well as places to input formative and custom assessment progress monitoring data. Individual, small group, class and school-wide data can be accessed and graphed. Data can be graphed in a multitude of ways (bar, line pie, scatter plot) to monitor student growth. Additionally, qualitative information is available. PLC notes and parent conferences can be recorded and accessed as needed.

TERMS, both a district and state data-base, is a repository of students' current and historic demographic and academic data. TERMS "talks" to Data Warehouse so that district student data are always current.

StudentPass, a district-developed program, tracks student attendance and discipline. Data are entered in StudentPass enabling reports on attendance, excessive tardiness, office discipline referrals, ISS and OSS.

School teams meet in grade level teams as professional learning communities. During these meetings, teams discuss teaching, problem solving and learning. Teams examine the standards to be taught, share best practices, engage in building

common formative assessments and review data. As a team they have strengthened their core teaching and have established that 80% of their students will meet the requirements. Re-teaching will occur as needed for the Tier 1 students. Data Warehouse has been designed to record the minutes from these meetings as well as to follow the progress of groups and individual students. This Tier 1 data will be used during PLCs to follow the rate of student progress over time. Teachers share results and best practices.

If students fail to meet with success in Tier 1 students are referred to the school's MTSS team and Tier 2 strategies. The Data Warehouse data management system continues to follow the student's progress as monitored by the PMP. Online assessments and other data points are tracked on the charts and graphs in the Data Warehouse.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

A variety of methods will be used to train staff on MTSS. Job embedded coaching will be used to train PLC teams in the following processes that support instruction and intervention: problem-solving, developing progress monitoring plans, data collection and data analysis. Online self-paced modules are available through our ANGEL online learning platform. ANGEL also houses a variety of resources including video clips, intervention ideas, behavior management techniques, data collection tools, etc. to support the professional growth of staff. In addition, live trainings in differentiated instruction and utilizing MTSS/RTI in the classroom are available.

The district training has incorporated a multi-tiered approach to staff development in the area of RtI. To facilitate training, a group of Professional Learning Community (PLC) team leaders and key leadership personnel from each school (K-12) completed an intensive 4 day training on RtI principles and consensus building. The PLC team leaders and key leadership personnel are charged with the responsibility to move RtI practices forward at the school level. Follow-up training will occur under the guidance of the District Coordinator of RtI/PBS through monthly on site walk throughs, problem-solving meetings, and PLC meetings. In addition, the District Coordinator of RtI/PBS will provide monthly follow-up trainings with School-Based InSS. Teachers meet with PLCs twice a month to discuss RtI implementation at their grade level. Finally, mini workshops on RtI-related topics, such as differentiating instruction, data analysis, and specific intervention training are available through district and school InSS personnel throughout the school year upon the request of a school administrator. In addition to district and school InSS face-to-face training, a variety of online tools are available for use in the schools. ANGEL and the Data Warehouse are being used as an online facilitators for RtI related documents, video clips, training materials and power points, research links, intervention tools, and a district Problem Solving/Response to Intervention manual. School personnel have access to Leaps and Love and Logic as well as RTI tool kits. In addition, the district required all instructional personnel (PK-12) to complete RtI training using the Direct Steps online training tool. Each staff member was required to complete 3 courses. New teachers will also complete this training.

The PLC teams will continue to monitor progress for all students throughout the year, through the use of the Data Warehouse resources.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS is supported in multiple ways. The master schedule is designed to provide common planning time for PLCs to plan and discuss core instruction, progress monitoring plans and data collection and analysis. Time is also allotted for professional learning opportunities. Data Warehouse reports and tools support PLCs in monitoring the fidelity of the implementation. These reports, along with teacher surveys and other data sources, are utilized to determine the types of professional learning opportunities and targeted supports that staff will need to effectively implement MTSS.

The MTSS leadership group will meet weekly to analyze school academic and behavioral data and discuss areas of need as well as strengths. Using this data the team will identify school wide trends. This information will be used to drive PLC topics so teams can problem solve, develop and implement Tier 1 interventions. CMS Administrators, Reading Coach and InSS will attend the weekly PLC meetings to provide guidance and support. PLC teams will determine the effectiveness of the interventions. Students in need of Tier 2 interventions will be identified. PLC teams will record the minutes from these meetings in Data Warehouse and share this information with the MTSS Leadership team for review and evaluation. The InSS will offer staff trainings in PMP development and tracking of data in Data Warehouse. School resource personnel (InSS, Reading Coach, School Counselors, Dean etc.) will assist teachers in developing research-based strategies for the Tier 2/3 PMPs and more intensive interventions will be utilized. The intervention data will be monitored for student rate of progress and shared with parents in graphical form. If needed, the PMP may be modified or a referral for evaluation may be requested. Based on the results of the evaluation and intervention progress the school team may determine that the student meets eligibility criteria for Special Education services. This multi-tiered system of support will provide the assistance needed so all students can achieve academic success and meet AYP. In order to provide staff with training opportunities CMS will utilize school and district staff to provide workshops throughout the year for analysis of Data Warehouse reports, use of Angel, Common Core, Differentiated Instruction, PBS, LEAPs, and other available resources.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Members: Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Reading Coach, Intervention Support Specialist [InSS] and School Counselors.

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

The LLT meets once per month to plan on-site professional development for the faculty; set goals for improving student achievement; analyze teacher, student and school-wide data and assessments [which include Benchmark Testing, FAIR Data, student grades and FCAT Results].

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

The initiatives for the LLT for this year are:

1. Ensure all teachers are aware of the students who are in multiple categories to ensure the students will make AYP in reading for the 2012-2013 school year.
2. Strategic in promoting school-wide reading by having a book fair, promote reading on the morning announcements, give prizes to students who meet their reading goals, and have twice per year a reading reward activity period.
3. Participate in Sunshine State Young Reader's Award Program
4. Increase use of Accelerated Reader by students and teachers.
5. Progress monitor our students through Data Warehouse and benchmark testing.
6. Increase use of Angel to increase parental communication of student assignments.
7. Differentiate instruction in all classrooms
8. Assign at-risk students a mentor
9. Promote joyful engagement of reading
10. Analyze areas of need at each grade level on the FCAT
11. Extra emphasis on strands being tested on the FCAT

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

No Attachment

### \*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

1. All teachers are trained to use the district-wide collaborative instructional strategies with the reading coach available to support the staff as needed.
2. Weekly staff development to help support classroom instruction.
3. Using Angel and email to communicate pertinent literacy information to staff.
4. Through PLC team meetings-literacy strategies and instruction is discussed
5. School-wide Literacy Team that discussed ways to promote literacy across the curriculum.

### \*High Schools Only

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

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

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

## Postsecondary Transition

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

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

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.  Reading Goal #1a:	The percent of students scoring proficiency, level 3, on the 2013 FCAT in reading will increase from 27% [186] to 27% [191].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% [186]	27% [191]

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Rigor:  Instructional Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	2a. Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	PLCs meet weekly. Once per month a PLC meeting will be devoted to Lesson Study/analysis of weekly lesson plans. PLCs will peer review lesson plans and offer suggestions for increased questioning rigor. Webb's DOK will be basis for peer review.	PLC meeting notes.
2	Instructional:  Lessons/activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	3c. TE use of differentiated instructional strategies will be monitored through CTEM, particularly in the area of expectations and support for low-expectancy students. (See CTEM alignment.)	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM, Teacher Leaders	PLCs meet weekly. Once per month the PLC will address/discuss need to keep instruction at a place that meets needs of 3,4,5 level performers.	PLC meeting notes.
3	Informational Text  Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	Teacher maintained logs, lesson plans.	Classroom visits, review of writing logs and lesson plans.

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

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



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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The percent of students scoring above proficiency (level 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT in reading will increase from 39% [27] to 43% [304].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% [271]	43% [304]

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	Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction:  1. Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	One CTEM Informal Observation will focus upon high order questions and high order discourse where students demonstrate their ability to function at a high level of thought.	CTEM Informal Observation
2	Rigor  Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	PLCs will discuss Webb's DOK and share high order questions used during previous instruction.	Lesson plans.
3	Informational Text  Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-12), in grades K-2 through Read-Alouds and in grades 3-12 with intertextual triads [not used in math classes], students will build	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	PLCs will discuss use of fiction and non-fiction text.	PLC meeting notes.

	analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.		
--	--	--	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3a:	The percent of students achieving learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in reading will increase from 75% [477] to 78% [508].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% [477]	78% [508]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Rigor:  Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	During Reading and Math PLC meetings topic of discussion is sharing of tools used to assure that lower 25% students are understanding subject matter being presented.	PLC meeting notes.
2	Interactive Learning  Lessons/activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	TE use of differentiated instructional strategies will be monitored through CTEM.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	During Reading and Math PLC meetings topic of discussion is sharing of tools used to assure that lower 25% students are understanding subject matter being presented.	PLC meeting notes.
	Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and	TE use of close reading and intertextual triads	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading	Behavior monitored via classroom visits.	CTEM

3	non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	across all content will be monitored through CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.	Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	
---	---	---	--------------------------	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	The percent of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in reading will increase from 73% [118] to 76% [124].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% [118]	76% [124]

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	Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Lower 25% Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	Lowest 25%: Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. Secondary; intensive math classes provide for co-teach opportunities so that student's intensive math needs are met in daily small group instruction with both the basic and co-teach personnel as well as independent practice and use of tech	PLC meeting notes, CTEM observations, quarterly benchmark assessments.

				applications specific to the student's needs.	
2	Instructional Text Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	Classroom visits, CTEM observations.
3	Rigor Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity.	Classroom visits, CTEM observations.

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 percent of students to achieve AMO on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 67% to 75%. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5B:	The percent of students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in reading in each ethnic subgroup will increase by 10% of the percentage not currently proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 76% [240] Black: 59% [27] Hispanic: 59% [171] Asian: 62% [8] American Indian: 18% [2]	White: 78% [251] Black: 63% [32] Hispanic: 63% [190] Asian: 66% [6] American Indian: 26% [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	Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Provide differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports as appropriate based on daily checks for understanding.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.
2	Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.

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:	The percentage of English Language Learners achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in reading will increase from 0% (0) to 33% (3). for the 2013 Sy CMS has 11 ELL LY that have 2012 FCAT scores.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% [0]	33% [3]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	TE will utilize a variety of ELL strategies to enhance understanding of content.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM Observation tools.
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM Observation tools.

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:	The percent of students with disabilities (SWD) achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in reading from 33% [32] to 40% [34].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% [32]	40% [34]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP goals, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Team Leader, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning	TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP goals, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database	Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Team Leader, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.

	aligned to the standards.	(Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.			
3	Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP goals, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Team Leader, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.

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:	The percent of economically disadvantaged students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in reading will increase from 57% [204] to 61% [245].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% [204]	61% [245]

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	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	Maintain high expectations for all students to appropriately respond to higher order questions, providing scaffolded support and structure as appropriate for low-expectancy students, enabling their success in meeting rigorous expectations.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, lesson plans.	CTEM Observation tools.
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups	Principal, Assistant Principal, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, lesson plans.	CTEM Observation tools.

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
					CTEM: Implementation in	Principal,

Intertextual Triad training	678	Reading Coach	Content Core Teachers	On-going via PLCs	Classrooms; Lesson Plans; PLC Minutes	Assistant Principal, Reading Coach
Webb's Depth of Knowledge and Rigorous Higher Order Questioning	678	Reading Coach	All teachers	On-going via PLCs	CTEM: Implementation in Classrooms; Lesson Plans; PLC Minutes	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach
Close Reading in the Content Area	678	Reading Coach	All teachers	On-going via PLCs	CTEM: Implementation in Classrooms; Lesson Plans; PLC Minutes	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal # 1:	Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking in 2013 will increase from 50% [7] to 55% [9].
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
50% [7]	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark.	TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to language acquisition and develop a language/vocabulary journal specific to student's needs.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CELLA/ELL contact, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits.	CTEM, 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:

Students scoring proficient in Reading in 2013 will increase from 23% [3] to 25% [4].

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

23% [3]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	TE will utilize a variety of ELL strategies to enhance understanding of content.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ELL/CELLA contact, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	classroom visits	CTEM, CELLA

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

Students scoring proficient in Writing in 2013 will increase from 14% [2] to 15% [3].

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

14% [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 have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language	TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners,	Principal, Assistant Principal, ELL/CELLA	classroom visits.	CTEM, CELLA



arts instruction.	scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	contact, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	
-------------------	--	---	--

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1a:	The percent of students scoring at proficiency (level 3) on the 2013 FCAT in Math will increase from 28% [191 to 28% [198].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% [191]	28% [198]

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Rigor:  Instructional Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	2a. Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	PLCs meet weekly. Once per month a PLC meeting will be devoted to Lesson Study/analysis of weekly lesson plans. PLCs will peer review lesson plans and offer suggestions for increased questioning rigor. Webb's DOK will be basis for peer review.	PLC meeting notes.
2	Instructional:  Lessons/activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	3c. TE use of differentiated instructional strategies will be monitored through CTEM, particularly in the area of expectations and support for low-expectancy students. (See CTEM alignment.)	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM, Teacher Leaders	PLCs meet weekly. Once per month the PLC will address/discuss need to keep instruction at a place that meets needs of 3,4,5 level performers.	PLC meeting notes.
3	Informational Text  Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	Teacher maintained logs, lesson plans.	Classroom visits, review of writing logs and lesson plans.
4					For all Barriers the use of Agile Mind as evaluation tool.

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a:	The percent of students scoring above proficiency (level 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT in math will increase from 36% [247] to 40% [282].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% [247]	40% [282]

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	Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction:  1. Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	One CTEM Informal Observation will focus upon high order questions and high order discourse where students demonstrate their ability to function at a high level of thought.	CTEM Informal Observation
2	Rigor  Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	PLCs will discuss Webb's DOK and share high order questions used during previous instruction.	Lesson plans.
3	Informational Text  Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-12), in grades K-2 through Read-Alouds and in grades 3-12 with intertextual triads [not used in math classes], students will build	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	PLCs will discuss use of fiction and non-fiction text.	PLC meeting notes.

		analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.		
4				For all Barriers the use of Agile Mind PD modules.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	The percent of students achieving learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in math will increase from 74% [469] to 77% [501].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% [469]	77% [501]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Rigor:  Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	During Reading and Math PLC meetings topic of discussion is sharing of tools used to assure that lower 25% students are understanding subject matter being presented.	PLC meeting notes.
2	Interactive Learning  Lessons/activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	TE use of differentiated instructional strategies will be monitored through CTEM.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	During Reading and Math PLC meetings topic of discussion is sharing of tools used to assure that lower 25% students are understanding subject	PLC meeting notes.

				matter being presented.	
3	Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	TE use of close reading and intertextual triads across all content will be monitored through CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	Behavior monitored via classroom visits.	CTEM

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	The percent of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in math will increase from 71% [113] to 74% [121].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% [113]	74% [121]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Lower 25% Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	Lowest 25%: Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. Secondary intensive math classes provide for co-teach opportunities so that student's intensive math needs are met in daily small group instruction with both the basic and	PLC meeting notes, CTEM observations, quarterly benchmark assessments.

		plans.		co-teach personnel as well as independent practice and use of tech applications specific to the student's needs.	
2	Instructional Text Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	Classroom visits, CTEM observations.
3	Rigor Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Dept. Chair.	Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity.	Classroom visits, CTEM observations.

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 # For the 2013 school year, the percentage of students scoring proficient [level 3 or higher] on the FCAT Math test will increase by 10%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B:	The percent of students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in math in each ethnic subgroup will increase by 10% of the percentage not currently proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 70% [220] Black: 54% [25] Hispanic: 60% [172] Asian: 85% [11] American Indian: 36% [4]	White: 73% [235] Black: 59% [30] Hispanic: 64% [193] Asian: 87% [8] American Indian: 42% [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	Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Provide differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports as appropriate based on daily checks for understanding.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.
2	Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned	Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.

	to the standards.	groups.			
3	, Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	Learners will write to explain their reasoning on mathematical tasks.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.

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:	The percentage of English Language Learners achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in math will increase from 54% [15] to 59% [16].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% [15]	59% [16]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	TE will utilize a variety of ELL strategies to enhance understanding of content.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM Observation tools.
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM Observation tools.
3	Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM Observation tools.

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:	The percent of students with disabilities (SWD) achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in math will increase from 41% [40] to 47% [40].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% [40]	47% [40]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Checks for	TE will accommodate/adapt classroom	Principal,	Lesson Plans,	CTEM

1	understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	work to be consistent with IEP goals, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	Assistant Principal, ESE Team Leader, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	classroom visits.	observation tools.
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP goals, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Team Leader, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.
3	Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP goals, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Team Leader, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.

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:	The percent of economically disadvantaged students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in math will increase from 56% [201] to 60% [241].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% [201]	60% [241]

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	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	Maintain high expectations for all students to appropriately respond to higher order questions, providing scaffolded support and structure as appropriate for low-expectancy students, enabling their success in meeting rigorous expectations.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, lesson plans.	CTEM Observation tools.
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups	Principal, Assistant Principal, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, lesson plans.	CTEM Observation tools.
3	Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of	Learners will write to explain their reasoning on mathematical tasks.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, lesson plans.	CTEM Observation tools.



## 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:	The number of students scoring at level 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC in 2013 will increase from 16% [10] to 16% [18].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% [10]	16% [18]

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Rigor: Instructional Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	2a. Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	PLCs meet weekly. Once per month a PLC meeting will be devoted to Lesson Study/analysis of weekly lesson plans. PLCs will peer review lesson plans and offer suggestions for increased questioning rigor. Webb's DOK will be basis for peer review.	PLC meeting notes.
2	Instructional: Lessons/activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	3c. TE use of differentiated instructional strategies will be monitored through CTEM, particularly in the area of expectations and support for low-expectancy students. (See CTEM alignment.)	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM, Teacher Leaders	PLCs meet weekly. Once per month the PLC will address/discuss need to keep instruction at a place that meets needs of 3,4,5 level performers.	PLC meeting notes.
3	Informational Text Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	Teacher maintained logs, lesson plans.	Classroom visits, review of writing logs and lesson plans.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The number of students scoring at levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC will increase from 84% [51] to 92% [102].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

84% [51]	92% [102]
----------	-----------

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	Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction:  1. Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	One CTEM Informal Observation will focus upon high order questions and high order discourse where students demonstrate their ability to function at a high level of thought.	CTEM Informal Observation
2	Rigor  Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	PLCs will discuss Webb's DOK and share high order questions used during previous instruction.	Lesson plans.

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal #					
	For the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC the number of students passing the exam will increase by 10%.					
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:	For the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC in each of the identified suboups there will be a 10% increase in student performance/pass rate.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 100% [36] Black: 100% [6] Hispanic: 100% [13] Asian: 100% [3] American Indian: 100% [1]	White: 100% [62] Black: 100% [6] Hispanic: 100% [38] Asian: 100% [3] American Indian: 100% [1]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Provide differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports as appropriate based on daily checks for understanding.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.
2	Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.
3	, Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	Learners will write to explain their reasoning on mathematical tasks.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM observation tools.

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:	For the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC the number of ELL students passing will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% [5]	100% [1]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	TE will utilize a variety of ELL strategies to enhance understanding of content.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM Observation tools.
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM Observation tools.
3	Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Lesson Plans, classroom visits.	CTEM Observation tools.

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:	For the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC the percentage of SWD students passing will increase by 10% [if applicable].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

100% [2]			100% [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	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote analytical, critical and independent thinking.	Maintain high expectations for all students, provide scaffolding and structure as needed.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, lesson plans.	CTEM Observation Tools.

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:	For the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Economically Disadvantaged students passing the test will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% [20]	100% [55]

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	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	Maintain high expectations for all students to appropriately respond to higher order questions, providing scaffolded support and structure as appropriate for low-expectancy students, enabling their success in meeting rigorous expectations.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, lesson plans.	CTEM Observation tools.
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups	Principal, Assistant Principal, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, lesson plans.	CTEM Observation tools.
3	Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	Learners will write to explain their reasoning on mathematical tasks.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, lesson plans.	CTEM Observation tools.

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

## Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

in need of improvement for the following group:

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal #				
	3A : <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:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:				
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Webb's Depth of Knowledge and Rigorous Higher Order Questioning	678	Math Department Chair; Reading Coach	All Math Teachers	On-going; training via PLCs for Math	CTEM; Implementation in classrooms; Lesson Plans; PLC Minutes	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Department Chair
Webb's Depth of Knowledge and Rigorous Higher Order Questioning	8	Math Department Chair, Reading Coach	Algebra Teachers	On-going	classroom visits, lesson plans	Principal, Assistant Principal
Agile Minds	678	Math Department Chair	All Math Teachers	On-going; training via PLCs for Math	CTEM; Implementation in classrooms; Lesson Plans; PLC Minutes	Principal; Assistant Principal;
					CTEM;	

Times Attack	678	Math Department Chair	All Math Teachers	On-going; training via PLCs for Math	Implementation in classrooms; Lesson Plans; PLC Minutes	Principal; Assistant Principal;
--------------	-----	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		The percent of students achieving proficiency (level 3) on the 2013 Science FCAT test will increase from 45% [102] to 47% [114].			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
45% [102]		47% [114]			
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
	Rigor:  Instructional Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies	2a. Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	PLCs meet weekly. Once per month a PLC meeting will be devoted to Lesson Study/analysis of weekly lesson plans.	PLC meeting notes.



1	designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	to the NGSSS or CCSS.		PLCs will peer review lesson plans and offer suggestions for increased questioning rigor. Webb's DOK will be basis for peer review.	
2	Instructional: Lessons/activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	3c. TE use of differentiated instructional strategies will be monitored through CTEM, particularly in the area of expectations and support for low-expectancy students. (See CTEM alignment.)	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM, Teacher Leaders	PLCs meet weekly. Once per month the PLC will address/discuss need to keep instruction at a place that meets needs of 3,4,5 level performers.	PLC meeting notes.
3	Informational Text Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	Teacher maintained logs, lesson plans.	Classroom visits, review of writing logs and lesson plans.
4		For all Barriers, teachers [when applicable] will use Discovery Ed Assignment Builder tool [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 group:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.  Science Goal #2a:	The percent of students scoring above proficiency (level 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT in science will increase from 20% [45] to 22% [53].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

20% [45]		22% [53]			
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	Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction:  1. Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	One CTEM Informal Observation will focus upon high order questions and high order discourse where students demonstrate their ability to function at a high level of thought.	CTEM Informal Observation
2	Rigor  Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	PLCs will discuss Webb's DOK and share high order questions used during previous instruction.	Lesson plans.
3	Informational Text  Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-12), in grades K-2 through Read-Alouds and in grades 3-12 with intertextual triads [not used in math classes], students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	PLCs will discuss use of fiction and non-fiction text.	PLC meeting notes.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.  Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Close Reading Specifically in the area of Science	678	Reading Coach	Science Teachers	On-going; via PLCs	PLC meeting notes; classroom visits; lesson plans	Principal, Assistant Principal
Webb's Depth of Knowledge Training and Rigorous Higher Order Questions	678	Reading Coach	Science Teachers	On-going; via PLCs	PLC meeting notes; classroom visits; lesson plans	Principal, Assistant Principal

Science Budget:

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

# 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:	The percent of students achieving proficiency level 3.0 or higher on 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 84% [196] to 92% [224].
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84% [196]	92% [224]

### 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 have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas when assessing student responses, check for proper capitalization of the first word of the sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is a complete sentence.  Learners will write to explain their reasoning on complex writing tasks.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, review of writing samples, lesson plans.	CTEM tools, review/critique of writing 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:

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT Writing mechanics	8	Reading Coach	8th grade teachers	on-going; PLCs	classroom visits; PLC meeting notes; student work	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach
PARCC Writing Mechanics	6	Reading Coach	6th grade teachers	on-going; PLCs	classroom visits; PLC meeting notes; student work	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	At least 80% [203] of 2013 7th grade will score at least Level 3 on Civics EOC Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	80% [203]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Rigor:  Instructional Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	2a. Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	PLCs meet weekly. Once per month a PLC meeting will be devoted to Lesson Study/analysis of weekly lesson plans. PLCs will peer review lesson plans and offer suggestions for increased questioning rigor. Webb's DOK will be basis for peer review.	PLC meeting notes.
2	Instructional:  Lessons/activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	3c. TE use of differentiated instructional strategies will be monitored through CTEM, particularly in the area of expectations and support for low-expectancy students. (See CTEM alignment.)	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM, Teacher Leaders	PLCs meet weekly. Once per month the PLC will address/discuss need to keep instruction at a place that meets needs of 3,4,5 level performers.	PLC meeting notes.
3	Informational Text  Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders	Teacher maintained logs, lesson plans.	Classroom visits, review of writing logs and lesson plans.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.  Civics Goal #2:	At least 15% [38] of 2013 CMS 7th grade will score Level 4 on Civics EOC Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	15% [38]

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	Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Provide differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports as appropriate based on daily checks for understanding.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, observations.	CTEM
	Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas when assessing student responses, check for proper capitalization of the first word of the	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CTEM Teacher Leaders.	Classroom visits, observations.	CTEM

2		sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is a complete sentence.		
---	--	---	--	--

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
Successful passing of Civics EOC	7	SS Department Chair	Civics teachers	on-going; EOC test; PLC meetings to prepare for EOC exam.	PLC meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal

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	By July 2013, the Average Daily Attendance rate (AD) will increase from 96% [678] to 97% [685]. By July 2013, the percent of students accruing 10 or more days of absence in a one school year period of time

Attendance Goal #1:	will decrease by 5%. By July 2013, the percent of students accruing 10 or more tardies in a one school year period of time will decrease by 2%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96% [678]	97% [685]
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
24% [195]	19% [134]
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
4% [30]	2% [14]

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	1.1. Rural nature of school attendance zone; parents' work is located a far distance from the school; road construction at entrance of school; many students arrive to school via school bus.	1.1. Continue to stress the importance of school attendance via TV show and parent out-dial; contact parents per district attendance policy.	1.1. Attendance Office; Dean	1.1. TERMS data	1.1. TERMS data

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

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

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

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

*End of Attendance Goal(s)*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	By July 2013, the number of in-school suspensions, total in-school suspension days assigned and percent of students receiving in-school suspension days will decrease by 5%.  By July 2013, the number of out-of-school suspensions, total out-of-school suspension days assigned and percent of students receiving out-of-school suspension days will decrease by 5%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
220 days	209 days
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
14% [99]	9% [63]
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
78 days	74 days
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
7% [49]	2% [46]
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	1.1 Zero Tolerance Offenses will result in either In-School or Out-Of-School Suspensions	1.1 Via TV Morning Show, remind students that zero tolerance offenses will be dealt with accordingly; advise students to seek School Counselor help if unsure how to proceed in a challenging situation.	1.1. Attendance Office; Dean; Principal; Guidance Office; Youth Relations Deputy	1.1. Analysis of TERMS discipline data.	1.1. TERMS

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						

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>	The percent of parents involved in school activities (e.g., Open House, Curriculum Nights, Festivals) will increase from 37% [260] to 40% [280].
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
37% [260]	40% [280]

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	1.1 The distance parents travel from home to work, thus parents arrive home late making it difficult for them to volunteer and attend events at the school.	1.1. Scheduling activities at various times of the school day [morning and evening]. Invite parents to be guest speakers Have concerts in which their child participates in.	1.1. CMS Volunteer Coordinator and RTI/PBS Team; Principal; Asst. Princ.	1.1. Sign-in sheets at events. Parent Survey(s)	1.1. Sign-in sheets at events. Parent Survey(s)
2	1.2 Both parents are working full-time making it difficult for parent to find time to participate in school activities.	1.2. Offering parents food at events such as Curriculum night, Family FCAT night so that they can attend events after work.	1.2. Volunteer Coordinator and RTI/PBS Team; Principal, Asst. Princ.	1.2. Parent Survey(s) Sign-in sheets	1.2. Sign-in sheets at events. Parent Survey(s)
3	1.3. Various sporting events parents attend with their child throughout the week making it difficult to attend school functions.	1.3. Recruit parents to volunteer at day time events at the school such as the school book fair, working in the PBS store, going on fieldtrips.	1.3. Volunteer Coordinator and RTI/PBS Team; Principal, Assistant Principal.	1.3. Parent Survey(s) and Sign-in sheets	1.3. Sign-in sheets at events. Parent Survey(s)

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						

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM		CMS will have 25 students participate in the school-wide science fair this school year.			
STEM Goal #1:					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	CMS Science Fair participation is typically required at 6th grade level.	CMS will offer/encourage Science Fair participation at 7th and 8th grades and will offer mentoring of fair projects at all three grade levels.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Dept. Chair, all science teachers.	List number of students in fair.	Number of students participating in 2012/2013 science fair.

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 Fair participation	678	Science Department Chair	Science PLC	On-Going;	PLC meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Department Chair
----------------------------	-----	--------------------------	-------------	-----------	-------------------	--

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:		By the end of the 2013SY at least 70% of current 6th grade students will have completed a semester of keyboarding.			
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	CMS has one CTE teacher. Int. to Tech is taught for one semester. CMS currently has no one eligible to administer industry certification exams.	Continue to offer Intro to Tech; seek person [s] interested in pursuing exam certification.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CTE teacher.	Monitor levels of CTE enrollment.	Semester class size reports.

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

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$0.00

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input checked="" type="radio"/> Priority	<input type="radio"/> Focus	<input type="radio"/> Prevent	<input type="radio"/> 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 9/14/2012)

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
AR Rewards	\$300.00
Reading Materials [magazine subscriptions for Reading Classes].	\$1,052.46
Funding of AR [projected].	\$3,800.00

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



Monthly meetings to discuss the following: 2013 SIP, CTEM, Webb's DOK use, benchmark/quarterly progress monitoring trends.

# 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

Collier School District CORKSCREW MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	76%	82%	94%	59%	311	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	65%	81%			146	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	74% (YES)	76% (YES)			150	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					607	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Collier School District CORKSCREW MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	76%	93%	58%	305	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	67%	76%			143	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	70% (YES)	77% (YES)			147	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					595	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested