FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: RICHARDSON MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Columbia

Principal: Mr. Lex Carswell

SAC Chair: Mrs. Libby Clary

Superintendent: Mr. Mike Millikin

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 9/28/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Lex Carswell	M.A. Ed. Leadership, Certified in: Ed Leadership. Assistant Superintendent, 4.5 years.	.25	16	District Grade: 2011: B 2010: B 2009: B 2008: B
Assis Principal	Angela Coppock	M.A.Ed. Leadership, Certified in: Ed Leadership.	.25	2	Columbia High School 2012: Pending 2011: B 2010: B
Assis Principal	Trey Hosford	M.A.Ed. Leadership, Certified in: Ed Leadership	.25	2.25	Challenge Learning Center / Alternative School: 2012: None Available 2011: None Available 2010: None Available

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	Susan Williams	BS Elem. Educ.; Certified in Elem. Educ. & ESOL, Endorsed in Reading	12	8	2012: D - No AYP 2011: C 77% AYP 2010: C 77% AYP 2009: C 74% AYP 2008: C 77% AYP 2007: C 72% AYP 2006: C 77% AYP 2005: C 77% AYP 2004: C 77% AYP

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 meetings of new teachers with principal	Principal	ongoing	
2	2. Mentoring new teachers with veteran staff	Susan Williams, Reading Coach; Libby Clary,CRT; Lucy Smith,County Mentor.	ongoing	
3	3. Beginning teacher program.	Angela Coppock, Administrator of Guidance and Curriculum	May, 2013	
4	4. ER&D Program	County Level	May, 2013	
5	5. Florida Universities Job Fairs	Columbia County School Board Personnel	May 2013	
6	6. NEFEC/Foundation for Rural Education Excellence- establish a retention program that will increase mentoring for new teachers and teachers will be offered training in reading endorsement.Teachers are also provided internet access to complete college courses, and assistance by Nationally Board Certified teachers	Angela Coppock, Administrator of Guidance and Curriculum; Libby Clary, CRT; Susan Williams, Reading Coach & Marcie Braden, National Board Teacher	May 2013	
7	7. District recruiting system	Lex Carswell, Principal	Ongoing	
8	8.Soliciting referrals from current employees	Lex Carswell, Principal	Ongoing	
9	9. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Lex Carswell, Principal	Ongoing	
10	10. EPI Program	Florida Gateway College	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Data is pending due to incomplete state evaluations	Data is pending due to incomplete state evaluations

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
47	8.5%(4)	31.9%(15)	23.4%(11)	34.0%(16)	21.3%(10)	93.6%(44)	10.6%(5)	2.1%(1)	21.3%(10)

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
Libby Clary	Latoya Powe	Mrs. Clary is a certified veteran teacher of 24 years in Social Studies and is certifiable in Language Arts. She is currently the Curriculum Resource Teacher.	Professional development specifically for beginning teachers will be provided at the school and district level as well as through NEFSU and the EPI Program at Florida Gateway College. Mrs. Braden a National Board Certified Teacher will serve as an added coach to all candidates.
John Cole	Carrie Jones	Mr. Cole is a veteran teacher of 13 years. He is certified in Social Studies and teaches Agriculture and Career Options	Professional development specifically for beginning teachers will be provided at the school and district level as well as through NEFSU and the EPI Program at Florida Gateway College.
Lucy Smith	Moses Parker	Mrs. Smith is a veteran teacher of 35 years and serves as CCSD Mentor.	Professional development will be provided at the school and district level as well as through NEFSU and the EPI Program at Florida Gateway College.
Susan Williams	Bobbie Jo Pittman	Mrs. Williams is a veteran teacher of 16 years. She currently is the Reading Coach.	Professional development will be provided at the school and district level as well as through NEFSU and the EPI Program at Florida Gateway College.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided through: Title I Supplemental Educational Services (SES), SAI Tutoring during the school day,intensive courses in mathematics and reading, content resource teachers, mentors, and before school tutoring.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

The Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program (MEP) will closely monitor migrant student progress at each school site by meeting on a regular basis with students, teachers, guidance personnel and other appropriate staff. The MEP will implement supplementary literacy and mathematics tutorials that address the unique needs of migrant students. The MEP will also provide a family advocate to serve as the liaison between the student's family and school.

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

The district receives funds for professional development to increase student achievement through teacher training.

Title III

The district did not qualify for Title III funds

Title X- Homeless

The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school,extended learning opportunity programs, and course recovery programs. SAI tutors work one-on-one or in small group settings with identified low performing students.

Violence Prevention Programs

The Administrator over Guidance and Curriculum at Richardson Middle School in coordination with the Student Assistance Program (S.A.P.) identifies students in need of anger management intervention and provides opportunities for those students to participate in anger management programs. RMS also participates in the Sonny's Kids with Character Program.

Nutrition Programs

Richardson Middle School offers breakfast and lunch to all students and participates in the national free and reduced lunch program. A nutrition unit is taught in the Physical Education Classes as a part of the Hoops for Heart program sponsored by the American Heart Association. The teacher for the teen pregnancy program teaches nutrition education to the students in the program.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Richardson Middle school offers two year long elective classes; one that combines Agriculture and Career Options. The second class is a computer keyboarding class which uses various software platforms.

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS leadership team includes:
Trey Hosford, Administrator of Student Affairs and Facilities
Lance Hastings, School Psychologist
Kim Lipthrott, Data Coach
Libby Clary, Curriculum Resource Teacher
Susan Williams, Reading Coach

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

The purpose of the MTSS in our school is to ensure high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance level and learning rate over time to make data-based decisions to guide instruction. The MTSS reviews school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The major goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.) The team used the Problem Solving Model and all decisions are guided by the review and analysis of student data.

The MTSS meets weekly and uses the problem solving process to:
•Oversee the multi-tiered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental, and Tier 3/Intensive)
• Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tier 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:
-Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading, math and
science
-Extended Learning Programs during and after school
-Intensive Reading and Math classes
-Create, manage and update the school resource map
• Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis.
• Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange training aligned with the SIP Goals
• Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels.
• Organize and support systematic data collection as needed.
• Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum).

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 School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the MTSS.
• The PSLT (Problem Solving Leadership Team) and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
o review and analyze screening and collateral data

o develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
o develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses
o establish methods to track students' progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or
enrichment
o develop progress monitoring goals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or
school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify interventions and/or enrichment activities).
o review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
o assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/MTSS processes

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.

CORE CURRICULUM - Tier 1
DATA SOURCE: FCAT released test, Progress Monitoring Assessments, FAIR, Classroom Assessments
DATA BASE: School Generated Excel Data Base, Think Gate, Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network, Subject Area Generated
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE: Reading Coach, Data Coach, Individual Teachers, CRT

SUPPLEMENTAL/INTENSIVE INSTRUCTION (TIERS 2 AND 3)
DATA SOURCE: Extended learning program,Performance Matters, FCAT Test Maker, FL Achieves, FAIR,OPM
DATABASE: School Generated Excel Database
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: PSLT, Reading Coach, Data Coach, Individual Teachers, PLC's, CRT

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Training will be provided by the District MTSS Coordinator. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District MTSS Coordinator develops resources and staff development trainings, staff development sessions will be conducted as they become available.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The plan to support MTSS will be as follows:
Policies and decisions (including curriculum,instruction,scheduling, staffing, and family involvement will be mutually determined based upon current evidence regarding effective practices.
The implementation will be guided by a formalized multi-year action plan with both academics and behavior becoming the top goals.
A formal, long term professional development plan for all staff and administrators with all activities directly tied to practices that support the implementation and refinement of a multi-tier system based upon local data.
The leadership team will actively work to enhance staff motivation and capacity to be actively involved in decision making and leading from within.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Lex Carswell, Principal
Angela Coppock, Administrator over Guidance and Curriculum
Susan Williams, Reading Coach
Ashley Mederios, Reading Teacher, Reading Teacher, 7th Grade
Tiara Jernigan, Reading Teacher, Reading Teacher, 8th Grade

Bobbie Jo Pittman, Reading Teacher, 6th Grade
Kim Lipthrott, Data Coach
Kathy Revoir, Media Specialist

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

The LLT is a subset of the Schools Leadership team. The LLT meets once a month to discuss the implementation of reading strategies.

The LLT provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies identified in the School Improvement Plan. Lex Carswell, principal, serves as the chairperson of the LLT. Susan Williams, Reading Coach, provides expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. Mr. Carswell and Mrs. Williams collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instruction support is provided to all teacher.

Mr. Carswell also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the School Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.

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

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas

- Professional Development

- Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the curriculum.

- Data analysis (on-going)

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/25/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*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.

Richardson Middle School has participated in the Florida Reading Initiative (FRI) Training and continues to implement the Essential Six reading strategies.

Susan Williams, Reading Coach, will provide on-site support of the implementation of the FRI through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities. Ms. Williams will create a yearly action plan that outlines professional development that will be offered throughout the school year.

The reading coach will also provide demonstration/model teaching opportunities focusing on the implementation of content-based literacy strategies as mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan. She will schedule and facilitate pre-observation, during observation, and post-observation activities and discussion.

The reading coach and other members of the Literacy Leadership Team (including the school principal) will review data, conduct progress monitoring of the plan, and evaluate reading data to insure that all teachers are teaching reading strategies across the curriculum.

The LLT will review students' literacy data and create lessons that are responsive to identified student needs.

Mrs. Williams will assist content area teachers with the integration of differentiated instruction strategies into their classrooms.

*High Schools Only

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

NA

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?

NA

Postsecondary Transition

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

NA

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In grades 6 - 8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Reading will increase from 56% to 59%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (230)	44% (234)

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	Appropriate use of student monitoring data to drive instruction. Minimal use of differentiated instruction in core classrooms.	1. Teachers will keep a data notebook with disaggregated data for their students. 2. Based on the data, teachers will decide what skills need to be taught to all students and what skills need to be retaught to particular groups of students. 3. Professional development will be provided to the faculty. 4. Differentiated instruction will be used with targeted students (remediationand/or enrichment).	Principal Administrator over Curriculum Reading Coach Data Coach CRT Teachers	Teachers will review monitoring data and keep track of the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% of mastery. Teachers will keep track in their data notebook of students' mastery of each SSS benchmark. Leadership team will review assessment data and note positive trends.	FAIR Performance Matters STAR FCAT Test Maker FL Achieves
2					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In grades 6 - 8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT Reading will increase from 18% to 20%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (91)	18% (96)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	Lack of focus on complexity of questions for assignments and assessments at the classroom level.	1. Using the cognitive complexity model of the FCAT Test, teachers will incorporate questions of challenging difficulty and high cognitive complexity in classroom assessments and assignments.	PLST Reading Coach Team Leaders Department Chairpersons	Academic teams and subject area departments examine student work and assessment data. Leadership team examines assessment data for positive trends. Classroom walk throughs. Review of lesson plans and classroom assessments. Review of rubrics.	Classroom assignments/assessments. FAIR Testing Performance Matters STAR FCAT Test Maker FL Achieves

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In grades 6 - 8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students making learning gains in Reading will increase from 53% to 56%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% (283)	54% (288)

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	Appropriate use of student monitoring data to drive instruction. Minimal use of differentiated instruction in core classrooms.	1. Teachers will keep a data notebook with disaggregated data for their students. 2. Based on the data, teachers will decide what skills need to be taught to all students and what skills need to be retaught to specific groups of students. 3. Professional development will be provided to faculty. 4. Differentiated Instruction will be used with students for (remediation and/or enrichment).	Principal Administrator over Curriculum Reading Coach CRT Data Coach Teachers	Teachers will review monitoring data and keep track of the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% of mastery. Teachers will keep track in their data notebook of students' mastery of each SSS benchmark. Leadership Team will review monitoring data and note positive trends.	FAIR Performance Matters STAR FCAT Test Maker FL Achieves

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				
			Person or	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In grades 6 - 8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students in the lowest quartile making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading will increase from 56% to 57%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51%(272)	52% (278)

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	Teachers at varying levels of understanding and implementing the FCIM Model. Minimal use of on-going monitoring data to identify students in need of specific interventions. Minimal understanding of when and how to implement mini lessons for identified students. Large number of students reading below grade level.	1. Teachers will use benchmark assessments to identify students in need of reinforcement/remediation. 2. LLT will develop a timeline for teaching the essential skills and standards. 3. Grade level teams will meet at the end of each grading period for FCIM Training dis-aggregating student monitoring data and Standards and Assessment training.	Academic teams will review mini-assessment data and record information in data notebooks. Principal Administrator over Curriculum LLT Reading Coach Data Coach CRT	LLT will review on-going assessments,etc. and plot number of students reaching 80% mastery.	Performance Matters FAIR STAR FCAT Test Maker FL Achieves
2					

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

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

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.	In grades 6-8, 79% of the following All Curriculum student subgroups will score a level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Reading or the percentage of non-proficient students will

Reading Goal #5B:		decrease by 10%. (Safe Harbor Targets: White 63%, Black 38%.		

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 60% (321) Black: 33% (200)/ AYP Data Unavailable	White: 63% (315) Black: 36% (245)/ AYP Data Unavailable

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	Teachers are at varying levels of understanding the types of vocabulary items that complement content instruction. Team meetings do not include the development of vocabulary instructional activities for upcoming lessons Students' lack of background knowledge.	1. Strengthen the core curriculum and improve student vocabulary acquisition through the implementation of appropriately leveled vocabulary development lessons across all content areas. 2. Teams will collaborate during Common Planning time. 3. Team teachers will familiarize themselves with upcoming lessons	Principal Administrator over Curriculum Reading Coach LLT Team Leaders	Review of teacher lesson plans. Classroom walk-throughs. Review of assessment data and fidelity data. Minutes of Team Meetings.	End of unit tests (all content areas). Vocabulary assessments (all content areas). Performance Matters FAIR

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:	NA

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In grades 6 - 8, 79% SWD All curriculum students will score a level 3 or above on the 2012 FCAT Reading Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10% in 2012 (*Safe Harbor Target - 30%).

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

	27% (45)/ AYP Data unavailable		30% (21)/ AYP Data unavailable	

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	Unavailable electronic accessibility to FAA data (instructional planning tool, mainframe, etc. Collecting data with fidelity Core curriculum teachers lack of understanding data and the students' disability to make instructional decisions. General education teachers understanding the IEP and instructional accommodations and implementing necessary strategies. Multiple preparations for SWD teachers.	1. SWD's reading comprehension will improve by connecting individual needs to instruction as outlined in the IEP. 2. General Ed and SWD teachers will familiarize themselves with each students' IEP goals, strategies, and accommodations. 3.Each grading period the General Ed and SWD teachers review students' IEP to ensure that all strategies and accommodations are being implemented with fidelity. 4. Across all content areas, teachers will write SMART goals for SWD students based on each grading periods material. 5. Teachers will write, and discuss effective differentiated strategies for remediation and enrichment for SWD students 6. All data is recorded in their data notebook	Principal Administrator over Curriculum ESE Team Leader Staffing Specialist	Review of IEP Progress Reports Fidelity checks (Fidelity monitoring tool will be created by SWD Monitoring Team. Monitoring data will be reviewed each grading period. The Monitoring Team will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of SWD students' reaching 80% mastery on units of instruction. Team leaders will share data with the SWD Monitoring Team, which will review data for positive trends.	STAR FAIR Performance Matters Unit & Benchmark Assessments 9 Weeks Grades for SWD students.
2	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See5A.1	See 5A.1
3	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In grades 6 - 8, 79% Economically Disadvantages All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2012 FCAT Reading or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. (Safe Harbor Target - 47%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (212)/ AYP Data unavailable	47% (221)/ AYP Data unavailable

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
	Teachers are at varying	1. Strengthen the core	Principal	Review of teacher lesson	End of unit tests

1	levels of understanding of the types of vocabulary items that complement content instruction Team meetings included limited discussion of leveled vocabulary development and assessment for content instruction Team meeting include limited discussion on the development of vocabulary instructional activities for upcoming lessons Students limited background knowledge	curriculum and improve student vocabulary acquisition through the implementation of appropriately leveled vocabulary lessons across all content areas.	Administrator over Curriculum Reading Coach LLT Team Leaders	plans for evidence of strategies. Classroom walk throughs. Review of monitoring data. Agendas/Minutes from Team Meetings	(all content areas. Vocabulary assessments(all content areas). Performance Matters FAIR
2	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1
3	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction Vocabulary Acquisition Strategies Data Analysis	6th-8th Grade 6th-8th Grade 6th-8th Grade	Reading Coach PLC's Course Specific Facilitators Principal Administrator over Curriculum Data Coach	All teachers school wide PLC's	PLC's: Ongoing PLC Course Specific Meeting Common Planning Meetings	Classroom walk throughs to monitor Differentiated Instruction. Classroom walk throughs to monitor Vocabulary Acquisition. PLT review of data.	Principal Administrator over Curriculum PLT

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:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In grades 6 - 8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 35% to 36%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (187)	36% (192)

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	Implementation of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Varying levels of understanding and implementation of Differentiated Instruction. Lack of common planning time for all math teachers to discuss best practices before units of instruction. Need for professional development in organizing effective PLC's for math instructors.	1.The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. 2.Student's math skills will improve through teachers implementing the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and providing differentiated instruction within the classroom. 3.PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. 4.As a professional development activity, PLC's will spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling research-based DI best practice strategies. 5.PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies discussed in their PLC meetings. 6.At the end of units, math teachers give common assessments identified from core curriculum materials. 7.PLC teachers will use data to discuss effective strategies, instructional needs such as remediation and enrichment. 8.Teachers will record all data in their data notebook and keep a log of all work done in PLC.	PLT Administrator over Curriculum Subject Area Leaders	Review of PLC Logs and data notebooks. Classroom walk throughs. •Documentation of SMART goals in lesson plans. •Documentation of DI in lesson plans.	Performance Matters Classroom Assessmsents Project CSI-PI

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:	

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 10% to 11%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10% (53)	11% (58)

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	Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. Lack of focus in PLC's or professional development on higher order questions. Students not appropriately identified. Lack of course offerings.	1.The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. As a result, teachers will be required to incorporate higher order questioning strategies into their lessons. 2.Teacher use of higher level questioning vs. lower level questioning. 3.Teachers assess students by having them identify and create different levels of questions. 4.Professional development activities on higher order questions using Webb's Depth of Knowledge will be provided during PLC's.	Administrator over Curriculum Math teachers	Collect data and compute percentage of higher level vs. lower level questioning in classroom and on classroom assessments. PLT will review data for positive trends. Review of monitoring assessments, student grades, FCAT scores to correctly place students.	Performance Matters Classroom Assessments FCAT

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in	

mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In grades 6 - 8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 47% to 48%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47% (251)	48% (256)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers at varying levels of understanding of the New Generation Sunshine State Standards.

Teachers at varying levels of implementation of differentiated instruction.

Students lack of basic skills and background knowledge in mathematics

Limited technology hardware in mathematics classrooms.</td>
<td>1. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum.
2.Students math skills will improve through the use of technology, hands-on activities, and differentiated instruction to implement the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.
3.Teachers will write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material.
4.As a Professional Development Activity, PLC's will spend time researching, sharing, teaching, and modeling scientific based technology and hands-on learning strategies.
5.PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum with strategies identified from PLC discussions.
6.At the end of the unit,</td>
<td>Principal

Administrator over Curriculum

Math Department Chair

CRT</td>
<td>Review of lesson plans to document use of technology, hands-on learning, and DI.

PLC's review data from unit assessments.

Classroom walk throughs

• PLT will review assessment data for positive trends.</td>
<td>Common Unit Assessments

Performance Matters

Benchmark Assessments</td>
</tr>
</table>

| | | common assessments from the curriculum will be given. 7.Data from the assessment will be shared at PLC's. 8.As a professional development activity PLC's will analyze data from unit assessments and identify strategies that were effective in producing learning gains. | | | |

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	NA

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

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

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	In grades 6 - 8, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 55% to 56%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (294)	56% (299)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Teachers at varying skill levels of implementing the FCIM. Teachers implementation of the FCIM is not consistent across math classes.	1. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. 2.Student will improve math skills through teachers using the FCIM strategy. 3. Through the use of	Principal Administrator over Curriculum Math Department Chair	PLC's will review data of mini assessments and record data in data notebook. Evidence of strategies used in lesson plans.	Classroom Assessments Performance Matters FCAT

			CRT	Classroom walk throughs
1	Limited understanding of how to remediate within the classroom and implement mini lessons within the District pacing guide.	available data, PLC's identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need remediation. 4.Based on the data, PLC's develop a projected timeline for reteaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. 5.As a professional development activity in PLC's, teachers will identify and/or create mini lessons and mini assessments for the identified benchmarks needing remediation/reinforcement. 6.Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments. 7.PLC teachers assess the data and adjust the timeline and move identified skills to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule.		Pacing Calendar

---

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

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

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:	In grades 6-8, 80% of the following All Curriculum student subgroups will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. (Safe Harbor Targets: White - 44%, Black - 69%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 49% (183) Black: 72%(149)	White: 50% (188) Black: 73% (157)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students not receiving academic support outside of the math classroom. Lack of per-requisite skills.	1. Students' math skills will improve through providing supplemental after class/instruction. 2.Identify student in lowest quartile and/or	Administrator over Curriculum Math Teachers	Review of District level baseline and midyear assessments for positive trends. Review of accelerated	Accelerated Math Assessments STAR Math Testing

		Level 1. 3.Schedule students into intensive math course. 4.Utilize online tutorials/practice and accelerated math within these classes.		math data for individual students to monitor learning gains.	FCAT
1					
2	Teacher support for planning remediation and enrichment activities. Large number of students in need of intensive math and scheduling conflict as a result.	1.Students' math skills will improve through the 1.Implementation of supplemental instruction for re-teaching and enrichment. 2.Each academic team will provide time weekly for remediation for targeted students. 3.Targeted students will attend either a re-teach or an enrichment session. 4.Reteach/enrichment sessions will be assessed with mini assessments to demonstrate mastery. 5.Offer SES tutoring	Administrator over Curriculum CRT Team Leaders Math Teachers	Teachers will record documentation of benchmark mastery on mini assessments in data notebook. Classroom walk trhoughs observing strategy. List of students attending re-teach or enrichment sessions.	Mini Benchmark Assessments Classroom Assessments FCAT

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In grades 6 - 8, 80% SWD All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math Test or the percentage of non proficient students will decrease by 10% in 2013. (Safe Harbor Target - 69%)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (33)	24% (39)

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	No electronic accessibility to FAA data (instructional planning tool, mainframe, etc). Collecting data with fidelity Core curriculum teachers lack of understanding data and the students' disability to make instructional decisions. General education teachers understanding the IEP and instructional accommodations and implementing necessary strategies. Teachers at varying skill levels.	1.Math skills will improve by connecting individual needs to instruction as outlined in the IEP. 2.Math General ed and/or SWD teachers will familiarize themselves with each student;s IEP goals, strategies, and accommodations. 3.Every nine weeks the Math General Ed and/or SWD teacher reviews students' IEP to ensure that all strategies and accommodations are being implemented with fidelity. 4.Using data, every nine weeks SWD students will receive an Individual Education Plan Progress Report (along with the report card) to inform parents of the students' progress in meeting IEP goals. 5.Math PLC's will write SMART goals for SWD students based on each nine weeks of material. 6.As a Professional Development Activity in the PLC, teachers will discuss the implementation of IEP strategies and modifications. 7.Based on data, PLC teachers will discuss strategies that were effective with SWD students. 8.Teachers provide differentiated instruction to targeted SWD students (remediation and/or enrichment). 9.All data is recorded in data notebook.	Principal ESE Team Leader Staffing Specialist Administrator over Curriculum	Review of IEP Progress Reports Fidelity checks (fidelity monitoring tool will be created by Principal's Leadership Team (PLT). Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. Teams will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of SWD students reaching 80% mastery on units of instruction. Team leaders will share data with the PLT. PLT will review data for positive trends.	Unit & Benchmark Assessments 9 Weeks Grades for SWD Students
2	See 5A.1 See 5A.2	See 5A.1 See 5A.2	See 5A.1 See 5A.2	See 5A.1 See 5A.2	See 5A.1 See 5A.2
3	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	In grades 6 - 8, 80% Economically Disadvantages All Curriculum Students will score Level 3 or above on the 2012 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%. (Safe Harbor Target - 59%)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (188)	66% (194)

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1
2	See 5A.2	See 5A.2	See 5A.2	See 5A.2	See 5A.2
3	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1	See 4.1

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The percentage of Standard Curriculum students passing the Algebra I EOC (Level 3) on the 2013 FCAT will be maintained at 100%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (24)	100% (15)

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students' skill level not being in-line with Parents' expectations for student remaining in class. Limited basic math skills (fractions, decimals).	1. Frequent monitoring. 2. Teachers use of higher level questions. 3. Teachers assess students by having them identify and create different levels of questions.	Administrator over Curriculum Algebra Teacher	Monitor Data. PLT will review data for positive trends.	Performance Matters FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The percentage of Standard Curriculum Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 on the 2013 Algebra EOC will be 27%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (24)	27% (4)

			Person or	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students' are still struggling with understanding basic Algebraic skills.	1. Frequent monitoring. 2.Consistent drill and practice of difficult skills.	Administrator over Curriculum Algebra Teacher	Monitor Data PLT will review data for positive trends.	Performance Matters Mini Assessments FCAT

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	The percentage of student subgroups by ethnicity not making satisfactory progress on the Algebra I EOC in 2013 will be 13% (Black) and 13% (White)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (24)	13% (2)Black 13% (2)White

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited basic Math skills (fractions, decimals). Parents' lack skills to assist and support with daily homework.	1.Frequent Monitoring 2.Before school tutoring 3.Saturday Algebra Camps	Administrator over Curriculum Algebra Teachers	Monitor Data PLT will review data for positive trends	Performance Matters FCAT

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra during 2012-2013 is 26%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (24)	26% (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	Students' skill level not being in-line with Parents' expectations for student remaining in class. Limited basic Math skills (fractions, decimals) Parental assistance with homework is unavailable.	1.Frequent monitoring 2.Before school tutoring. 3.Saturday Algebra Camps	Administrator over Curriculum. Algebra Teachers	Monitor Data PLT will review Data for positive trends.	Performance Matters FCAT

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:	The percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry on the 2013 EOC will be 67%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	67% (6)

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 find it difficult to transition from 2 Dimensional thinking to 3 Dimensional thinking. students struggle with logical thinking rather than abstract thinking. Students miss skills that build on each other when absent from school.	1.Frequent monitoring 2.Saturday EOC practice sessions. 3.Online access to practice deficient skills.	Administrator over Curriculum. Geometry Teacher	Monitor Data PLT will review data for positive trends.	Performance Matters FCAT EOC Mini Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	The percentage of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Geometry on the 2013 EOC will be 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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	Students find it difficult to transition from 2 Dimensional thinking to 3 Dimensional thinking. Students struggle with logical thinking rather than abstract thinking.	1.Frequent monitoring 2.Saturday EOC practice sessions. 3.Online access to practice deficient skills.	Administrator over Curriculum. Geometry Teacher	Monitor data PLT will review data for positive trends.	Performance Matters FCAT EOC Mini Assessments

Students miss skills that build on each other when absent from school.				

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

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

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	The percentage of student subgroups by ethnicity not making progress in Geometry during 2012-2013 will be 22%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	White 22% (2)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students find it difficult to transition from 2 Dimensional thinking to 3 Dimensional thinking. Students struggle with logical thinking rather than abstract thinking.	1.Frequent monitoring 2.Saturday EOC practice sessions. 3.Online access ability to practice deficient skills.	Administrator over Curriculum Geometry Teacher	Monitor data PLT will review data for positive trends.	Performance Matters FCAT EOC Mini Assessments

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

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

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

			Person or	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					

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

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

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

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:	The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry is 67%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	67% (6)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students find it difficult to transition from 2 Dimensional thinking to 3 Dimensional thinking. Students struggle with logical thinking rather than abstract thinking. Students miss skills that build on each other when absent from school. Parental support for homework is unavailable.	1.Frequent monitoring. 2.Saturday EOC practice sessions. 3.Before school tutoring. 4.Online access to practice deficient skills.	Administrator over Curriculum Geometry Teacher	Monitor Data PLT will review data for positive trends.	Performance Matters FCAT EOC Mini Assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Technology and Instructional equipment for Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS)	6th-8th Grade	Marcy Braden Al Nelson	Mimio Board Training / All Core Subjects / School Wide	Early Release Days and Teacher Work Days: Oct. 22 2012 Nov 7 2012 Dec 5 2012 Mar 13 2013	Administrators walk throughs Documented Lesson Plans Hands on Activity Implementation	Principal Administrator over Curriculum

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In grade 8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science test will increase from 29% to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

29% (60)	30% (62)	

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	Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts. Not all teachers are able to attend available science trainings on dates available by the district. Not all teachers are knowledgeable of the strategies of inquiry based instruction. Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of student data and/or the implementation of inquiry model.	1.The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. 2.Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teacher will increase the number of inquiry based instruction. 3.Teachers will attend District Science training and share information with their PLC's. 4.PLC's write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. 5.As a Professional Development Activity in their PLC's, teachers will spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction. 6.PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies. 7. At the end of units, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 7.Teachers bring assessment data to their PLC. 8.Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective. 9.All data is recorded in data notebook.	Principal Administrator over Curriculum Science Department Chair Science Teachers	Science PLC will review unit assessments and chart the increase in number of students achieving 80% mastery. Data will be shared with PLT and reviewed for positive trends	Performance Matters Classroom Assessments FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	In grade 8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 3% to 4%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3% (9)	4% (11)

	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	Teachers are at varying skills levels with higher order questioning techniques. PLC meetings do not focus on higher order questioning strategies for upcoming lessons.	1. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. There will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students. 2.PLC's will write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of materials. 3.Teacher will implement targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons. 4.Teachers implement common assessments. 5.Teachers will bring assessment data back to the PLC's. 6.PLC's will review student responses to higher order questions to access student's higher order thinking processes.	Principal Administrator over Curriculum Science Teachers	Science PLC's will review unit assessments and chart the increase in number of students reaching 80% accuracy. Science PLC's will share data with PLT and they will review for positive trends.	Classroom Assessments Performance Matters FL Achieves FCAT

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.	NA

Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

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:	In grade 8, the percentage of All Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Writing will maintain or increase from 95% to 96%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
95% (164)	96% (171)

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	•Teachers new to language arts lack skill and understanding regarding the FCAT Writing Assessment and Scoring Rubric. •Teachers new to Language Arts may not have FCAT Writing training •Teachers do not have confidence using holistic scoring methods.	Tier 1: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Action Steps: 1. As a professional development activity, teachers participate in assessment and rubric refresher courses and practice scoring within PLCs. 2. As a professional development activity, language arts chair and reading coach will facilitate advanced scoring sessions. 3. Continue the use of the Mary Lewis writing model as a means of teaching writing. New language arts teachers will be trained in Mary Lewis writing as a professional development activity in their PLCs. 4. Language Arts teachers will implement monthly writing assessments into their lesson plans. 5. Incorporate the use of Larry Bell's 12 words.	AP of Curriculum Reading Coach Language Arts Department Chair	•PLCs will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance and modify the instructional calendar as needed to provide differentiated instruction as needed. •Review by PLC of monthly writing assessement to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency (Level 4). Data will be kept in data notebook.	Monthly writing assessments Classroom writing assignments

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
No Data Submitted						

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**

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The attendance rate will increase from 93% in 2011-2012 to 94% during 2012-2013. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease from 10 in 2011-2012 to 9 in 2012-2013.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93% (494)	94% (499)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
10 (53)	9 (48)

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
	NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Most students with significant unexcused absences/tardies (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.	The Administrative Staff along with appropriate staff will meet every 20 days to: 1) review attendance data, and 2) discuss targeted students.	Administrator over Student Affairs Attendance Clerk	Review of 20 day attendance reports Follow steps outlined for reporting of Truancy Issues.	20 day attendance report S400 Attendance Screen Yellow Truancy Folders

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
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

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:	The total number of out-of-school suspension will decrease by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
NA	NA
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
NA	NA
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
192 (36%)	173 (26%)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
NA	NA
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student responsibility for behavior and actions	1. Create school-wide rules 2. Implement research behavior modification programs such as "Why Try, " and Response to Intervention Problem Solving Methods.	Administrative Team	Review monthly discipline data	Mid and End of Year Discipline Reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	During the 2012-2013 school year, parental involvement will increase from 89% to 90%
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
89% (473)	90% (478)
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		Notification of parent meetings not being received by parents.	Notification of parent meetings will be sent home by a variety of methods including: flyers taken home by students, IRIS Alert phone calls, notification on website, notes home in planner, and personal phone calls by team teachers.	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Data collected on the number of parents attending parent meetings.	Sign in sheet from meetings.
2		Parents not aware of opportunities for involvement.	Create calendars for each 9 weeks that highlight activities for parental involvement. Post calendar on the website and send copies home. Utilize school marquee to remind parents of involvement activities.	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Data collected on the number of parents participating in activities each 9 weeks.	Sign in sheets for parental involvement activities.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:			In grades 6th through 8th all Standard Curriculum Students will be provided with the opportunity to experience 21st century potential careers.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited exposure to real life Science and Engineering activities. Students' perceive Math and Science as difficult academic subjects. Limited access to technology.	1.Teachers will provide more Inquiry-based / hands-on instruction. 2.PLC's will discuss effective instructional methods/lessons. 3.Data notebooks will be kept to show sequence and growth.	Administrator over Curriculum Science Chairperson Science Teachers Math Chairperson Math Teachers	PLC's will review benchmark assessments and chart the number of students' at 80% mastery.	FL Focus Performance Matters FCAT

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	In grades 6th through 8th the percentage of All Curriculum Students being provided with the opportunity to experience 21st century potential careers is 23.5% (125)

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	Too many students' Not enough class blocks / teachers. Curriculum,technology/ equipment needed.	1.Students' need to be grouped by career interest. 2.Business/community leaders can provide real life experiences/ expertise in hands-on activities.	Administrator over Curriculum Mary Keen - Adult Ed Careers Teacher	Project based learning assignments. Technology based assignments. Classroom observation. Research Projects/Presentations.	Holistic Rubrics Oral Assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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

○ Priority	○ Focus	○ Prevent	○ NA

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ○ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 8/31/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

August/September
- Assist and Approve SIP / PIP / School Compact
•October

- Review baseline data
•November
-Review reading objectives
-Review 1st 9 weeks student assessment data and fidelity check information
•December
-Review writing objectives
•January
-Review math objectives
-Begin planning SAC sponsored Family Fun Night & Educational Showcase for April
•February
- Review mid-year data
- Review second nine weeks student assessment data and fidelity check information
- Continue planning Family Fun Night
•March
- Review science objectives
- Begin planning for parent/student/faculty/community surveys
- Check progress of Family Fun Night plans
•April
- Review the attendance suspension goals
- Carry out SAC sponsored Family Fun Night
•May
- Review the third nine weeks student assessment data and fidelity check information
- Discuss ideas for the 2013-2014 SIP

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Columbia School District
RICHARDSON MIDDLE SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	55%	46%	86%	29%	216	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	53%	55%			108	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	56% (YES)	65% (YES)			121	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					445	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Columbia School District
RICHARDSON MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	54%	46%	90%	32%	222	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	56%	56%			112	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	63% (YES)	55% (YES)			118	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					452	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested