# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
# 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: GRIFFIN MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Leon

Principal: Gwendolyn Lynn Thomas

SAC Chair: Christopher Gautney

Superintendent: Jackie Pons

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/1/2012

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Bachelor of Science Health & Physical Education<br><br>M aster of Ed. Health & Physical Education | | | 2012 Griffin Middle School Grade C; AYP - NM Reading Mastery - 39; Math Mastery - 36; Science Mastery - 25; ELL - NA Learning Gains Read - 62 Learning Gains Math - 54 Lowest 25% Read - 69 Lowest 25% Math - 57 SWD Reading - 12 SWD Math - 12 2011 Griffin Middle School Grade C; AYP - NM Reading Mastery - 53; Math Mastery - 54; Science Mastery - 32; ELL - NA Learning Gains Read - 50 Learning Gains Read - 62 Lowest 25% Read - 64 Lowest 25% Math - 65 SWD Reading - 32 SWD Math - 25 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Gwendolyn Thomas | Modified Master's Degree - Educational Leadership<br><br>Certifications:<br>Ed Leadership (all levels)<br><br>Health Ed (7-12)<br>Physical Ed (6-12)<br><br>Physical Ed (K-8)<br><br>School Principal (All levels) | 5 | 10 | 2010 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 54;<br>Math Mastery - 50;<br>Science Mastery - 33;<br>ELL - NA<br>SWD Reading - 28<br>SWD Math - 26<br>2009 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade – C; AYP NM<br>Reading Mastery: 52%<br>Math Mastery: 52%<br>Science Mastery:28%<br>Ell: N/A<br>SWD Reading: 26%<br>SWD Math: 20%<br>2008 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade – C; AYP NM<br>Reading Mastery: 55%<br>Math Mastery: 57%<br>Science Mastery:37%<br>Ell: N/A<br>SWD Reading:26%<br>SWD Math: 28%<br>2007 Deerlake Middle<br>Grade – A; AYP Yes<br>Reading Mastery: 89%<br>Math Mastery: 91%<br>Science Mastery:76%<br>Ell: N/A<br>SWD Reading: Yes<br>SWD Math: Yes |
| Assis Principal | Vivian Cooley | Bachelors of Science Mathematics Education<br><br>Masters of Ed<br>Ed. Leadership<br><br>Certifications:<br>. Mathematics Ed (6-12)<br><br>• Exceptional Student Education<br><br>• Educational Leadership<br><br>• Principal | 3 | 8 | 2012 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 39;<br>Math Mastery - 36;<br>Science Mastery - 25;<br>ELL - NA<br>Learning Gains Read - 62<br>Learning Gains Math - 54<br>Lowest 25% Read - 69<br>Lowest 25% Math - 57<br>SWD Reading - 12<br>SWD Math - 12<br><br>2011 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 53;<br>Math Mastery - 54;<br>Science Mastery - 32;<br>ELL - NA<br>Learning Gains Read - 50<br>Learning Gains Read - 62<br>Lowest 25% Read - 64<br>Lowest 25% Math - 65<br>SWD Reading - 32<br>SWD Math - 25<br><br>2010 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 54;<br>Math Mastery - 50;<br>Science Mastery - 33;<br>ELL - NA<br>SWD Reading - 28<br>SWD Math - 26<br><br>2009 – Rickards High School<br>Grade – D; AYP NM<br>Reading Mastery: 38%<br>Math Mastery: 68%<br>Science Mastery: 31%<br>ELL: N/A<br>SWD Reading: N/A<br>SWD Math: N/A<br><br>2008 – Rickards High School<br>Grade – C; AYP NM<br>Reading Mastery: 42%<br>Math Mastery: 75%<br>Science Mastery: 31%<br>ELL: N/A<br>SWD Reading: N/A<br>SWD Math: N/A<br><br>2007 – Rickards High School<br>Grade _C; AYP NM<br>Reading Mastery: 41%<br>Math Mastery: 68%<br>Science Mastery: 40%<br>ELL: N/A<br>SWD Reading: N/A |

| | | | | | SWD Math: N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assis Principal | Darren Wallace | • BS Physical Education, Florida A&M University<br><br>• M.Ed. Physical Education, Florida A&M University<br><br>• Modified Curriculum for Educational Leadership Certification, Florida A&M University<br><br>CERTIFICATIONS:<br><br>State of Florida teaching certificate in Secondary Physical Education 6-12<br><br>• State of Florida Educational Leadership (All levels)<br>• Expires June 30, 2013 | 2 | 7 | 2012 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 39;<br>Math Mastery - 36;<br>Science Mastery - 25;<br>ELL - NA<br>Learning Gains Read - 62<br>Learning Gains Math - 54<br>Lowest 25% Read - 69<br>Lowest 25% Math - 57<br>SWD Reading - 12<br>SWD Math - 12<br><br>2011 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 53;<br>Math Mastery - 54;<br>Science Mastery - 32;<br>ELL - NA<br>Learning Gains Read - 50<br>Learning Gains Read - 62<br>Lowest 25% Read - 64<br>Lowest 25% Math - 65<br>SWD Reading - 32<br>SWD Math - 25<br><br>R. Frank Nims Middle School 2005-2006<br>Grade: D AYP: No<br>• R. Frank Nims Middle School 2006-2007<br>Grade: F AYP: No<br>• R. Frank Nims Middle School 2007-2008<br>Grade: C AYP: No<br>• R. Frank Nims Middle School 2008-2009<br>Grade: D AYP: No<br>• Amos P. Godby High School 2009-2010<br>Grade: Pending AYP: No |

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Math | Pamela Scott | Bachelors of Science<br><br>Masters<br>• Elementary Ed.<br><br>• Early Childhood Ed.<br>• Mathematics (5-9) | 21 | 3 | 2012 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 39;<br>Math Mastery - 36;<br>Science Mastery - 25;<br>ELL - NA<br>Learning Gains Read - 62<br>Learning Gains Math - 54<br>Lowest 25% Read - 69<br>Lowest 25% Math - 57<br>SWD Reading - 12<br>SWD Math - 12<br><br>2011 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 53;<br>Math Mastery - 54;<br>Science Mastery - 32;<br>ELL - NA<br>Learning Gains Read - 50<br>Learning Gains Read - 62<br>Lowest 25% Read - 64<br>Lowest 25% Math - 65<br>SWD Reading - 32<br>SWD Math - 25<br><br>2010 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 54;<br>Math Mastery - 50;<br>Science Mastery - 33;<br>ELL - NA<br>SWD Reading - 28<br>SWD Math - 26<br><br>2009 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade – C; AYP NM<br>Reading Mastery: 52% |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Math Mastery: 52%<br>Science Mastery: 28%<br>Ell: N/A<br>SWD Reading: 26%<br>SWD Math: 20%<br>2008 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade – C; AYP NM<br>Reading Mastery: 55%<br>Math Mastery: 57%<br>Science Mastery: 37%<br>Ell: N/A<br>SWD Reading: 26%<br>SWD Math: 28%<br>2007 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade – C; AYP NM<br>Reading Mastery: 63%<br>Math Mastery: 63%<br>Science Mastery: 32%<br>Ell: N/A<br>SWD Reading: 26%<br>SWD Math: 28% |
| Science | Demarco Speight | | 4 | | 2012 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 39;<br>Math Mastery - 36;<br>Science Mastery - 25;<br>ELL - NA<br>Learning Gains Read - 62<br>Learning Gains Math - 54<br>Lowest 25% Read - 69<br>Lowest 25% Math - 57<br>SWD Reading - 12<br>SWD Math - 12<br><br>2011 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 53;<br>Math Mastery - 54;<br>Science Mastery - 32;<br>ELL - NA<br>Learning Gains Read - 50<br>Learning Gains Read - 62<br>Lowest 25% Read - 64<br>Lowest 25% Math - 65<br>SWD Reading - 32<br>SWD Math - 25<br><br>2010 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 54;<br>Math Mastery - 50;<br>Science Mastery - 33;<br>ELL - NA<br>SWD Reading - 28<br>SWD Math - 26<br><br>2009 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade – C; AYP NM<br>Reading Mastery: 52%<br>Math Mastery: 52%<br>Science Mastery: 28%<br>Ell: N/A<br>SWD Reading: 26%<br>SWD Math: 20% |
| Reading Coach | Adrianna Taylor | | 2 | | 2012 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 39;<br>Math Mastery - 36;<br>Science Mastery - 25;<br>ELL - NA<br>Learning Gains Read - 62<br>Learning Gains Math - 54<br>Lowest 25% Read - 69<br>Lowest 25% Math - 57<br>SWD Reading - 12<br>SWD Math - 12<br><br>2011 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 53;<br>Math Mastery - 54;<br>Science Mastery - 32;<br>ELL - NA<br>Learning Gains Read - 50<br>Learning Gains Read - 62<br>Lowest 25% Read - 64<br>Lowest 25% Math - 65<br>SWD Reading - 32<br>SWD Math - 25<br><br>2010 Griffin Middle School<br>Grade C; AYP - NM<br>Reading Mastery - 54; |

| | | | | | Math Mastery - 50; Science Mastery - 33; ELL - NA SWD Reading - 28 SWD Math - 26 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## 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. Participation in district and state recruitment fairs | Administration | July-ongoing | |
| 2 | 2. Staff recommendations | Teacher Leaders | July-ongoing | |
| 3 | 3. Recommendation of Colleagues, current teachers, and other administrators | Principals and Assistant Principals | July-ongoing | |
| 4 | 4. Partnership with University College of Education Departments | Administration | July - ongoing | |
| 5 | 5. Mentor/team new teachers with veteran teachers | Principal | July - 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 |
|---|---|
| N/A All teachers are effective/higly effective at Griffin Middle School | N/A |

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 43 | 14.0%(6) | 27.9%(12) | 27.9%(12) | 30.2%(13) | 51.2%(22) | 100.0%(43) | 18.6%(8) | 4.7%(2) | 2.3%(1) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Marilyn Bentley-Carter | Nichol Nicolas | Department Chair; NBCT; Mentor Certified with Beginning Teacher Mentor Training; Use of Best Practices Strategies; Willing and Available | Weekly/ biweekly Meetings; Teach Like a Champion Book Study; Formal and Informal Observations; Modeling; Collegial Conversations; help sessions; Regular meetings with lead administrator; Participation in district beginning teacher program; Peer observations |
| Demarco Speight | Rachel Hayes | Science Coach and Department Chair; Mentor Certified with Beginning Teacher Mentor Training; Use of Best Practices Strategies; Willing and Available | Weekly/boiweekly Meetings; Teach Like a Champion Book Study; Formal and Informal Observations; Modeling; Collegial Conversations; help sessions; Regular meetings with lead administrator; Participation in district beginning teacher program; Peer observations |
| Rhoda Whitfield | Rebecca Hurd | Teacher Leader; Mentor Certified with Beginning Teacher Mentor Training; Use of Best Practices Strategies; Willing and Available | Weekly/biweekly Meetings;Teach Like a Champion Book Study; Formal and Informal Observations; Modeling; Collegial Conversations; help sessions; Regular meetings with lead administrator; Participation in district beginning teacher program; Peer observations |

# ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I dollars will be used to supplement programs academic programs to include parental involvement, professional development for all staff. School administrators will coordinate these efforts.

The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs or summer school. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

Title I, Part D

The district receives funds to support Ghazvini Learning Center and the FOCUS center. Services are coordinated with district Drop-Out Prevention and Neglected and Delinquent programs.

Title II

Title II
District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students and new instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students. Funds at Sunshine Middle are used to purchase SuccessMaker licenses and provide professional development for SuccessMaker.

## Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of

immigrant and English Language Learners.

## Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. Title I provides a resource teacher to support Title I students in non-Title I schools.

## Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
21st Century After School grant funds will be used to expand supplemental services before school, after school and during the summer to support Level 1 and Level 2 students.

## Violence Prevention Programs

Violence Prevention Programs
Olweus Bully Prevention program will be implemented in conjunction with the homeroom literacy program. One day per week (20 minutes) will be dedicated to Bullying Prevention. The activities will include: classroom meetings, guest speakers, school-wide videos, assemblies, and individual/group counseling. PBS, Positive Behavior Support, will be used to assist students in developing positive behavior which will enhance learning and deminish classroom distractions.

## Nutrition Programs

Provision 2 is an option in the federal School Breakfast and Dinner Programs and National School Lunch Program for schools to reduce the paperwork and simplify the logistics of operating school meals programs. Griffin Middle School has opted for the Breakfast and Lunch Programs under Provision 2. Provision 2 increases student participation in school meals.
• Children who eat school meals have more nutritious diets than children who don't, regardless of income level.
• Better nutrition in children leads to better academic performance, behavior and learning environments.
• Providing school meals at no charge promotes the value of good nutrition to all students.

## Housing Programs

## Head Start

## Adult Education

## Career and Technical Education

## Job Training

## Other

Griffin Middle School is a certified testing site for MicroSoft Office. Students completing the Information Technology courses have the opportunity to sit for industry standard certification in MicroSoft Office - Word, PowerPoint, Excel.

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based MTSS Leadership Team consists of: Principal and Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Assistant Principal of Administration (as needed), Academic Coaches, Referral Coordinator, referring classroom teacher, and Guidance Counselor. Functions of this team include: Provides vision, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RTI, monitor teachers to ensure quality Tier I, II, and III instruction in every classroom, establish bi-weekly student level problem solving team meetings and attend, ensures implementation of intervention support, ensures adequate professional development is

provided to support RTI and communicates with outside stakeholders regarding school-based RTI.
Academic Coaches (Reading, Science, Math) : Serves as a content area specialist and expert in selecting appropriate grade/skill level interventions, Trains teachers in the delivery of intervention and provide needed support during implementation. Monitor data of students in Tier II and Tier III and presents progress and fidelity of intervention to the school wide RTI team for further problem solving if needed. Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, and collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support.
Referring ESE teachers: (Varying exceptionalities, speech, gifted) Provides information about intervention instruction, participates in student data collection, collaborates with general education teachers.
School Social Worker (as needed): Provides information about community services available to assist the family unit and ultimately the success of the identified student.
School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates implementation of intervention plans. Provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities.
Program Specialist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates implementation of intervention plans. Provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities.

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 school-based MTSS Leadership team focuses on developing and maintaining a problem-solving system to ensure optimal student achievement for all students.
The team meets bi-weekly. Examples of activities during bi-weekly meetings include reviewing student data (screening, progress monitoring. The review of data will facilitate identification of students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate or high risk for not achieving benchmarks. Based on evaluation of data and identification of student needs the team will identify professional development and resources needed. The team collaborates regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation and make decisions about implementation of effective interventions, ensures that faculty and staff are trained in the process and procedures of RTI, and monitors and documents the progress of Tier II and Tier III students.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS Leadership team meets with the administration and other staff representatives to help develop the SIP. The team also collaborates with the School Advisory Council to obtain input from the council. The team provides data, helps set goals and expectations, identifies resources and suggests strategies that would ensure attainment of instructional goals.

## 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.

Progress Monitoring is obtained through the administration of Curriculum Based Measurements, Successmaker and other FCAT simulation assessments. (FOCUS mini-assessments)
Midyear data is obtained through Successmaker, and other FCAT simulation assessments.

End of year data is obtained through FCAT, and Successmaker. The data is made available through the use of the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN). Additionally, Genesis Attendance & Discipline Reports, Genesis Grading Reports, Educators Handbook and Data Director are used to determine student needs.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided for teachers before school, after school, and during teachers' planning times. Mini-trainings on MTSS topics will be addressed at monthly faculty, department and team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

This team will have weekly scheduled meetings; a specific location; and resources available as needed. In order to accommodate teacher participation in the discussions, class coverage will be provided as needed for identified teachers. School administrators will work with the team, as needed, to assist in service identification and provision on an as needed basis. Resources will be provided as needed to support the team.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

## School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team consists of the Administrative Team, Referral Coordinator, Department Heads, Guidance Counselor, and Team Leaders.

Gwendolyn Lynn Thomas - Principal
Vivian Cooley - Assistant Principal of Curriculum
Darren Wallace - Assistant Principl of Administration
Tarran King-Jefferson - Referral Coordinator and Guidance Counselor
Damon Mays - 6th Grade Team Leader
Adrianne Taylor - 7th Grade Team Leader
Christopher Gautney - 8th Grade Team Leader
Adrianne Taylor - Reading Coach
Marilyn Bentley-Carter - Langage Arts Department Chair
Pamela Scott - Math Department Chair and Math Coach
Demarco Speight - Science Department Chair and Science Coach
Susie Sanders - Fine Arts Department Chair
Joy Marshall - Social Studies Department Chair

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

The team meets once per month and scheduled as needed, if a need arises before a scheduled time. Teachers make recommendations to the team for possible interventions which can be used with students of concern. The role of this team is to review student performance data, discuss common assessment, and revise established procedures to best meet the needs of all students. The meetings focus on reading, writing, math, and science strategies for increased student engagement. Coaches on this team will perform classroom walk throughs and mentor/model effective teaching practices. Coaches will also hold grade level data chats, identify sub-groups for targeted interventions and monitor mini benchmark assessments. Needs which are not resolved with this team will be referred the Response to Intervention Team which is comprised of the school psychologist, district intervention specialist, and the school social worker, when needed.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT this year are:
1. Implementation of Common Unit plans, Common Assessments, common lessons and common syllabi
2. Facilitation of Lesson Studies within grade levels and departments
3. Support data anaylsis; Data chats; and data driven instruction
4. Support literacy across all content areas
5. Homeroom week plan activities with focus on reading - vocabulary development and decoding, math, science, writing, and bully prevention.

For the 2012-2013 school year the Literacy Team will look at the needs of the lowest 35% (levels 1 & 2 students), and all subgroups to determine if the reading programs/curriculum being used are meeting the needs of the students. All Level 1 and level 2 FCAT Reading students will be administered SRA Decoding test, STAR assessment, and SM5 IP to determine level of performance. All level 1 math students will complete SM5 IP. The Reading, Math and Science Coaches will present new/available research based programs/curriculum that will address the needs of the lowest 35% learners, and all subgroups. Subgroups will include: black students, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and white students.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/1/2012)

## *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

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

To ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher, content area reading professional development is offered to 6-8th grade teachers. 8 teachers are reading endorsed. 6-8th grade teachers use department and grade specific common syllabi, common lesson plans, and common assessments . Teen Biz software and Great Books are used by all level 2 reading teachers, with Great Books also being used in the Social Studies classes.

## *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?

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

## Postsecondary Transition

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

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. <br><br> Reading Goal #1a: | For the 2013 school year, 31% ( 181 students) of the matched curriculum students will achieve proficiency on the FCAT Reading Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8, 25% (118 students) of student achieved proficiency on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. | For the 2013 school year, 31% (181 students) of the matched curriculum students will achieve proficiency on the FCAT Reading Test. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited proficiency of students using non-fiction print | Focus on non-fiction reading strategies in Social Studies, Science, and language arts | Reading Coach, APC, Social Studies Department head, and science coach | Student focus notebook; mini classroom assessments, state assessments, Data Chats, common lesson planning, common assessments, lesson studies | FCAT Reading, Data Director |
| 2 | Reading Across the Curriculum | Identify reading benchmarks to be taught in each core class. | Reading Coach, Math coach, science coach, language arts department chair, APC | Common reading assessments, common assessments, FOCUS lessons using FOCUS notebook for langauage arts and Social studies | FCAT Reading |
| 3 | Implementation of Common Core Standards | Develop cross walk between NGSSS and Common Core Standard | Reading Coach, Math coach, science coach, language arts department chair, APC | mini classroom assessments, state assessments, Data Chats, common lesson planning, common assessments, lesson studies | FCAT Reading; Data Director |
| 4 | Reading Across the Curriculum | CAR-PD (Content Area Reading Professional Development) implemented in all content areas | Reading Coach | Mini Assessments | Mini assessments |
| 5 | Cross-Curricular Reading Programs | Implementation of the Teen Biz program in Language Arts, and Social Studies classes | Reading, Language Arts, and Social Studies Teachers | Teen Biz Progress Monitoring Reports | Classroom Assessment and Teen Biz Performance Reports |
| 6 | Implementing Professional Development | Present use of CIS Model (Comprehension Instructional Sequence Module Overview) Present to faculty implementation of PLC (Professional Learning Committees) | Department Head through Department Meetings | Classroom Walkthrough to demonstrate engagement | Classroom Walkthrough |

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: | The percentage of identified students proficient in reading will decrease to 27% (9) in the 2013 administration of the FAA reading test. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8, 37% (4) students achieved a Level 4,5,or 6 in reading on the 2012 administration of the FAA reading test. | The percentage of identified students proficient in reading will decrease to 27% (9)in the 2013 administration of the FAA reading test. |

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Student Attendance | Monitor Student Attendance; Student Attendance Award by 9 weeks | Classroom Teacher | Improved student attendance reporting - Pinpoint reports monitored weekly | Pinpoint Attendance reports |
| 2 | Student Behavior | Positive Behavior System | Classroom Teacher | Monitor student behavior daily, mid-term progress reports; 9 weeks report cards | Educator's Handbook |
| 3 | Lack of Student Response to Instruction | Scaffolding, Modify Response, and Small Group Instruction | ESE Department Head, Staff Specialist | Mini aAssessment | Alternative assessment |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | For the 2013 school year, 20% (82 students) of the matched curriculum students will achieve above proficiency on the FCAT Reading Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8, 14% (66 students) of student achieved above proficiency on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. | For the 2013 school year, 20% (82 students) of the matched curriculum students will achieve above proficiency on the FCAT Reading Test. |

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Advanced/High School Course Offerings | Offer additional opportunities for student to take advanced and or high school level courses including Leon County Virtual School | Administration / Guidance Counselor | Master Schedule/Teacher Rosters with Student FCAT Scores | Common EOC exams, student Progress Reports and Report Cards |
| 2 | Insufficient emphasis on higher level thinking | Implementation of NGCAR-Pd in social studies and language arts social studies classes | Language Arts and Social Studies Department Head | Classroom Walkthrough for rigor and engagement Lesson Plans | Classroom Walkthrough for rigor and engagement and Lesson Plans |
| 3 | Teacher Training | Implementation of CIS Model, Inquiry Based Discussions through Language Arts, Science, Reading, and Social Studies | Reading Coach, Coach, Social Studies Department Head, Language Arts Department Head | Classroom Walkthroughs | Classroom Walkthroughs |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Lack of Proficiency in reading complex text | CIS model and TeenBiz incorporated in advanced level core classes to support critical/deep thinking, SREB lesson plan template, graphic organizers, vocabulary development | APC, Reading Coach, Social Studies, Language Arts, and Science Department Head | Mini Assessments, common lesson planning, lesson studies, and PLC's | FCAT reading TeenBiz reports |

| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #2b: | In grades 6-8, 73% of students will achieve a Level 7 or higher in reading on the 2013 administration of the FAA reading test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8, 64% (4)of students achieved a Level 7 in reading on the 2012 administration of the FAA reading test. | In grades 6-8, 73% of students will achieve a Level 7 or higher in reading on the 2013 administration of the FAA reading test. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lack of student response to instruction. | Scaffolding, small group instructions, and modify response answers. | ESE Department Head, Staff Specialist | Mini Assessments | Alternative assessment |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3a: | For the 2013 school year, 66% (300 students) of the matched curriculum students will make learning gains on the FCAT Reading Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8, 62% (274 students) of student made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. | For the 2013 school year, 66% (300 students) of the matched curriculum students will make learning gains on the FCAT Reading Test. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Cross-Curricular Reading Programs | Implementation of the Teen Biz program and CIS Model, Language Arts, and Social Studies classes | Language Arts, Reading, and Social Studies Teachers | Teen Biz Progress Monitoring Reports | Classroom Assessment and Teen Biz Performance Reports |
| 2 | Limited number of proven, successful programs for level 2 students. | Implementation of Teen Biz and CIS Model in all Level 2 Language Arts and Social Studies clases | Reading Coach | Teen Biz individual student reports, classroom walkthroughs, teacher lesson plans | Teen Biz data reports, classroom walkthroughs |
| 3 | Reading Across the Curriculum | NGCAR-PD (Next Generation Content Area Reading Professional Development) implemented in all | Reading Coach | Lesson Plans and classroom walkthroughs | Mini Assessments |

| | content areas | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student Behavior | Positive Behavior System;<br>Anedoctal Records using teacher actions | Classroom Teacher | Weekly review of Educator's handbook | Educator's Handbook |
| 2 | Beginning Teacher | Mentor Teacher Assigned; Teacher modeling | Mentor Teacher; Department Chair | Peer to peer observations;<br>iObservation tool | iObservation tool |

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | For the 2013 school year, 72% (93 students) of the lowest 25% of the matched curriculum students will make learning gains on the FCAT Reading Test. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8, 69% (85 students) of the lowest 25% of the matched curriculum students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. | For the 2013 school year, 72% (93 students) of the lowest 25% of the matched curriculum students will make learning gains on the FCAT Reading Test. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student deficiencies in using reading skills | Implementation of Read 180 in all Level 1 reading classrooms. | Reading Coach | Read 180 individual student reports, classroom walkthroughs, teacher lesson plans | Read 180 data reports, classroom walkthroughs |
| 2 | Limited background knowledge | Vocabulary Across the Curriculum Strategy in homeroom activities | Reading Coach | Weekly Mini-Assessments | Weekly Mini-Assessments |
| 3 | Reading Across the Curriculum | NGCAR-PD (Next Generation Content Area Reading Professional Development) implemented in all content areas | Reading Coach, Language Arts and Social Studies Department Head | Classroom Walkthroughs and Lesson Plans | Classroom Walkthroughs and Lesson Plan |
| 4 | Teacher Training | Provide training and implementation in Read 180 and NGCAR-Pd | Reading Coach | Classroom Walkthroughs and Lesson Plans | Classroom Walkthroughs and Lesson Plans |

| 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 # |
| --- | --- |
| | In grades 6-8, 77% of the matched curriculum students will achieve proficiency in reading. |
| | 5A : |

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 51% | 58% | 63% | 68% | 73% |  |

| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #5B: | In grades 6-8, 42% (173 students) of Black students will score at or above Level 3 on the 2013 Reading FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8, 35% (131 students) of Black students scored at or above Level 3 on the 2012 Reading FCAT. | In grades 6-8, 42% (173 students) of Black students will score at or above Level 3 on the 2013 Reading FCAT. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited number of data proven successful programs for level 2 students. | Implementation of Teen Biz and CIS in all Language Arts and Social Studies classrooms | Language Arts and Social Studies department head | Teen Biz individual student reports, classroom walkthroughs, and teacher lesson plans | Teen Biz data reports and classroom walkthroughs |
| 2 | Reading Across the Curriculum | NGCAR-PD (Next Generation Content Area Reading Professional Development) implemented in Language Arts and Social Studies areas | Language Arts and Social Studies Department Head | SuccessMaker, Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs | SuccessMaker |
| 3 | Uncommon Assessments | Provide training on Data Director during Department meetings and create common assessments | Reading Coach and Language Arts and Social Studies Department Heads | Progress Monitoring | Progress Monitoring |

| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #5C: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5D: | For the 2013 school year, 21 % (20 students) of matched curriculum students with disabilities will achieve proficiency on the FCAT Reading Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8, 12% (12 students) of the matched curriculum students with disabilities achieved proficiency on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. | For the 2013 school year, 21% (20 students) of matched curriculum students with disabilities will achieve proficiency on the FCAT Reading Test. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Ability for ESE teachers to assist students with disabilities in the classroom | Implementation of an inclusion program for students with disabilities | ESE Teachers, Administration | Student evaluation by ESE Teacher, classroom assessments | Common evaluation by ESE teacher, classroom assessments, progress monitoring assessments |
| 2 | Teacher Training | ESE Department will train content area teachers ESE strategies and implementing accommodations | ESE Department | Student Progress Report | Student Progress Report |
| 3 | Reading Across the Curriculum | NGCAR-PD (Next Generation Content Area Reading Professional Development) implemented in all content areas | Reading Coach,Language Arts, ESE, and Social Studies Department Head | Classroom walkthroughs and Lesson Plans | Classroom Walkthroughs and Lesson Plans |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5E: | In grades 6-8, 41% (143 students) of the matched curriculum students who are economically disadvantaged will achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8, 36% (124 students) of the matched curriculum students who are economically disadvantaged achieved proficiency on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. | In grades 6-8, 41% (143 students) of the matched curriculum students who are economically disadvantaged will achieve proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Student Readiness | Implementation of Teen Biz in all Language Arts and Social Studies classrooms | Reading Coach, Language Arts and Social Studies Department Head | Teen Biz individual student reports, classroom walkthroughs, and teacher lesson plans | Teen Biz data reports | |
| 2 | Reading Across the Curriculum | NGCAR-PD (Next Generation Content Area Reading Professional Development) implemented in all content areas | Reading Coach, Language Arts and Social Studies Department Head | SuccessMaker and Teen Biz Reports | SuccessMaker and Teen Biz Reports | |
| 3 | In ability to set academic goals | Differentiated instruction, scaffolding learning, and data charts | Reading Coach and Language Arts Department Head | Mini Assessments | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| READ 180 | 6-8 Reading | READ 180 Specialist | Level 1 Reading Teachers & Reading Coach | September 2012, ongoing | Weekly evaluation of READ 180 reports, classroom walkthroughs, monthly Reading Team meetings | Leadership Team, Reading Coach |
| Great Books | 6-8 Social Studies, Language Arts, and Reading | Great Books Specialist | Social Studies, Language Arts, and Reading Teachers | September 2012, October 2012, ongoing | Lesson modeling monthly as needed, weekly evaluation of Great Books Reports, classroom walkthroughs | Reading Coach, Leadership Team |
| Accelerated Reader | 6-8 Grade Language Arts | Accelerated Reader Specialist | Media Specialist; Language Arts Teachers | October 2012 - ongoing | Weekly report review | Language Arts Teachers, media specialist; lead administrators |
| Teen Biz | 6-8 Reading and Social Studies | Teen Biz Specialist | Levels 1, 2, and 3 FCAT reading students; General Language Arts Students | September 2012, ongoing | Weekly report review, classroom walkthroughs | Reading Coach; Literacy Team |
| Rewards | 6-8 Reading | Rewrards Specialist; Reading Coach | Level 1 Reading Teachers; Reading Coach | October 2012 ; ongoing | Lesson modeling monthly as needed, weekly evaluation of Great Books Reports, classroom walkthroughs | Reading Coach; Literacy Team |
| WUR Scoring | 6-8 Language Arts and 6-8 Social Studies Teachers | District Writing Developer | Language Arts Teachers; Social Studies Teachers | October 2012; Ongoing | classroom walkthroughs; review student WUR writing scores;Monitor data through Data Director | Reading Coach; Language Arts Teachers; Lead Administrators |

---

Reading Budget:

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

| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
|---|---|---|---|

**Technology**

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |

**Professional Development**

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Effective implementation of Instructional Focus Calendar | Development of Focus Calendars | Title I Title II | $400.00 |
| iObservation | Instructional Practices Score | Title 1 and Title II | $400.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $800.00 |

**Other**

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $800.00 |

*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.<br><br>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 |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.<br><br>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. <br><br> 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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | In grades 6-8 33% (189 students) of matched curriculum students will achieve mastery on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8 26% (124 students) of matched curriculum students achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test | In grades 6-8 33% (189 students) of matched curriculum students will achieve mastery on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test |

## Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Limited proficiency of students using non-fiction print | Focus on non-fiction reading strategies in Social Studies, Science, and language arts | Reading Coach, APC, Social Studies Department head, and science coach | Student focus notebook; mini classroom assessments, state assessments, Data Chats, common lesson planning, common assessments, lesson studies | FCAT Reading, Data Director |
| 2 | Reading Across the Curriculum | Identify reading benchmarks to be taught in each core class. | Reading Coach, Math coach, science coach, language arts department chair, APC | Common reading assessments, common assessments, FOCUS lessons using FOCUS notebook for langauage arts and Social studies | FCAT Reading |
| 3 | Implementation of Common Core Standards | Develop cross walk between NGSSS and Common Core Standard | Reading Coach, Math coach, science coach, language arts department chair, APC | mini classroom assessments, state assessments, Data Chats, common lesson planning, common assessments, lesson studies | FCAT Reading; Data Director |
| 4 | Lesson Study<br>Lack of common planning | Practice and deepen knowledge<br>Content area reading strategies<br>Provide clear learning goals | Math Coach | Lesson Plan checks<br>Use of focus calendar and pacing guide | Classroom walkthroughs, teacher lesson plans |
| 5 | Limited proficiency of students using informational text | Focus on non-fiction reading strategies in Social Studies, Science, Math, and Language Arts | Reading Coach, APC, Social Studies Department head, Math and Science Coaches | Mini classroom assessments, state assessments, Data Chats, common lesson planning, common assessments, lesson studies, Math Homeroom Activity Plan, student focus notebook | FAIR, FCAT Reading, Riverside Data Director, SM5 |
| 6 | Lack of proficiency in prerequisite math skills | Level 1 students in SM5, Homeroom Math Activity | Math Coach APC | Professional Learning Community (PLC), Mini Assessments | Mini Assessments, SM5 |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1b: | In grades 6-8, 73% of students achieved a Level 4,5, or 6 in math on the 2013 administration of the FAA mathematics test. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8, 82% (4) of students achieved a Level 4,5, or 6 in math on the 2012 administration of the FAA mathematics test. | In grades 6-8, 73% of students achieved a Level 4,5, or 6 in math on the 2013 administration of the FAA mathematics test. |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lack of Student Response to Instruction | Scaffolding, Modify Response, and Small Group Instruction | ESE Department Head & Staff Specialist | Mini Assessment | Alternative Assessment |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | In grades 6-8 18% (94 students) of matched curriculum students will score level 4 or 5 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8 10% (46 students)of matched curriculum students scored level 4 or 5 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test | In grades 6-8 94% (94 students) of matched curriculum students will score level 4 or 5 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test. |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Communicating high expectations | Enrollment in higher level mathematics courses such as advanced, Algebra Honors, or Geometry Honors | Math Coach/APC | Engaging students in cognitively complex task;<br><br>Student achievement on End Of Course Exams and Progress Monitoring Assessments | End of Course Exams,Common Assessments, Progress Monitoring Tools |
| 2 | Student Readiness | Homeroom math activity plan, Data Chats, Small Group Differentiated Instruction | Math Coach | Student achievement on classroom and county assessments | Common Assessments, County Progress Monitoring Assessment |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b: | In grades 6-8, 27% of students achieved a Level 7 in math on the 2013 administration of the FAA mathematics test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | In grades 6-8, 18% of students achieved a Level 7 in math on the 2012 administration of the FAA mathematics test. | In grades 6-8, 27% of students achieved a Level 7 in math on the 2013 administration of the FAA mathematics test. |
|---|---|---|

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lack of Student Response to Instruction. | Scaffolding, Modify Response, and Small Group Instruction | ESE Department Head & Staff Specialist | Mini Assessments | Alternative Assesments |

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: | On the 2013 FCAT mathematics data 59% (302students) of the bottom quartile will show learning gains |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| On the 2012 FCAT mathematics data 54% (274 students)of the students showed learning gains | On the 2013 FCAT mathematics data 59% (302 students) of the bottom quartile will show learning gains |

| 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 | Resources- textbooks, manipulatives; Tracking student progress | All students actively engaged, Modeling, Rigor, Effective use of Technology (SM5), Chunking content | Math Coach, AP for Curriculum | Departmental Planning, Staff Development, Lesson Study | Common Assessments, SM5 Cumulative Performance Reports |
| 2 | Student inability to set learning goals | Differentiated Instruction and Scaffolding Learning | Math Coach and APC | Common Focus Calendars | Data Chats |

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

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

Mathematics Goal #3b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | On the 2012 FCAT mathematics data 63% (86 students) of the bottom quartile will show learning gains. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on 2012 FCAT mathematics data 57% (65 studens) of the bottom quartile showed learning gains. | On 2012 FCAT mathematics data 63% (86 students)of the bottom quartile will show learning gains. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student Inability to Set Goals | Differentiated Instruction Scaffolding Learning | Math Coach | Common Focus Calendars | Data Chats |
| 2 | Student Readiness | Intensive Math Classes will use SM5 and teacher directed small group instruction the second semester | Classroom Math Teacher,Math Coach and Principal | Weekly Review of SM5 data; Data Chats | Classroom Walkthroughs, SM5 Data |
| 3 | Student Readiness | Homeroom Math Mini Lessons | Math Coach | Progress Monitor student performance on common assessments; The Math Department will have ongoing meetings to disaggregate data and monitor student progress, data chats, classroom walkthroughs focus calendars; Coach/Teacher Conferences | Mini Assessments,Baseline, Beginning, Midyear, and End of Year Assessments, Riverside Data Director Reports |

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 #<br>In 2016-2017, 70% of students will score level 3 or above thereby reducing Griffin's achievement gap by 50%<br><br>5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | 39% | 34% | 43% | 52 | 61 |  |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | On the 2012 FCAT mathematics data 40% (163 students)of the black ethnicity students will show learning gains |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| On the 2011 FCAT mathematics data 33% (135 students) of | On the 2012 FCAT mathematics data 40% (163 students)of |

| | the black ethnicity students showed learning gains | the black ethnicity students will show learning gains |
|---|---|---|

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Student interaction with new knowledge | Real world relevance/Rigor, Demonstrate value and respect for all students | Principal, AP for Curriculum | Staff Development | Progress Reports, Progress Monitoring |
| 2 | Student inability to set goals | Differentiated instruction scaffolding learning | Math Coach | Common Focus Calendar | Data Chats |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test, 21% (21 students) of students with disabilities will show learning gains. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| On the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Test 12% ( 10 students) of students with disabilities showed learning gains. | On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test, 33% (21 students) of students with disabilities will show learning gains. |

| | | 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 | Resources for the acquisition of manipulatives, technology, and computers | Differentiated Instruction, Teacher made manipulatives where possible | Math Coach Principal | Documentation in lesson plans | Principal, Math Coach |
| | Lack of Proficiency | Direct Differentiated | Math Coach | Classroom Walkthroughs | Classroom |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | student perquisite skills | Instruction, ESE inclusion teacher | APC | | Walkthroughs and progress monitoring |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5E: | On the 2012 FCAT mathematics data 42% ( 172 students)of the bottom quartile will show learning gains. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| On the 2011 FCAT mathematics data 36% (143 students) of the Economically Disadvantaged showed learning gains. | On the 2012 FCAT mathematics data 42% (172 students)of the bottom quartile will show learning gains. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student readiness | Homeroom math activity plan | Math Coach | Student achievement on classroom assessments and county assessments | Common assessments, County Progress Monitoring Assessments |
| 2 | Resources for the acquisition of manipulatives | Differentiated Instruction, Teacher made manipulatives where possible | Math Coach Principal | Documentation in lesson plans | Principal, Math Coach |
| 3 | Student Lack of Proficiency | Bell to Bell Instruction; Organize students to practice and deepen knowledge; Engage students in cognitively complex tasks | Math Coach APC | Classroom Walkthroughs | Classroom Walkthroughs |

*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.<br><br>Algebra Goal #1: | In grades 7-8 55% ( students) curriculum students achieved proficient on the 2013 administration of the Algebra I EOC. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 7-8 44% (7 students) curriculum students achieved proficient on the 2012 administration of the Algebra I EOC. | In grades 7-8 55% ( students) curriculum students achieved proficient on the 2013 administration of the Algebra I EOC. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | Implementation of | Develop cross walk | Reading Coach, | mini classroom | FCAT Reading; |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Common Core Standards | between NGSSS and Common Core Standard | Math coach, science coach, language arts department chair, APC | assessments, state assessments, Data Chats, common lesson planning, common assessments, lesson studies | Data Director |
| 2 | Limited proficiency of students using informational text | Focus on non-fiction reading strategies in Social Studies, Science, Math, and Language Arts | Reading Coach, APC, Social Studies Department head, Math and Science Coaches | Mini classroom assessments, state assessments, Data Chats, common lesson planning, common assessments, lesson studies | FCAT Math, Data Director Progress Monitoring |
| 3 | Lesson Study Lack of common planning | Practice and deepen knowledge Content area reading strategies Provide clear learning goals | Math Coach/APC/Principal | Lesson Plan checks Use of focus calendar and curriculum pacing guide | Classroom walkthroughs, teacher lesson plans |
| 4 | Lack of proficiency in prerequisite math skills | Practice and deepen knowledge in content area strategies; Use of manipulatives | Math Coach/APC/Principal | PLC, Mini Assessments | 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 Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #2: | In grades 6-8 61% ( students) curriculum students achieved Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 administration of the Algebra I EOC. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8 56% (9 students) curriculum students achieved Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 administration of the Algebra I EOC. | In grades 6-8 61% ( students) curriculum students achieved Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 administration of the Algebra I EOC. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student Readiness | Data Chats, Small Group, Differentiated Instruction | Math Coach/APC/Principal | Student achievement on classroom and county assessments | Common Assessments, County Progress Monitoring Assessment |
| 2 | Communicating high expectations | Enrollment in higher level mathematics courses such as advanced , Algebra Honors, or Geometry Honors | Math Coach/ APC | Engaging students in cognitively complex task; Student achievement on End of Course exams and progress monitoring assessments | End of Course Exams, Common Assessments, Progress monitoring tools |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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 #<br><br>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.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3B: | In grades 7-8 0% ( students) of matched standard curriculum student subgroups by ethnicity did not achieve learning gains on the 2013 administration of the Algebra I EOC. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n grades 7-8 0 % (0 students) of matched standard curriculum student subgroups by ethnicity did not achieve learning gains on the 2012 administration of the Algebra I EOC.<br>White: NA<br>Black: 0%<br>Hispanic: NA<br>Asian: NA<br>American Indian;<br>NA | In grades 7-8 0% ( students) of matched standard curriculum student subgroups by ethnicity did not achieve learning gains on the 2013 administration of the Algebra I EOC. |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student interaction with new knowledge | Real world relevance/Rigor, Demonstrate value and respect for all students | Principal, APC | Staff Development | Progress Reports, Progress Monitoring |
| 2 | Student Inability to Set Goals | Differentiated Instruction Scaffolding Learning | Math Coach/APC/Principal | Common Focus Calendars | Data Chats |

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.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3C: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3D: | In grades 6-8 0 % (0 students) of SWD matched curriculum students did not achieve satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the Algebra I EOC. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| In grades 6-8 0 % (students) of SWD matched curriculum students did not achieve satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the Algebra I EOC. | In grades 6-8 0 % (0 students) of SWD matched curriculum students did not achieve satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the Algebra I EOC. |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Resources for the acquisition of manipulatives, technology, and computers | Differentiated Instruction, Teacher made manipulatives where possible | Math Coach Principal | Documentation in lesson plans | Principal, Math Coach |
| 2 | Lack of Proficiency student perquisite skills | Direct Differentiated Instruction, ESE inclusion teacher | Math Coach APC | Classroom Walkthroughs | Classroom Walkthroughs Progress Monitoring |

| 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.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3E: | In grades 6-8 0% (0 students) of ED matched curriculum students did not achieve satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the Algebra I EOC. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6-8 0 % (students) of ED matched curriculum students did not achieve satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the Algebra I EOC. | In grades 6-8 0% (0 students) of ED matched curriculum students did not achieve satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the Algebra I EOC. |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Resources for the acquisition of manipulatives | Differentiated Instruction, Teacher made manipulatives where possible | Math Coach/APC/Principal | Documentation in lesson plans | Principal, Math Coach |

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Implementation of Common Core Standards | Develop cross walk between NGSSS and Common Core Standard | Reading Coach, Math coach, science coach, language arts department chair, APC | mini classroom assessments, state assessments, Data Chats, common lesson planning, common assessments, lesson studies | FCAT Reading; Data Director |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #2: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Geometry Goal #  3A : | | | | |
| 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: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

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

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

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

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

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3D: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3E: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teach Like a Champion | 6-8 Grade Math | Math Department chair and coach | 6-8 math teachers | August 2012 - ongoing | Classroom Walkthroughs | Lead Administrator; Math coach and department chair |
| Common Core Training | 6-8 Grade Math | District Developer; Math Department Chair and math coach | 6-8 grade math teachers | August 2012 - ongoing | iObservation; Lesson Plan reviews; monitor focus calendar implementation | Lead Administrator; Math coach and department chair |

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 |
| PLC | Teach Like a Champion | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| Classroom Walk Throughs | iObservation | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| Book Study | Common Core Standards | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |

| | | | Subtotal: $1,200.00 |
|---|---|---|---|

*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.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | In grade 8, 28% of matched curriculum students will increase proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grade 8, 20% (28 students)of matched curriculum students achieved proficiency on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science. | In grade 8, 28% of matched curriculum students will increase proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited proficiency of students using non-fiction print | Focus on non-fiction reading strategies in Social Studies, Science, and language arts | Reading Coach, APC, Social Studies Department head, and science coach | Student focus notebook; mini classroom assessments, state assessments, Data Chats, common lesson planning, common assessments, lesson studies | FCAT Reading, Data Director |
| 2 | Reading Across the Curriculum | Identify reading benchmarks to be taught in each core class. | Reading Coach, Math coach, science coach, language arts department chair, APC | Common reading assessments, common assessments, FOCUS lessons using FOCUS notebook for langauage arts and Social studies | FCAT Reading |
| 3 | Implementation of Common Core Standards | Develop cross walk between NGSSS and Common Core Standard | Reading Coach, Math coach, science coach, language arts department chair, APC | mini classroom assessments, state assessments, Data Chats, common lesson planning, common assessments, lesson studies | FCAT Reading; Data Director |
| | Student Readiness | Science Homeroom Mini Lessons Focusing on Difficult Scientific Concepts | Science Coach | Progress monitoring of student performance on teacher assessments and district assessments. The Science Department will have on-going meetings to disaggregate data and monitor student progress, conduct data | Benchmark mini assessments, District Baseline, Mid-year, and End of the Year assessments from Riverside Data Acheives. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | | | | talks with students, have periodic classroom walkthroughs by administration and the Science Coach,use focus calendars that are developed using the district science pacing guide,and have frequent conferences between the Science Coach and Teacher. Conferences | |
| 5 | Student Inability to Set Goals | Differentiated Instruction that includes Scaffolded Learning | Science Coach | Common Focus Calendars developed from District Science Pacing Guide | Data talks between teacher and students. |
| 6 | Lack of effective instructional strategies | Incorporation of Doug Lemov's (2010) 49 Techniques that put students on the path to college readiness. | Science Coach | Classroom walkthroughs & Lesson Plans | District Assessments and Teacher Generated Assessments. |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1b: | In grades 8, 40% (3)of students achieved a Level 4,5,or 6 in science on the 2013 administration of the FAA science test.<br><br>*Increased student population - 8 students total |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 8, 100% (3)of students achieved a Level 4,5,or 6 in science on the 2012 administration of the FAA science test. | In grades 8, 40% (3)of students achieved a Level 4,5,or 6 in science on the 2013 administration of the FAA science test.<br><br>*Increased student population - 8 students total |

<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 | Beginning Teacher | Participation in beginning teacher program | Lead Administrator; Department Chari; Mentor Teacher | iObservation; Peer to Peer observations; classroom walkthroughs | iObservation |
| 2 | Student difficulty with abstract thinking | Team teaching; common lesson planning; attend Science department meetings and trainings | Lead administrator; ESE department chair | Classroom Walkthroughs; monitor student grades and mini assessments | Studnet gradebook; Pinpoint; Student mid-term and end of grading period progress reports |

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.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | In grade 8, 13% (18 students) of matched curriculum students will earn above proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT science test |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grade 8, 5% (7 students)of matched curriculum | In grade 8, 13% (18 students)of matched curriculum |

students achieved above proficiency(FCAT Levels 4 and 5) on the 2012 administration of the FCAT science test | students will earn above proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT science test

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Science Literacy | Science Homeroom Mini Lessons | Science Department | Staff Development | Common Assessment and District Level Assessments |
| 2 | Student inability to achieve learning goals | Use Nine-Week Incentives | Science Department | Student Growth Charts that document when a student has mastered or not mastered a benchmark. | Progress Monitoring and Benchmark 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: | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gizmos | 6-8 Science | Gizmos Trainer; Science Coach | 6-8 grade science teachers | September 2012 - ongoing | Review Gizmo montly teacher/student usage reports; student progress and report cards | Science Coach;lead administrator |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core Standards | 6-8 grade science teachers | District Science Defveloper; Science Coach | 6-8 grade science teachers | September 2012 - ongoing | classroom walk throughs; monitor and review lesson plans and focus calendar | Science Coach;lead administrator |
| STEM | 6-8 grade science teachers | District Science Defveloper; Science Coach | 6-8 grade science teachers | September 2012 - ongoing | classroom walk throughs; monitor and review lesson plans and focus calendar | Science Coach;lead administrator |

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 |
| Book Study | Teach Like a Champion | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| PLC | Vocabulary Lessons/Informational Text | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $800.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $800.00 |

*End of Science Goals*

# Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.<br><br>Writing Goal #1a: | On the 2013 administration of the FCAT writing test 90% (135 students) of the students in 8th Grade will score level 4.0 or above in writing. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| On the 2012 administration of FCAT Writing Griffin scored a 77% (98 students) | On the 2013 administration of the FCAT writing test 90% (135 students) of the students in 8th Grade will score level 4.0 or above 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Limited proficiency in | Concentrated writing | L.A. Department | Monthly cross | WUR rubric |

| 1 | writing conventions. | focus across the curriculum | Head | curriculum writing activities | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Students lack of proficiency on previous writing assessments | Level specific writing workshops | APC | Mini Assessment | Practice WUR |
| 3 | Limited knowledge of the writing process by content area teachers | Professional development in writing across the curriculum | L.A. Department Head | Peer and administrative classroom walkthroughs | WUR results |

| 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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1b: | In grades 8, 40% (3)of students achieved a Level 4,5,or 6 in writing on the 2013 administration of the FAA writing test.<br><br>*Increased student population - 8 students total |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 8, 66% (2)of students achieved a Level 4,5,or 6 in writing on the 2013 administration of the FAA science test. | In grades 8, 40% (3)of students achieved a Level 4,5,or 6 in writing on the 2013 administration of the FAA writing test. |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lack of student response to instruction | Scaffolding, Modify Response, and Small Group Instruction | ESE Department Head & Staff Specialist | Mini Assessments | Alternative 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Writing Process using Anchor Papers | 6-8 Grade Language Arts and Social Studies | District Developer; Writing Lead Teacher | 6-8 Grade Language Arts and Scoial Studies Teachers | October 2012 - Ongoing | Review WUR; mini assessments | Writing Lead Teacher; Language Arts Departmetn Chair; Lead Administrator |
| Scoring WUR | 6-8 Grade Language Arts and Social Studies | District Developer; Writing Lead Teacher | 6-8 Grade Language Arts and Scoial Studies Teachers | October 2012 - Ongoing | Review WUR Scores; mini assessments | Writing Lead Teacher; Language Arts Departmetn Chair; Lead Administrator |

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 |
| PLC | Writing Anchor Papers | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $400.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | **Grand Total: $400.00** |

*End of Writing Goals*

# Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.<br><br>Civics Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 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.<br><br>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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core Standards | 7th Grade Civics | Social Studies Department Chair | 7th Grade Civics Teacher(s) | August 2012 - Ongoing | Biweekly review of lesson plans; classroom walkthroughs | Lead Administrator |
| NG CARPD | 6-8 Grade Scoial Studies | District Developer | 6-8 Grade Social Studies Teachers | August 2012 - ongoing | Biweekly review of lesson plans; classroom walkthroughs | Lead Administrator |

---

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 | In grades 6-8, the attendance rate for Griffin Middle School will be 96%(523 students) for the 2012-2013 school year. |
|---|---|
| Attendance Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| In grades 6-8, the attendance rate for Griffin Middle School was 93.98% (512 students) for the 2011-2012 school year | In grades 6-8, the attendance rate for Griffin Middle School will be 96% (561 students)for the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| In grades 6-8, 12% (65 students) of students were considered excessively absent for the 2011-2012 school year | In grades 6-8, 10%(59 studens) of students will be considered excessively absent for the 2012-2013 school year |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| In grades 6-8, 2% (11 students)of students were considered excessively tardy for the 2011-2012 school year | In grades 6-8, 1%(6) of students will be considered excessively absent for the 2012-2013 school year |

| | 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 | Teacher Training | Full Implementation of the Attendance Tracking Process | Administration | Excessive Attendance Reports | bi-weekly monitoring of grade level attendance by teams, Attendance Tracking Process documentation |
| 2 | Student mobility | Respone to Intervention Team by teacher referral | Referral Coordinator; lead administrator; classroom teacher | Student Withdrawal; SIS monitoring | PinPoint Attendance; SIS System 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PinPoint Attendance Training | 6-8 Grade Teachers | PinPoint Trainer; Department Chairs; Lead Teachers; Lead Administrator | School Wide | August 2012 - Ongoing | Review of PinPoint Attendance Report by Teacher | Lead Administrator |
| Compulsory School Attendacnce Process (CSAP) | All Teachers | Lead Administrator | School Wide | August 2012 - ongoing | Review of Attendance Reports | Lead Administrator |

Attendance Budget:

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

*End of Attendance Goal(s)*

# Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Suspension<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | In-School and Out of School suspensions will be reduced by 5% (11 students) for the 2011-2012 school year. |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| In grades 6-8, a total of 291 incidents of In-School Suspensions were recorded during the 2011-2012 school year. | In grades 6-8, a maximum of 200 In-School Suspensions will be recorded during the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| In grades 6-8, a total of 30% (164) students were suspended in-school during the 2011-2012 school year. | In grades 6-8, a total of 176 students will be suspended in-school during the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| In grades 6-8, a total of 483 Out of School Suspensions were recorded during the 2011-2012 school year. | In grades 6-8, a maximum of 250 Out of School Suspensions will be recorded during the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| In grades 6-8, a total of 37% (200) students were suspended out of school during the 2010-2011 school year. | In grades 6-8, a maximum of 194 students will be suspended out of school during the 2012-2013 school year. |

| | 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 | Positive Behavior Reinforcement Program | Implementation of Positive Behavior Support | Teachers, Staff, Administration | Data Analysis through Educators Handbook, Monthly PBS Team Meetings | Educators Handbook 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.* | Increae the number of volunteer hours by 5% (77 hours) for the 2012-2013 school year. |
| --- | --- |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| There were approximately 1530 volunteer hours logged for the 2011-2012 school year. | Log approximately 1610 volunteer hours during the 2012-2013 school year. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Parents have limited time to volunteer. | Offer volunteer opportunities to parents outside of the school and the school day. | Parent Liaison/Volunteer Coordinator | An increase in the number of volnteer hours. | Volunteer sign-in log. |
| 2 | Invalid /inaccurate parent contact information. | Conduct address verifications through homeroom and parent activities such as Open House. | Parent Liaison | An increase in the number of volnteer hours. | Volunteer sign-in log. |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School, Family, and Community partnership | School Wide | District | Parent Liaison; lead administrator; volunteer coordinator | August 2012; ongoing | Monitor volunteer logs | Volunteer Coordinator; lead administrator; parent liaison |

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<br><br>STEM Goal #1: | In grades 7 and 8, 85% of matched curriculum students will successfully complete a science fair project and participate in the school-wide science fair. |

| 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 | Availability of resources for students. | Before-school, after-school, and in-class support from teachers, staff, and volunteers. | Science Coach and 7th and 8th Grade Science Teachers | Completion of Science Fair Project Board and participation in the school-wide Science Fair | School-wide Science Fair rubric |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | 6-8 Grade Science | Math Coach; Science Coach | 7-8 Grade Algebra; 8th Grade Geometry; 8th Grade Biology | August 2012 - ongoing | Classroom walk throughs; lesson plan reviews; | Science Coach; Math Coach; Lead Administrator |

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<br><br>CTE Goal #1: | 90% (158) of 8th grade students will complete Careeer Awareness Inventory. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student Attendance | Monitor Student Attendance | Lead Administrator; Dean of Students | Reveiw Auto Dialer Reports | Auto Dialer; PinPoint Attendance |

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)

### Goal: The percent of students enrolled in high school credit offerings will increase by 5%.

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 | | | | | | |

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 The percent of students enrolled in high school credit offerings will increase by 5%. Goal(s)*

## FINAL BUDGET

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

| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |

### Technology

| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |

### Professional Development

| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Reading | Effective implementation of Instructional Focus Calendar | Development of Focus Calendars | Title I Title II | $400.00 |
| Reading | iObservation | Instructional Practices Score | Title 1 and Title II | $400.00 |
| Mathematics | PLC | Teach Like a Champion | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| Mathematics | Classroom Walk Throughs | iObservation | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| Mathematics | Book Study | Common Core Standards | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| Science | Book Study | Teach Like a Champion | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| Science | PLC | Vocabulary Lessons/Informational Text | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| Writing | PLC | Writing Anchor Papers | Title I and Title II | $400.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $3,200.00 |

### 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: $3,200.00** |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| j̇ⁿ Priority | j̇ⁿ Focus | j̇ⁿ Prevent | j̇ⁿ NA |
|---|---|---|---|

Are you a reward school:   j̇ⁿ Yes  j̇ⁿ No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/1/2012)

## 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.

 No. Disagree with the above statement.

## If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Efforts to recruit SAC members are ongoing. Recruiting efforts include regular invitations to parents of students are newly enrolled in the school, weekly list serv; recruiting of community and business partners.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|---|
| Professional Development aligned with SIP goals | $3,200.00 |

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

Activities of SAC will include: Monitoring and discussion of SIP goals; data analysis of progress monitoring data, budget approval of SIP funds, and parent workshops aligned with completion of SIP goals.

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Leon School District
GRIFFIN MIDDLE SCHOOL
2010-2011

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 52% | 54% | 76% | 32% | 214 | 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 | 50% | 62% | | | 112 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 64% (YES) | 65% (YES) | | | 129 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 455 | |
| Percent Tested = 99% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

Leon School District
GRIFFIN MIDDLE SCHOOL
2009-2010

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 54% | 50% | 78% | 33% | 215 | 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 | 58% | 66% | | | 124 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 62% (YES) | 68% (YES) | | | 130 | 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 | | | | | 469 | |
| Percent Tested = 99% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |