

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



## School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

### PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

#### School Information

School Name: Surfside Middle School	District Name: Bay
Principal: Dr. Sue Harrell	Superintendent: Bill Husfelt
SAC Chair: Nancy Pride	Date of School Board Approval:

#### Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[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)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Sue Harrell	B.S. English Education M.S. Educational Leadership Ed. D. Curriculum and Instruction	9	15	Grade: A for the last seven years, including 2012. 2006: Reading-71% proficient, 68% learning gains, 75% of lower quartile gains; Math-67% proficient, 70% learning gains 2007: Reading-73% proficient, 62% learning gains, 62% lower quartile gains; Math-71% proficient, 76% learning gains, 74% lower quartile gains 2008: Reading-79% proficient, 69% learning gains, 68% lower quartile gains; Math-78% proficient, 78% learning gains, 72% lower quartile gains 2009: Reading-82% proficient, 68% learning gains, 65% lower

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

					<p>quartile gains; Math-78% proficient, 77% learning gains, 78% lower quartile gains  2010: Reading-76% proficient, 61% learning gains, 55% lower quartile gains; math-71% proficient, 68% learning gains, 61% lower quartile gains  2011: Reading-74% proficient, 63% learning gains, 68% lower quartile gains; math-76% proficient, 76% learning gains, 72% lower quartile gains  2012: Reading-66% proficient, 70 points for lowest 25% learning gains; math-62% proficient, 48 points for lowest 25%</p> <p>AMO:  2012: Economically disadvantaged and students in the lower 25% need improvement in math and reading.  2011: Economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities need improvement in reading and math.  2010: Economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities need improvement in reading and math.  2009: All subgroups met criteria. SMS achieved AYP.  2008: Students with disabilities needed improvement in math.  2007: Students with disabilities needed improvement in math and reading.  2006: Students with disabilities needed improvement in reading and math; economically disadvantaged students needed improvement in math.</p>
Assistant Principal	Matt Pitts	B. S. Health Education M.A. Biology Ed. S. Curriculum and Instruction	7	8	<p>Grade: A for the last seven years, including 2012.  2006: Reading-71% proficient, 68% learning gains, 75% of lower quartile gains; Math-67% proficient, 70% learning gains  2007: Reading-73% proficient, 62% learning gains, 62% lower quartile gains; Math-71% proficient, 76% learning gains, 74% lower quartile gains  2008: Reading-79% proficient, 69% learning gains, 68% lower quartile gains; Math-78% proficient, 78% learning gains, 72% lower quartile gains  2009: Reading-82% proficient, 68% learning gains, 65% lower quartile gains; Math-78% proficient, 77% learning gains, 78% lower quartile gains  2010: Reading-76% proficient, 61% learning gains, 55% lower quartile gains; math-71% proficient, 68% learning gains, 61% lower quartile gains</p>

				<p>2011: Reading-74% proficient, 63% learning gains, 68% lower quartile gains; math-76% proficient, 76% learning gains, 72% lower quartile gains</p> <p>2012: Reading-66% proficient, 70 points for lowest 25% learning gains; math-62% proficient, 48 points for lowest 25%</p> <p>AMO:</p> <p>2012: Economically disadvantaged and students in the lower 25% need improvement in math and reading.</p> <p>2011: Economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities need improvement in reading and math.</p> <p>2010: Economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities need improvement in reading and math.</p> <p>2009: All subgroups met criteria. SMS achieved AYP.</p> <p>2008: Students with disabilities needed improvement in math.</p> <p>2007: Students with disabilities needed improvement in math and reading.</p> <p>2006: Students with disabilities needed improvement in reading and math; economically disadvantaged students needed improvement in math.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

## **Instructional Coaches**

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (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)	Number of Years at Current School	Number 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)

## **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
1. Principal/Administration will meet regularly with new teachers.	Principal/Administration	On-going
2. New teachers will be partnered with veteran staff.	Assistant Principal	On-going
3. New teachers will participate in Bay District's New Teacher Induction Program.	Assistant Principal	May 2013
4. ESOL Endorsement and Reading Endorsement opportunities provided to all staff members via Bay District initiatives.	Principal	May 2013
5. Use on online application database for new recruits	Administration	On-going
6. Opportunities for professional development through T2T (Teacher-to-Teacher)	Administration	May 2013

***Non-Highly Effective Instructors***

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and 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 instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

***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	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
46	0	13	17	50	39.1	100	17.4	15.2	13

***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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Administrator : Dr. Sue Harrell

Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

School Psychologist: Janice Shipbaugh

Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Pauline Danner

Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Regular Education Teachers - Martha Wright(6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>),Tinsley McGruder (7<sup>th</sup>)

Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

ESE Teacher: Melissa Gaddy

Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Guidance Counselors: Nancy Rawson, Amanda Hancock

Provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; assist the school and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.

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?

MTSS team will meet monthly. MTSS team may meet more often at beginning of the school year. The team functions to conduct on-going FCAT data,DEA, DIBELES, EASYC|BM and other Universal Screening data to match interventions to student needs and stakeholder accountability. The MTSS team ensures MTSS/RtI professional development is provided to staff. The MTSS team is responsible for school-wide implementation. The MTSS team provides training and coaching to school staff. School administrators will use individual student performance data to determine activities and the MTSS structures needed to best meet the needs of their students. The MTSS process will be integrated in the District Reading Plan, District Student Progression Plan, and School Improvement Plan. The

**August 2012**

**Rule 6A-1.099811**

**Revised April 29, 2011**

MTSS team will also be responsible for relaying information to each team.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?  The curriculum, delivery of instruction within the curriculum, and professional development are all driven by student achievement. MTSS team will collaborate with the School Improvement Team, School Advisory Council, Surfside Middle School Staff, and the school principal to help in the development of the School Improvement Plan. The team will provide data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; help set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship). The MTSS Team contributed to the Professional Development areas of plan by outlining how MTSS/RtI Professional Development will be delivered to faculty and staff.
<b>MTSS Implementation</b>
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. Reading is measured by using the Discovery Education Assessments, FCAT, DIEBELS, Classworks as well as any other methods that the teachers utilize to help the student. Math is measured by Discovery Education Assessments, easy CBM end of chapter tests and standardized test such as the FCAT scores results as well as any other methods that the teachers utilize to help the student; Writing is measured through monthly writing prompts, writing portfolios and standardized test results. Discipline referrals and attendance are monitored by RtIB and FOCUS (FOCUS, PMRN, Discovery Education Assessments, FCAT, RtIB, Fast ForWord)
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional development was provided during preschool inservice to introduce MTSS. Additional training sessions on the MTSS problem solving model, data-based decision making, and evaluating interventions will be implemented in early September and October 2012 and as needed during the school year. The MTSS team will also evaluate additional staff professional
Describe the plan to support MTSS. MTSS will be supported by the principal, administration, and the MTSS team with follow up mini inservices for staff and faculty throughout the year. There will also be a MTSS focus group established as a PLC for further understanding of the MTSS process.

***Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)***

<b>School-Based Literacy Leadership Team</b>
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Vicki Weaver-instructional staff, reading, Martha Cordell, instructional staff-reading, Kimberly Jarrard, instructional staff-ASPIRE, Melissa Gaddy, instructional staff-ESE, Tanya Standifer, instructional staff-ASPIRE, Lenee Marshall, instructional staff-ASPIRE, Sarah Howell, media specialist.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy team meets monthly to discuss results of classroom based assessments and to review reading strategies that are being used in core curriculum classes throughout the school. The team assists core teachers with reading strategies that will help their students reading scores improve.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Under the guidance of the principal and reading coach, the LLT will meet monthly to focus on literacy initiatives, programs, student performance data, and literacy concerns throughout the school. The primary goal of the team is to ensure that all stakeholders support the work of the reading coach and the school's literacy goals



through a whole-school approach. Revision of DEAR time to STEM initiatives featuring 2 reading activities (schoolwide) per week. Activities are designed by literacy leaders and are provided/modeled for faculty prior to use with students. Teacher4s will begin incorporating ELA CCSS across all subject areas.

***Public School Choice***

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

*Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the “Upload” page.*

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

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

***\*Grades 6-12 Only*** Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

Teacher's lesson Plans will be reviewed for the inclusion of the Reading Comprehension Strategies with heavy focus on the CCSS. Content Area teachers will utilize the guided reading provided in their discipline to help students connect to the text. Word Walls will be incorporated throughout content classes in the school. All teachers will present reading activities provided by literacy team to 7<sup>th</sup> period stem classes.

***\*High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

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

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

***Postsecondary Transition***

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

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

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>			1A.1. Lack of comprehension and inference skills	1.1. To utilize effective reading instructional strategies determined by baseline assessment data	1.1. Reading Teachers, Language Arts Teachers, Administrator	1.1. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, and instructional focus calendars	1.1. Benchmark Assessment Tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
<b>Reading Goal #1A:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
In grades 6-8, 35% of students tested will achieve Level 3 proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment with the incorporation of the CCSS across discipline.	33%(316)	35%(291)					
			1A.2. Reading not required for all students after 5 <sup>th</sup> grade	1.2. Increase the rigor of the content area class reading strategies determined by baseline assessment data and incorporate differentiated instruction in content areas that include reading strategies	1.2. Reading Teachers, Content Area Teachers, MTSS team, Administrators	1.2. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, and instructional focus calendars	1.2. Benchmark Assessment Tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
			1A.3. Lack of instruction that addresses specific reading deficiencies	1.3. Implementing a differentiated instructional model to address specific reading deficiencies determined by baseline assessment data	1.3. Reading Teachers, Administrators	1.3. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, and instructional focus calendars	1.3. Benchmark assessment tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>			1B.1. Students do not have basic knowledge of words/sight words.	1B.1. Increase phonics and phonemic awareness instruction with regards to vocabulary.	1B.1. ESE Teacher/ Admin	1B.1. Lesson plans, CBM's	1B.1. CBM's, FCAT AA scores.
<b>Reading Goal #1B:</b>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
32% of the students tested will score at levels 4-6.	**	**					
			1B.2. Students lacking background knowledge.	1B.2. Increase instruction to build on background of given text.	1B.2. Teacher1	1B.2. Lesson Plans	1B.2. CBM's

August 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised April 29, 2011

		1B.3. Lack of instruction that addresses specific reading deficiencies	1.3. Implementing a differentiated instructional model to address specific reading deficiencies determined by baseline assessment data	1.3. Reading Teachers, Administrators	1.3. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, lesson plans, and instructional focus calendars	1.3. Benchmark assessment tests, FCAT AA Reading Assessment 2013
--	--	---	---	--	--	---

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>			2.1. Lack of independent reading.	2.1. REEF time part of the daily schedule	2.1. Teachers, Administrators	2.1. Lesson Plans and Administrative Walkthroughs	2.1. Reading logs and journals	
<b>Reading Goal #2A:</b> In grades 6-8, 30% of students tested will achieve Level 4 or 5 proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 29%(278)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 30%(249)						
				2.2. Students in content area classes are not actively involved in answering higher-level questions and using critical thinking to support the answers.	2.2. Higher ordered questions that are in content area teacher's edition will be emphasized during instruction	2.2. Content area teachers, department chairs	2.2. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars	2.2. Benchmark assessment tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
				2.3. Lack of motivation to read	2.3. Provide incentives to students to increase reading frequency	2.3. Teachers, administrators	2.3. Reading logs and lesson plans	2.3. Reading logs and students reading grades
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			2B.1. Students do not have access to curriculum books on reading level.	2B.1. Give access to reading mastery programs on current level(fast	2B.1. Teacher/ Fast Forward Teacher	2B.1. Lesson plans, class schedules	2B.1. FF Results, FCAT AA 2013 Scorers	

Reading Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*		forward),			
90% of students tested will score at or above level 7.	***	***	2B.2. Students lacking background knowledge.	2B.2. Increase instruction to build on background of given text.	2B.2. Teacher1	2B.2. Lesson Plans	2B.2. CBM's
			2B.3. Lack of instruction that addresses specific reading deficiencies	2.3. Implementing a differentiated instructional model to address specific reading deficiencies determined by baseline assessment data	2.3. Reading Teachers, Administrators	2.3. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, lesson plans, and instructional focus calendars	2.3. Benchmark assessment tests, FCAT AA Reading Assessment 2013

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3.1. Lack of monitoring the bubble students who could go either way, decrease or increase	3.1. Identify and monitor progress of bubble students to ensure that students are in their appropriate instructional level or reading group and making progress	3.1. MTSS Team, reading and language arts teachers, administrators	3.1. Data analysis results, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	3.1. Benchmark Assessment tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013, Classworks.
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grades 6-8, 70% of students tested will achieve learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment	70%(630)	73%(613)					
			3.2. Lack of a true understanding of the research process and how to analyze and evaluate information from a variety of sources	3.2. Review previous data related to reference skills and determine specific deficiencies and teach students how to synthesize, analyze, and evaluate text as they learn to navigate through the research process.	3.2. Teachers, MTSS team, administrators	3.2. Data analysis results, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	3.2. Benchmark assessment tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
			3.3. Lack of instruction that addresses specific reading deficiencies	3.3. Implementing a differentiated instructional model	3.3. MTSS team, administrators, reading and language arts teachers	3.3. Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, research based program strategies	3.3. Benchmark assessment tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.

Reading Goal #3B: NA first year.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.



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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			4.1. Identification of lowest 25% of students making learning gains	4.1. Identify students and schedule level 1 a 90 minute reading block and level 2 a 45 minute block	4.1. MTSS team; reading teachers, administrators	4.1. Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, research based program strategies (Reading 180, Fast ForWord)	4.1. Reading 180, Fast ForWord, Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
<b>Reading Goal #4:</b> In grades 6-8, 71% of students in the lowest 25% tested will achieve learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 70%(73)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 71%(75)					
			4.2. Lack of instruction that addresses specific reading deficiencies	4.2. Implementing a differentiated instructional model implementing Kagan and CRISS strategies	4.2. Reading teachers, RtI team, administrators	4.2. Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, research based program strategies	4.2. Reading 180, Fast ForWord, Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
			4.3. Lack of confidence among low achieving students	4.3. Implement a teacher mentoring program to monitor student progress	4.3. RtI team, mentors, administrators	4.3. Mentor list, mentor log	4.3. Reading 180, Fast ForWord, Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> <b>Reading Goal #5</b> Increase the number of students reading on grade level.	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>		All students and subgroups will continue to improve and/or meet criteria of scoring 3.0 or better in reading on the 2012 FCAT.	All students and subgroups will continue to improve and/or meet criteria of scoring 3.0 or better in reading on the 2013 FCAT.	All students and subgroups will continue to improve and/or meet criteria of scoring 3.0 or better in reading on the 2014 FCAT.	All students and subgroups will continue to improve and/or meet criteria of scoring 3.0 or better in reading on the 2015 FCAT.	All students and subgroups will continue to improve and/or meet criteria of scoring 3.0 or better in reading on the 2016 FCAT.	All students and subgroups will continue to improve and/or meet criteria of scoring 3.0 or better in reading on the 2017 FCAT.
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b> <b>Reading Goal #5B:</b> In grades 6-8, 79% of students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Assessment.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White:32% Black:74% Hispanic:43% Asian:55% American Indian:n/a	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White:30% Black:50% Hispanic:40% Asian:50% American Indian:n/a	5B.1. Lack of comprehension and inference skills	5B.1. To utilize effective reading instructional strategies determined by baseline assessment data	5B.1. Reading teachers, Language Arts teachers, Administrator	5B.1. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars	5B.1. Benchmark Assessment Tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2012	
			5B.2. Reading not required for all students after 5 <sup>th</sup> grade	5B.2. Increase the rigor of the content area class reading strategies determined by baseline assessment data and incorporate differentiated instruction in content areas that include reading strategies	5B.2. Reading Teachers, Content Area Teachers, MTSS team, Administrators	5B.2. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars	5B.2. Benchmark Assessment Tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013	
			5B.3. Lack of instruction that addresses specific reading deficiencies	5B.3. Implementing a differentiated instructional model to address specific reading deficiencies determined by baseline assessment data	5B.3. Reading Teachers, Language Arts teachers, Administrators	5B.3. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus	5B.3. Benchmark assessment tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2012	

**August 2012**  
**Rule 6A-1.099811**  
**Revised April 29, 2011**

					calendars	
--	--	--	--	--	-----------	--

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1. Lack of comprehension and inference skills	5C.1. To utilize effective reading instructional strategies determined by baseline assessment data	5C.1. Reading teachers, Language Arts teachers, Administrator	5C.1. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars	5C.1. Benchmark Assessment Tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grades 6-8, 70% of students will achieve learning gains on the 2013FCAT Assessment.	75%	70%					
			5C.2. Reading not required for all students after 5 <sup>th</sup> grade	5C.2. Increase the rigor of the content area class reading strategies determined by baseline assessment data and incorporate differentiated instruction in content areas that include reading strategies	5C.2. Reading Teachers, Content Area Teachers, RtI team, Administrators	5C.2. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars	5C.2. Benchmark Assessment Tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2012
			5C.3. Lack of instruction that addresses specific reading deficiencies	5C.3. Implementing a differentiated instructional model to address specific reading deficiencies determined by baseline assessment data	5C.3. Reading Teachers, Language Arts teachers, Administrators	5C.3. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars	5C.3. Benchmark assessment tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2012
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1. Lack of comprehension and inference skills	5D.1. To utilize effective reading instructional strategies determined by baseline assessment data	5D.1. Reading teachers, Language Arts teachers, Administrator	5D.1. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars	5D.1. Benchmark Assessment Tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grades 6-8, 70% of SWD tested will achieve learning	71%	70%					

gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment		5D.2. Reading not required for all students after 5 <sup>th</sup> grade	5D.2. Increase the rigor of the content area class reading strategies determined by baseline assessment data and incorporate differentiated instruction in content areas that include reading strategies	5D.2. Reading Teachers, Content Area Teachers, RtI team, Administrators	5D.2. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars	5D.2. Benchmark Assessment Tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
		5D.3. Lack of instruction that addresses specific reading deficiencies	5D.3. Implementing a differentiated instructional model to address specific reading deficiencies determined by baseline assessment data	5D.3. Reading Teachers, Language Arts teachers, Administrators	5D.3. Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars	5D.3. Benchmark assessment tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5.E.1 Students in content area classes are not actively involved in answering higher-level questions and using critical thinking to support the answers.	5.E.1 Higher ordered questions that are in content area teacher's edition will be emphasized during instruction	5.E.1 Content area teachers, department chairs	5.E.1 Review of Reading quarterly assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars	5.E.1 Benchmark assessment tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2012
<b>Reading Goal #5E:</b>  In grades 6-8, 70% of the economically disadvantage students tested will achieve learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> #8%	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> #5%	5.E.2 Lack of instruction that addresses specific reading deficiencies	5.E.2 Implementing a differentiated instructional model implementing Kagan and CRISS strategies	5.E.2 Reading teachers, RtI team, administrators	5.E.2 Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, research based program strategies	5.E.2 Reading 180, Fast ForWord, Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2012
			5.E.3 Lack of confidence among students	5.E.3 Implement a teacher mentoring program to monitor student progress	5.E.3 RtI team, mentors, administrators	5.E.3 Mentor list, mentor log	5.E.3 Reading 180, Fast ForWord, Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2012

## Reading Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
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
CRISS	6-8	Bailey	All Teachers	Pre-Planning	Strategies in Lesson Plans	Administrators
Kagan Cooperative Learning School Implementation	6-8 All Subjects	Kathy Jones, Trainer	All teachers	Monthly meetings in 2012-2013 school year (Subject area, staff, and team meetings)	Discussion during subject area team meetings	School Improvement Team and Kathy Jones, Kagan Certified school trainer

**August 2012**  
**Rule 6A-1.099811**  
**Revised April 29, 2011**

RtI Leadership Teams	6-8 Reading	Melissa Gaddy	RtI Team	Monthly – 4 <sup>th</sup> Thursday	Minutes from meetings, data collection sheets	Melissa Gaddy
Differentiated Instruction	6-8 All Subjects	Florida Inclusion Network	ESE/regular teacher teams	October 20 <sup>th</sup> -21 <sup>st</sup>	Examples of shared strategies, strategies in lesson plans	Department chairs, ESE teachers, administrators
PLC/Subject Area, Data Analysis	6-8 Language Arts	Department Chair	Language Arts and Reading Teachers	Monthly meetings	Agenda, meeting minutes, data collection sheets	Department chairs, administrators
Discovery Education Assessment Training	6-8 Reading and Language Arts teachers	Kathy Jones and Linda Yori, District TOSA	Language Arts and Reading teachers	Planning Periods	Sign-In Sheets, benchmark assessments	Department Chairs, Administrators
Ruby Payne: A Framework for Understanding Poverty	6-8 All Grades	Administrators	School Wide Participation	Faculty Meetings	Sign-in sheets	Administrators

**Reading Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Reading Goals*



## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>		1.1. Teachers not having strong enough ESOL content knowledge to implement effective ESOL listening/speaking strategies in the classroom.	1.1. Provide teachers who teach English Language Learners effective strategies to implement in the classroom that will promote student listening/speaking skills.	1.1. Guidance Counselor/ESOL Coordinator	1.1. Teachers will monitor student performance in both listening and speaking every quarter.	1.1. CELLA- Listening and speaking portion
<b>CELLA Goal #1:</b> <i>65% [11] of English Language Learners will meet Listening/Speaking proficiency as measured by CELLA</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	52% [9]					
	1.2. Limited student background knowledge and inability to connect to content curriculum. 1.3. Lack of parent English fluency causing difficulty providing school support at home.	1.2. Teachers will use differentiated instruction to meet the needs of English Language Learners. 1.3. Providing opportunities for parents of ELLs to become more involved in the school setting	1.2. Classroom Teacher 1.3. Guidance Counselor/ESOL Coordinator	1.2. Teachers will follow up with student to gauge student understanding. 1.3. Student improvement will be monitored based on parent attendance at school functions.	1.2. Weekly classroom assessments 1.3. Sign-in sheet for parents at school functions, and CELLA scores.	1.2. 1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>		2.1. Teachers not having strong enough ESOL content knowledge to implement effective ESOL reading strategies in the classroom.	2.1. Provide teachers who teach English Language Learners strategies to implement in the classroom that will help improve student reading skills. Also, provide students with access to Rosetta Stone computer software to help with the improvement of reading skills	2.1. Guidance Counselor/ESOL Coordinator	2.1. Teachers will monitor student performance in reading every quarter.	2.1. CELLA- Reading portion and FCAT-Reading portion
<b>CELLA Goal #2:</b> <i>25% [5] of English Language Learners will meet Reading proficiency as measured by CELLA</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	18% [3]					
	2.2. Limited student background knowledge and inability to connect to content curriculum. 2.3. Lack of parent English fluency causing difficulty providing school support at home in reading.	2.2. Teacher will use differentiated instruction in Reading to meet the needs of English Language Learners. 2.3. Providing opportunities for parents to become more involved in the school setting and be more exposed to student reading material	2.2. Classroom Teacher 2.3. Guidance Counselor/ESOL Coordinator	2.2. Teachers will follow up with student to gauge student understanding. 2.3. Student improvement in reading will be monitored based on parent attendance at school functions.	2.2. Weekly classroom assessment. 2.3. Sign-in sheet for parents at school functions, CELLA scores and FCAT Reading Scores.	2.2. 2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>		2.1. Teachers not having strong enough ESOL content knowledge to implement effective ESOL writing strategies.	2.1. Provide teachers who teach English Language Learners strategies to implement in the classroom that will help to improve writing skills	2.1. Guidance Counselor/ESOL Coordinator	2.1. Teachers will monitor student performance in writing every quarter	2.1. CELLA-Writing portion
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b>	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</b>					
35% [6] of English Language Learners will meet Writing proficiency as measured by CELLA	24% [4]	2.2. Limited student background knowledge and inability to connect to content curriculum.	2.2. Teacher will use differentiated instruction in writing to meet the needs of English Language Learners	2.2. Classroom Teacher	2.2. Teachers will follow up with student to gauge student understanding.	2.2. Weekly classroom assessment.

**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of CELLA Goals*

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>IA. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1.1. Limited technology to access the research based learning tools on Discovery Education Assessment and the new textbooks adopted for the district.	1.1. Teachers will use mathematical vocabulary, model note taking strategies, and incorporate content reading into lessons to enhance and improve mathematics literacy.	1.1. Math teachers are responsible for analyzing the results of the Discovery Education Assessment and taking correct action with their students.	1.1. Formative and Summative assessment will require students to be proficient in mathematics vocabulary and content reading. Students will be assessed three times a year using Discovery Education Assessment to determine student mastery of grade level standards.	1.1. New state-adopted textbook materials and Discovery Education Assessment will allow teachers to analyze master of grade level standards tested on the FCAT Math 2013
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grades 6-8, 33% of students tested will achieve Level 3 proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Math Assessment	28%(000)	33%(000)					
			1.2. Not having a universal lesson plan for all math teachers; lack of quarterly and semester assessments	1.2. Use the district provided pacing guides and develop school based lesson plans; used a school developed grading policy for formative and summative assessments	1.2. Math teachers, administrators	1.2. Administrators check lesson plans in common computer drive to monitor compliance of the pacing guide	1.2. Quarterly and semester assessments; Discovery Education Assessment
			1.3. Lack of availability of technology for student use	1.3. To provide exposure to a variety of hands-on content activities using manipulatives, Kagan Cooperative structures, and CRISS strategies to build depth of knowledge; use problem based learning	1.3. Math teachers, administrators	1.3. Review of department quarterly assessments and Discovery Education Assessment	1.3. Math teachers will analyze the data and implement corrective action using remediation problems for Discovery Education
<b>IB. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1B.1. Limited exposure to math concepts	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

50% of the students will score at level 4,5, or 6 for the FAA.	**	**					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2.1. Lack of availability to technology for student use	2.1. Develop essential questions that are aligned with the daily instruction and provide enrichment and stimulating activities through hands-on labs and virtual simulations/computer programs.	2.1. Advanced Math teachers, administrators	2.1. Review of department quarterly assessments, and Discovery Education Assessment	2.1. Quarterly assessments on benchmarks covered to date and Discovery Education Assessment
<b>Mathematics Goal #2A:</b>  In grades 6-8, 35% of students tested will achieve Level 4 or 5 proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Math Assessment.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> 31%(291)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> 35%(287)					
			2.2. Not having a universal lesson plan for all math teachers; lack of quarterly and semester assessments	2.2. Use the district provided pacing guides and develop school based lesson plans; used a school developed grading policy for formative and summative assessments	2.2. Math teachers, administrators	2.2. Administrators check lesson plans in common computer drive to monitor compliance of the pacing guide	2.2. Quarterly and semester assessments; Discovery Education Assessment
			2.3. Student’s lack of appropriate problem solving skills	2.3. Provide exposure to a variety of assessment items and problem solving techniques through FCAT practice problems and word problems on all benchmarks.	2.3. Math teachers, administrators	2.3. Review of department quarterly assessments, chapter tests, and Discovery Education Assessment	2.3. Quarterly assessments on benchmarks covered to date, Discovery Education Assessment
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2B.1. Lack of student progress	2B.1. Will include instruction that address specific math deficiencies specific	2B.1. Teachers/ Admin	2B.1. Lesson Plans	2B.1. FAA and monitoring

Mathematics Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	monitoring. Lack of instruction that addresses specific Math deficiencies	to this groups learning needs.			
55% of the students will score at or able a level 7 on the alternate assessment.	***	***					
			2B.2. Lack of exposure to hands- on materials/activities	2B.2. To provide exposure to a variety of hands-on content	2B.2. Teachers/Admin	2B.2. Lesson Plans	2B.2. FAA and progress monitoring.
			2.3 Student's lack of appropriate problem solving skills	2.3 Provide exposure to a variety of assessment items and problem solving techniques through practice problems and word problems on all benchmarks.	2.3 Math teachers, administrators	2.3 Review of department quarterly assessments, chapter tests, and Lesson Plans	2.3 Assessments on math problems and score from the FAA.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3.1. Lack of student progress monitoring. Lack of instruction that addresses specific Math deficiencies.	3.1. Review quarterly assessments and district benchmark assessments progress. To implement differentiated instruction model.	3.1. Math teachers, administrators	3.1. Review of pre and post-tests in each chapter and Discovery Education Assessment and determine appropriate intervention	3.1. Quarterly assessments on benchmarks covered to date and district benchmark assessments, Discovery Education Assessment
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> In grades 6-8, 65% of students tested will achieve learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 63%(592)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 65%(532)					
			3.2. Not having a universal lesson plan for all math teachers; lack of quarterly and semester assessments	2.2. Use the district provided pacing guides and develop school based lesson plans; used a school developed grading policy for formative and summative assessments	2.2. Math teachers, administrators	2.2. Administrators check lesson plans in common computer drive to monitor compliance of the pacing guide	2.2. Quarterly and semester assessments; Discovery Education Assessment
			3.3. Student's lack of appropriate problem solving skills	3.3. Provide exposure to a variety of assessment items and problem solving techniques through FCAT practice problems and word problems on all benchmarks.	3.3. Math teachers, administrators	3.3. Review of department quarterly assessments, chapter tests, and Discovery Education Assessment	3.3. Quarterly assessments on benchmarks covered to date, Discovery Education Assessment
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					



N/A	***	***					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4.1. Lack of student progress monitoring. Lack of instruction that addresses specific Math deficiencies	4.1. Review quarterly assessments and district benchmark assessments progress to implement differentiated instruction model	4.1. Math teachers, administrators	4.1. Review of department quarterly assessments and district benchmark assessments, Discovery Education Assessment	4.1. Quarterly assessments on benchmarks covered to date and district benchmark assessments , Discovery Education Assessment	
<b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b> In grades 6-8, 50% of students tested in the lowest 25 percentile will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 48%(451)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 50%(414)						
				4.2. Not having a universal lesson plan for all math teachers; lack of quarterly and semester assessments	4.2. Use the district provided pacing guides and develop school based lesson plans; used a school developed grading policy for formative and summative assessments	4.2. Math teachers, administrators	4.2. Administrators check lesson plans in common computer drive to monitor compliance of the pacing guide	4.2. Quarterly and semester assessments; Discovery Education Assessment
				4.3. Lack of support personnel to address students that need additional assistance.	4.3. Provide explicit, instruction, coaching, and modeling assistance within the teacher classroom. Create pullout schedule for addressing student deficiencies in the lowest 25 percentile population.	4.3. Math teachers, math tutors, administrators	4.3. Review of department quarterly assessments and Discovery Education Assessment	4.3. Discovery Education Assessment and FCAT Math Assessment 2013

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>  Mathematics Goal #5A:  Increase the number of students proficient in math.	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>		<b>All students and subgroups will continue to improve and or meet AYP criteria of 86% scoring 3.0 or better in math on the 2012 FCAT</b>	<b>All students and subgroups will continue to improve and or meet AYP criteria of 86% scoring 3.0 or better in math on the 2013 FCAT</b>	<b>All students and subgroups will continue to improve and or meet AYP criteria of 90% scoring 3.0 or better in math on the 2014 FCAT</b>	<b>All students and subgroups will continue to improve and or meet AYP criteria of 92% scoring 3.0 or better in math on the 2015 FCAT</b>	<b>All students and subgroups will continue to improve and or meet AYP criteria of 93% scoring 3.0 or better in math on the 2016 FCAT</b>	<b>All students and subgroups will continue to improve and or meet AYP criteria of 95% scoring 3.0 or better in math on the 2017 FCAT</b>
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>  Mathematics Goal #5B:  In grades 6-8, 79% of students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Assessment	2012 Current Level of Performance: <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White:37% Black:62% Hispanic:44% Asian:45% American Indian:na	2013 Expected Level of Performance: <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White:35% Black:50% Hispanic:40% Asian:40% American Indian:na	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Lack of student progress monitoring. Lack of instruction that addresses specific Math deficiencies.	5B.1.  Review quarterly assessments and district benchmark assessments progress. To implement differentiated instruction model.	5B.  Math teachers, administrators	5B.1  Review of department quarterly assessments and Discovery Education Assessment	5B.1.  Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Math 2012	
			5B.2 Not having a universal lesson plan for all math teachers; lack of quarterly and semester assessments	5B.2.  Use the district provided pacing guides and develop school based lesson plans; used a school developed grading policy for formative and summative assessments	5B. Math teachers, administrators	5B.2.  Administrators check lesson plans in common computer drive to monitor compliance of the pacing guide	5B.2.  Quarterly and semester assessments; Discovery Education Assessment	
			5B.3. Lack of exposure to hands-on materials/activities	5B. To provide exposure to a variety of hands-on content activities using manipulatives.	5B.3. Math teachers, administrators	5B.3.  Review of department quarterly assessments and Discovery Education Assessment	5B.3.  Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Math 2013	

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

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1. Lack of student progress monitoring. Lack of instruction that addresses specific Math deficiencies.	5C.1. Review quarterly assessments and district benchmark assessments progress. To implement differentiated instruction model.	5C.1. Math teachers, administrators	5C.1. Review of department quarterly assessments and Discovery Education Assessment	5C.1. Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Math 2012
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> At least 50% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 61%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 50%					
			5C.2. Not having a universal lesson plan for all math teachers; lack of quarterly and semester assessments	5C.2. Use the district provided pacing guides and develop school based lesson plans; used a school developed grading policy for formative and summative assessments	5C.2. Math teachers, administrators	5C.2. Administrators check lesson plans in common computer drive to monitor compliance of the pacing guide	5C.2. Quarterly and semester assessments; Discovery Education Assessment
			5C.3. Lack of exposure to hands-on materials/activities	5C.3. To provide exposure to a variety of hands-on content activities using manipulatives.	5C.3. Math teachers, administrators	5C.3. Review of department quarterly assessments and Discovery Education Assessment	5C.3. Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Math 2013
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1. Lack of student progress monitoring. Lack of instruction that addresses specific Math deficiencies.	5D.1. Review quarterly assessments and district benchmark assessments progress. To implement differentiated instruction model.	5D.1. Math teachers, administrators	5D.1. Review of department quarterly assessments and Discovery Education Assessment	5D.1. Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Math 2012
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> At least 50% of SWD will make learning gains in math.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 69%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 50%					
			5D.2. Not having a universal lesson plan for all math teachers; lack of quarterly and semester assessments	5D.2. Use the district provided pacing guides and develop school based lesson plans; used a school developed grading policy for formative and summative assessments	5D.2. Math teachers, administrators	5D.2. Administrators check lesson plans in common computer drive to monitor compliance of the pacing guide	5D.2. Quarterly and semester assessments; Discovery Education Assessment
			5D.3. Lack of exposure to hands-on materials/activities	5D.3. To provide exposure to a variety of hands-on content activities using manipulatives.	5D.3. Math teachers, administrators	5D.3. Review of department quarterly assessments and Discovery Education Assessment	5D.3. Benchmark Assessment test, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Math 2013



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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b> <b>Mathematics Goal #5E:</b> <i>70% of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>	5E.1. Lack of teacher understanding of Economically Disadvantaged students	5E.1. Monthly trainings using the Ruby Payne: A Framework for Understanding Poverty model	5E.1.	5E.1. Discovery Education Assessment, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars, teacher surveys of poverty trainings	5E.1. Benchmark Assessment Tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Reading Assessment 2013
	47%	54%	5E.2. Not having a universal lesson plan for all math teachers; lack of quarterly and semester assessments	5E.2. Use the district provided pacing guides and develop school based lesson plans; used a school developed grading policy for formative and summative assessments	5E.2. Math teachers, administrators	5E.2. Administrators check lesson plans in common computer drive to monitor compliance of the pacing guide	5E.2. Quarterly and semester assessments; Discovery Education Assessment
			5E.3. Lack of support personnel to address students that need additional assistance.	5E.3. Provide explicit, instruction, coaching, and modeling assistance within the teacher classroom. Create pullout schedule for addressing student deficiencies	5E.3. Math teachers, math tutors, administrators	5E.3. Review of department quarterly assessments and Discovery Education Assessment	5E.3. Discovery Education Assessment and FCAT Math

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

**Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals** *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.</b>			2.1. Increased enrollment in Alg I honors to include 7 <sup>th</sup> grade.	2.1. Review 7 <sup>th</sup> /8 <sup>th</sup> grade NGSSS and CCSS along with Alg I NGSS and CCSS	2.1. Math Teachers	2.1. Performance on EOC for ALG I honors and FCAT	2.1. EOC for Alg I honors and FCAT.
Algebra Goal #2: Maintain 100% of students at level 4/5 on EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100%(00)	100% (00)					
			2.2. Increase number of 8 <sup>th</sup> graders in ALG I honors.	2.2. Revises 8 <sup>th</sup> grade NGSSS and CCSS in Alg I course. Incorporated 4MATH4 into curriculum.	2.2. Math Teachers	2.2. Performance on EOC for ALG I honors and FCAT	2.2. EOC for Alg I honors and FCAT.
		2.3. Textbook not aligned to CCSS.	2.3. Alg I honors course to include CCSS.	2.3. Math Teachers	2.3. Performance on EOC for ALG I honors and FCAT	2.3. EOC for Alg I honors and FCAT.	



Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>							
	Algebra 1 Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> n/A							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *						
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>						
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:						
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C:  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D:  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E:  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

*End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals*

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
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
Kagan Cooperative Learning School Implementation	6-8 All Subjects	Kathy Jones, Trainer	All teachers	Monthly meetings in 2012-2013 school year (Subject area, staff, and team meetings)	Discussion during subject area team meetings	School Improvement Team and Kathy Jones, Kagan Certified school trainer
MTSS Leadership Teams	6-8 Mathematics	Melissa Gaddy	RtI Team	Monthly – 4 <sup>th</sup> Thursday	Minutes from meetings, data collection sheets	Melissa Gaddy
Differentiated Instruction	6-8 All Subjects	Florida Inclusion Network	ESE/regular teacher teams	October 20 <sup>th</sup> -21 <sup>st</sup>	Examples of shared strategies, strategies in lesson plans	Department chairs, ESE teachers, administrators
PLC/Subject Area, Data Analysis	6-8 Mathematics	Department Chair	Mathematics Teachers	Monthly meetings	Agenda, meeting minutes, data collection sheets	Department chairs, administrators
Discovery Education Assessment Training	6-8 Mathematics Teachers	Kathy Jones Linda Yori, Kathy Lewis	Mathematics Teachers	Planning Periods	Sign-In Sheets, benchmark assessments	School Leadership Team, Administrators
CPALMS Lesson Study	6-8 Math teachers	Jill Cearney	Math Teachers(PLC)	Planning Periods	Sign in sheets, Lesson plans observations	Lesson study leader

**Mathematics Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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]).

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>IA. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>			1.1. Lack of understanding science concepts due to lack of reading in the content area	1.1. Increase reading comprehension by utilizing CCSS through the implementation of CRISS reading strategies such as graphic organizers (i.e. Venn diagrams, vocabulary improvement strategies, concept maps, selective underlining, margin notes) and increase number of hand on labs using and Kagan Cooperative strategies	1.1. Science teachers, administration	1.1. Notebook monitoring, lesson plans documenting hands on lab, PLC meetings	1.1. Notebook and lab assessments, vocabulary assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Science 2013
<u>Science Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grade 8, 50% of students tested will achieve Level 3 proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment	39%(130)	50%(167)					
			1.2. Lack of retention of information from previous earth science and life science instruction	1.2. Use of the District Pacing Guide to provide in-depth investigation in areas of deficiency and provide remediation/relearning.	1.2. Science teachers, science department chair, administrators	1.2. Discovery Education Assessment strategies, FCAT Explorer, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, PLC meetings	1.2. Benchmark assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Explorer progress, FCAT Science 2013
			1.3. Lack of real world application and hands on experience in the low proficient strand of Scientific Thinking	1.3. Inquiry based science instruction and applying science concepts and skills to real world applications; participation in Surfside Science Fair and science related field trips	1.3. Science teachers, administration	1.3. Classroom walk through, lesson plans, instructional focus calendars, PLC meetings	1.3. Discovery Education Assessment, Science Fair Project, FCAT 2013

<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1B.1. Lack of understanding science concepts due to lack of reading in the content area .	1B.1. Increase reading in science vocabulary.	1B.1. Teacher	1B.1. Lesson Plans	1B.1. FAA, daily work
<b>Science Goal #1</b> 50% of the students will score at level 4,5, or 6 on the FAA.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 25%(25)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 50%(4)					
			1B.2. Lack of retention of information from previous science instruction	1B.2. Teach and re teach science ideas that have been covered in class.	1B.2. Teacher	1B.2. Lesson Plans	1B.2. FAA daily work
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>			1.1. Lack of understanding science concepts due to lack of reading in the content area	1.1. Increase reading comprehension by utilizing CRISS reading strategies such as graphic organizers (i.e. Venn diagrams, vocabulary improvement strategies, concept maps, selective underlining, margin notes) and increase number of hand on labs using and Kagan Cooperative strategies	1.1. Science teachers, administration	1.1. Notebook monitoring, lesson plans documenting hands on lab, PLC meetings	1.1. Notebook and lab assessments, vocabulary assessments, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT Science 2013
<b>Science Goal #2A:</b> In grade 8, 16% of students tested will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 15%(50)	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 16%(53).					
			2.2. Deficiency in Scientific Thinking strand due to students not participating in scientific research	2.2. Students in advanced science will be required to participate in scientific research through a class scientific research project and/or science fair project.	2.2. Science teachers, administrators	2.2. Monitoring of science fair project/research, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	2.2. Science project, science assessment tests, Discovery Education Assessment, FCAT 2013
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2B.1. Lack of understanding science concepts due to lack of reading in the content area	2B.1. Increase reading comprehension by utilizing vocabulary improvement strategies.	2B.1. Teacehr	2B.1. Lesson Plans	2B.1. FAA and class room work.
<b>Science Goal #2B:</b> Increase the number of students scoring at or above level 7 in science on the FAA.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> **	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> **					
			2B.2. Deficiency in Scientific Thinking .	2B.2. Increase exposure to the scientific thinking model.	2B.2. Teacher	2B.2. Lesson Plans	2B.2. FAA and class work.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.





## Science Professional Development

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
Kagan Cooperative Learning School Implementation	6-8 All Subjects	Kathy Jones, Trainer	All teachers	Monthly meetings in 2012-2013 school year (Subject area, staff, and team meetings)	Discussion during subject area team meetings	School Improvement Team and Kathy Jones, Kagan Certified school trainer
Differentiated Instruction	6-8 All Subjects	Florida Inclusion Network	ESE/regular teacher teams	October 20 <sup>th</sup> -21 <sup>st</sup>	Examples of shared strategies, strategies in lesson plans	Department chairs, ESE teachers, administrators
PLC/Subject Area, Data Analysis	6-8 Science	Department Chair	Science Teachers	Monthly meetings	Agenda, meeting minutes, data collection sheets	Department chairs, administrators
Discovery Education Assessment Training	6-8 Science	Kathy Jones and Linda Yori, District TOSA	Science Teachers	Planning Periods	Sign-In Sheets, benchmark assessments	Department Chairs, Administrators
CALA for Advancement of Learning and Assessment at FSU	7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science	Glen Faust and Linda Yorie	Science Teachers(PLC)	Meetings throughout the school year	Fellowship through Florida State	Project Lead
BIOSCOPEs Lesson Study	7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> grade Science	Yori, Buddi, Waters, Cerney	PLC Science	Meetings throughout the school year	Sign in sheets, meeting minutes.	PLC Lead

## Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011

			<b>Subtotal:</b>
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>			1.1. Students' lack of grade level appropriate vocabulary knowledge in which to apply varied word choice to their writing	1.1. Students will learn to utilize vocabulary choices drawn from their Language arts literature textbooks along with additional novels and outside readings, and other sources, implementation of ELA CCSS across subjects	1.1. Language Arts Teachers	1.1. Students' writing samples from Surfside Writes, classroom walkthroughs, word walls, students' notebooks	1.1. Benchmark assessments, students' writing portfolios, Surfside Writes assessment, FCAT Writes 2013
<b>Writing Goal #1A:</b> In grade 8, 80% of students tested will achieve Level 3 or higher proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> 76%(183)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> 80%(264)	1A.2. Students' lack the skill to implement varied sentence structure in which to apply to their writing	1.2. Students will learn to implement varied sentence structure through in-class lessons and grammar practice through reading-writing connections	1.2. Language Arts Teachers, Language Department Head, administrators classroom walkthrough	1.2. Students' writing samples from Surfside Writes, classroom walkthroughs, word walls, students' notebooks	1.2. Benchmark assessments, students' writing portfolios, Surfside Writes assessment, FCAT Writes 2012
			1.3. Students' lack the ability to generate adequate supporting details in which to effectively support their topic	1.3. Students will learn to apply precise, related to the topic, and effective supporting details to add to their writing pieces in order to support their topic	1.3. Language Arts Teachers, Language Arts Department Head, Administrators classroom walkthroughs	1.3. Students' writing samples from Surfside Writes, classroom walkthroughs, word walls, students' notebooks	1.3. Benchmark assessments, students' writing portfolios, Surfside Writes assessment, FCAT Writes 2012
			1B.1. Students' lack of grade level appropriate vocabulary knowledge in which to apply varied	1B.1. Students will learn to utilize vocabulary choices drawn from class work.	1B.1. Teacher	1B.1. Lesson Plans	1B.1. FAA and class work
<b>Writing Goal #1B:</b> 75% of the students taking	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					

the AA will score 4 or higher.	75%(3)	75%(5)		word choice to their			
			IB.2. Students' lack the skill to implement varied sentence structure in which to apply to their writing	writing Students will learn varied sentence structure.	IB.2. Teacher	IB.2. Lesson Plans	IB.2. FAA and Class work
			IB.3. Students' lack the ability to generate adequate supporting details in which to effectively support their topic	IB.3. Students will learn about supporting details in class.	IB.3. Teacher	IB.3. Lesson Plans	IB.3. FAA and Class work.

## Writing Professional Development

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
Kagan Cooperative Learning School Implementation	6-8 All Subjects	Kathy Jones, Trainer	All teachers	Monthly meetings in 2012-2013 school year (Subject area, staff, and team meetings)	Discussion during subject area team meetings	School Improvement Team and Kathy Jones, Kagan Certified school trainer
PLC/Subject Area, Data Analysis	6-8 Language Arts	Department Chair	Language Arts Teachers	Monthly meetings	Agenda, meeting minutes, data collection sheets	Department chairs, administrators
Differentiated Instruction	6-8 All Subjects	Florida Inclusion Network	ESE/regular teacher teams	October 20th-21st	Examples of shared strategies, strategies in lesson plans	Department chairs, ESE teachers, administrators
ELA CCSS Implementation	6-8 all subjects	District staff Spec	All teachers	September 2012	Discussion during subject area team meetings	Admin, departments chairs

## Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011

			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Writing Goals*

**Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)***

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.</b>			1.1. Students have no background knowledge for Civics vocabulary.	1.1. Using baseline EOC data, determine specific learning deficiencies and teach students to synthesize, analyze, and evaluate Civics text as they navigate through the required curriculum.	1.1. Civics Teacher	1.1. Student formative and summative assessment data, teacher lesson plans.	1.1. DEA/EOC
Civics Goal  Establish baseline data for student achievement on Civics EOC exam during 2012-2013. Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, increase annually the number of students passing the EOC exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	*N/A	60%					
			1.2. Common Core standards are not published as of yet for the Civics curriculum.	1.2. Utilize Common Core Social Studies benchmarks as a part of daily lesson planning and utilize all required NGSSS Civics standards into 6 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> , and 8 <sup>th</sup> grade curriculums.	1.2. Civics Teacher	1.2. Beginning with 2012-2013 school year, establish baseline EOC results and Pre and Post test scores for Civics instruction. Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, review and analyze EOC exam data and Pre and Post test results.	1.2. DEA/EOC
			1.3. Students will need intensive vocabulary growth to excel in the Civics curriculum.	1.3. : Implement a differentiated instructional model for Civics instruction using CRISS and KAGAN strategies	1.3. Civics Teacher	1.3. Administrator walkthroughs, minutes from Social Studies team meetings.	1.3. DEA/EOC
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.</b>			2.1. Students have no background knowledge for Civics vocabulary	2.1. Using baseline EOC data, determine specific learning deficiencies and teach students to synthesize, analyze, and evaluate Civics text as they navigate through the required curriculum.	2.1. Civics Teacher	2.1. Student formative and summative assessment data, teacher lesson plans.	2.1. DEA/EOC
Civics Goal #2:  All students and subgroups will meet and/or exceed EOC exam requirements beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	25%					
			2.2. Common Core standards are not published as of yet for the Civics curriculum.	2.2. Utilize Common Core Social Studies benchmarks as a part of daily lesson planning and utilize all required NGSSS Civics standards into 6 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> , and 8 <sup>th</sup> grade curriculums.	2.2. Civics Teacher	2.2. Beginning with 2012-2013 school year, establish baseline EOC results and Pre and Post test scores for Civics instruction. Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, review and analyze	2.2. DEA/EOC



					EOC exam data and Pre and Post test results.	
		2.3. Students will need intensive vocabulary growth to excel in the Civics curriculum.	2.3. Implement a differentiated instructional model for Civics instruction using CRISS and KAGAN strategies	2.3. Civics Teacher	2.3. Administrator walkthroughs, minutes from Social Studies team meetings.	2.3. DEA/EOC

## Civics Professional Development

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
Kagan Cooperative Learning School Implementation	6-8 All Subjects	Kathy Jones, Trainer	All teachers	Monthly meetings in 2012-2013 school year (Subject area, staff, and team meetings)	Discussion during subject area team meetings	School Improvement Team and Kathy Jones, Kagan Certified school trainer
PLC/Subject Area, Data Analysis	6-8 Language Arts	Department Chair	Civic Teachers	Monthly meetings	Agenda, meeting minutes, data collection sheets	Department chairs, administrators
Differentiated Instruction	6-8 All Subjects	Florida Inclusion Network	ESE/regular teacher teams	October 20th-21st	Examples of shared strategies, strategies in lesson plans	Department chairs, ESE teachers, administrators
Civics CCSS	7 <sup>th</sup> grade	District Instructional specialist	7 <sup>th</sup> grade Civics teachers	Sept-April Monthly	Sign In Sheets	District Instructional Specialist

## Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011

			<b>Subtotal:</b>
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Civics Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Attendance</b>							
<b>Attendance Goal #1:</b>  In grades 6-8 decrease the number of absences, excessive absences, and tardies	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u> 93.95	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u> 95%	1.1. Students and parents do not feel accountable for students not attending school	1.1. Contact parents after 5th absence for a child study team conference, refer to district level truancy resource representative, notify teacher mentor (if available)	1.1. Teachers, guidance counselors, attendance clerk, administrators	1.1. Parent Conference (CST) notes and strategies, notes from teacher mentor, improved attendance	1.1. Attendance Data
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
		<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of absences in this box.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students tardy in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students tardy in this box.</i>					
		1.2. Very transient community.	1.2. Contract parents about protocol for moving and withdrawing students for school.	1.2. Attendance, administrators, guidance	1.2. IRIS, newsletters, CST	1.2. Attendance Data	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

## Attendance Professional Development

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
PLC/Positive Behavior Support	6-8	PBS Team	School Wide	PLC Monthly Meetings on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Wednesday	Monitor RtI:B, FOCUS Data	Administrators, Data Clerk
Parent Portal	6-8	School News letter	School Wide	All year	Monitor the number of parents signed up for parent portal	Data Clerk, Admin.

## Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011

*End of Attendance Goals*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>I. Suspension</b>							
<b>Suspension Goal #1:</b> Reduce the number of suspensions and number of students suspended by 2% in 2012-2013	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	1.1. Reducing the number of students participating in outside of the classroom behavioral interventions in order to maximize instructional learning opportunities	1.1. Utilize the Positive Behavior Support Plan to reinforce positive behavior with rewards instead of focusing on the negative actions of a student.	1.1. Teachers, PBS coach, PBS Team Members, Administrators	1.1. Number of positive referrals generated each month; Number of suspensions and repeat offenders.	1.1. RtI:B data, number of students participating in PBS fun days
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
			1.2. Lack of implementation of school-wide discipline plan	1.2. Provide teachers with discipline data and training during pre-planning week, providing school wide discipline rules posters, each teacher will read and discuss	1.2. Team leaders, administrators, School Improvement Team, PBS Coach, PBS Team members	1.2. Number of PBS referrals, list of teachers participating in the PBS positive referrals, lesson plans, evidence of posters	1.2. SWIS data

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011

			assigned pages of the Surfside handbook, PBS information presented			
		1.3. Students unaware of appropriate social behavior.	1.3. Weekly character education lessons used in REEF time. Development of intervention programs(Beach Conection, Girls on Track, Social Skills Class, Abstinence classes)	1.3. Teachers, interventions coaches	1.3. Lesson plans and meeting notes	1.3. Intervention coach and Admin



## Suspension Professional Development

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
PLC/Positive Behavior Support	6-8	PBS Team	School Wide	PLC Monthly Meetings on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Wednesday	Monitor SWIS Data	Administrators, Data Clerk
PBS Refresher	6-8	USF PBS Team	School PBS members	During the Summer	Sign In Sheets	District

## Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PBS	USF PBS Project	PBS	800
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>800Subtotal:</b>
			<b>800 Total:</b>

*End of Suspension Goals*

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

**Upload Option-**For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

**Online Template-** For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>							
<b>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</b>	1.1. Ability to keep parents involved due to lack of communication	1.1. Inform parents of educational goals and school activities through newsletters, school and district calendars, flyers, school marquee, school website, and community events, IRIS Alerts.	1.1. School Volunteer Coordinator, Administrators	1.1. Monitoring of parent survey and sign in sheets	1.1. Parent survey and sign-in sheets
Increase parental involvement by 10%	40%(375)	50%(400)					
			1.2. Parents lack of resources at home (instructional materials, computers) to help their child	1.2. A School's Parent Resource Center will be set up where parents can come in and use the computer and have access to a variety of instructional materials	1.2. Teachers, guidance counselors, administration	1.2. Sign-in sheets to determine how many parents use the School's Parent Resource Center	1.2. Sign-in Sheets
			1.3. Parents not aware of educational goals and opportunities available	1.3. Open House, parent workshops which include Dads and Doughnuts, Moms and Muffins, Schooling the Sharks, ESOL Coffee, Aspire Parent Meeting, "Taming the Cat" meeting, and a Military Parents Coffee	1.3. Teachers, guidance counselors, administration	1.3. Sign-in sheets, level of participation	1.3. Conference meeting sheets, sign-in sheets

## Parent Involvement Professional Development

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
Ruby Payne: A Framework for Understanding Poverty	6-8 All Grades	Administrators	School Wide Participation	Faculty Meetings	Sign-In Sheets	Administrators

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011



## Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
<b>Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
<b>Technology</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

STEM Goal(s)	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
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
<b>STEM Goal #1:</b>  Engage all students in STEM actives and curriculum.	1.1. Lack of pre-defined curriculum	1.1.Collaboration of all teachers to prepare for STEM activities to implement 2 times a week.	1.1.SMS Instructional staff.	1.1.Survey at beginning and end of year on STEM.	1.1.Increased interest/awareness of student body in STEM careers.
	1.2. Minimal experience of staff with STEM.	1.2.Co-teaching	1.2.Staff	1.2.Faculty Feedback on REEF time.	1.2.Development of STEM curriculum.
	1.3. All students participate.	1.3.7 <sup>th</sup> prd 30 min REEF Time. Broaden pre-engineering opportunities with additional PLTW Class.	1.3.Staff	1.3.Survey	1.3.Postive survey results.

## STEM Professional Development

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/PLC CPALMS	6/7/8	K. Jones	Jay Buddi Science	One time a week	Monitor REEF Time, implementation, Bioscopes, incorporation into curricullum	Same as participates.
			Kathy Jones Math			
			Susie Waters Science Linda Yori Science			
Bioscopes	6-9	Jones, Waters, Yori, Cerney	Jones(Math) Waters(Science) Yori(Science) Cerney(Math)	Once a week	Monitor REEF time implementation	Participates

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011



**STEM Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Engineering Books for each teacher			3000
			<b>3000Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CPALMS Internet Resources			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Collaboration on REEF Lessons			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Growing the PLTW classes and resouorces			
	Grant	SAME grant	24,000
			<b>24000Subtotal:</b>
			<b>27,000 Total:</b>

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>			1.1. Student lack of understanding the definition of bullying	1.1. Incorporate a bullying prevention class as part of the PE curriculum to help educate students about what bullying is and also help them understand the consequences of this behavior. Weekly character ed lesson through REEF time. Civility through Kagan character building strategies.	1.1. Teachers, administration	1.1. The number of discipline referrals for bullying, incidents reported to teachers and guidance, student response to the end of the year School Climate Survey	1.1. Discipline referrals, RtI:B data, 2012-2013 School Climate Survey
<u>Additional Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
Reduce the perception that students and parents have about the rate of bullying on campus by 5%	Parents 33%	Parents 28%					
	Students 48%	Students 43%					
			1.2. Parent's perception of bullying on campus	1.2. Parent meeting, Schooling the Sharks, that focuses on school safety and bullying on campus	1.2. Guidance, Administration	1.2. The number of parental concerns related to bullying incidents, parents' response to the end of the year School Climate Survey	1.2. Parental complaints, 2012-2013 school climate survey
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

## Additional Goals Professional Development

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
Bullying In-service	6-8	Matt Pitts	School Wide	School Based In-service, August 2nd, 2012	End of the year climate survey	Administrators
PLC/Positive Behavior Support	6-8	PBS Team	School Wide	PLC Monthly Meetings on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Wednesday	Monitor SWISS Data	Administrators, Data Clerk

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011



**Additional Goal(s) Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

**Final Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>27,000 Total:</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>27,000 Grand Total:</b>

## **Differentiated Accountability**

### **School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

Are you reward school?  Yes  No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

### **School Advisory Council (SAC)**

#### *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 members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting *Yes* or *No* below.

Yes  No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.

Amount
