

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2009 - 2010 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



**School Name: ATTUCKS MIDDLE SCHOOL**

**District Name: Broward**

**Principal: Carletha B. Shaw**

**SAC Chair: Karen W. Blount**

**Superintendent: James Notter**

**Date of School Board Approval: December 1, 2009**

**Last Modified on: 09-11-2009**

**Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commission**  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

**Dr. Frances Haithcock, Chance**  
K-12 Public Schools  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

## VISION and MISSION STATEMENTS

### Mission:

Attucks Middle School's mission is to provide a quality education to all students, in a safe and secure environment, while providing unique educational opportunities in the study of communication and broadcast arts through the use of technology.

### Vision:

- that all members of society deserve to be treated with respect.
- that student achievement is developed through cooperation among the home, community, school and students.
- that when teachers encourage a high level of academic excellence students will strive to achieve it.
- that each individual is capable of learning through a diversified approach.
- that our school services and programs should reflect the needs of our multicultural population.
- that all students should be prepared to function in a highly technological society.
- that the future of society is sitting in our classrooms.
- that school is a place that enhances creativity and instills a sense of pride.
- that students have a right to be in a safe and secure educational environment.
- that students should be provided with the fundamentals that will enable them to think critically.
- that students' learning should incorporate the use of technology throughout the curriculum.

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### SCHOOL PROFILE/DEMOGRAPHICS

#### Brief History and Background of the School

Our school is located in the neighborhood of Liberia in Hollywood. The school originally opened in 1914 as a high school. In 1968 the school became a middle school. The school serves students in grades 6 through 8.

Attucks Middle is a total school magnet program with dual magnet themes. Attucks is a Communications & Broadcast Arts Magnet. Students utilize reading, writing, listening and speaking through use of a state of the art television production studio, monthly production of a student newspaper, live morning television show and the total in-house production of a DVD yearbook.

We are also a Center for Instructional Technology Education Magnet where students and teachers have access to individual laptop computers for use as a teaching and learning tool. Teachers present lessons in an engaging atmosphere using various traditional and non-traditional modalities, and students demonstrate mastery of learning through multimedia projects. Students at Attucks are the only middle school students in Broward County afforded such an opportunity. Having access to the DLES laptop computer program enhances our ability to integrate technology into the curriculum.

#### Unique School Strengths for Next Year

- Attucks Middle was able to maintain a letter grade of "A", through learning gains;
- Level 1 & 2 students will be placed in as 90 minute reading intensive block;
- As minority enrollment, free/reduced lunch increased, test scores and learning gains also increased;
- Each content area has access to a Promethean board thereby having the ability to integrate technology in all areas;
- Enrollment for incoming Magnet out of bound students, has increased by approximately 35 students for the 09/10 school year;

-Extended learning opportunities such as FCAT Camps, before and after school tutoring, and Saturday school will provide intensive students one on one instruction;  
-Established Professional Learning Communities (PLC'S) will provide teachers an to opportunity discuss and disaggregate data, collaborate and plan lessons that embrace thematic units and insure cooperative learning for all learners;  
-The addition of a Science Coach will increase support for teachers in planning lessons, differentiating instruction and implementing weekly labs for all students;  
-Through the Communications and Broadcast Arts and Center for Instructional Technology Magnet programs students will have the opportunity to explore various facets of technology such as Graphic/Web Design, TV Broadcast, Newspaper, Yearbook and the production of a Digital Yearbook (DVD).

#### Unique School Weaknesses for Next Year

-All content area teachers are not reading endorsed  
-Additional Promethean boards are needed to integrate technology to all grade levels and all teams;  
-Subgroups are not consistent in meeting AYP in reading and math: Black and Economically Disadvantage in Reading and White and Black students in Math.

#### Student Demographics

The 2008-09 Student Demographics are as follows  
Female--48.9%  
Male--51.0%  
White--16.8%  
Black--51.9%  
Hispanic--25.4%  
Asian--2.26%  
Native--.12%  
Multi--3.27%  
  
Free Reduced--75.9%  
ELL--5.67%  
SWD/ESE--12.4%

#### Student Attendance Rates

2008-09 data shows:  
  
Attendance rate--91.7%

#### Student Mobility

2008-09  
Mobility--28.1%

#### Student Suspension Rates

2008-09  
Out of School Suspension rate--2.70%  
In-School Suspension rate--27.20

#### Student Retention Rates

2008  
Retention rate--2.94%

#### Class Size

4-8 Average in 2008-09--19.37

#### Academic Performance of Feeder Pattern

Academic Performance of Feeder Pattern  
The majority of students come to Attucks from the following schools:

Bethune Elem--B--82% of criteria satisfied  
Reading--65% met high standards; Economically Disadvantages did not meet AYP in Reading;  
Math--58% met high standards; Black, Hispanic and Econ. Disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Math. Writing: 83% met state standards in writing.  
Science--30%

Oakridge Elem--A--95% of criteria satisfied  
Reading--71% met high standards; All subgroups met AYP in Reading  
Math--72% met high standards; Black, Econ. Disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Math  
Writing--88% met state standards in writing  
Science--40% scored at or above grade level

Stirling Elem--A--82% of criteria satisfied  
 Reading--71% met high standards; Black, Econ. Disadvantage, SWD did not make AYP in Reading  
 Math--74% met high standards; Black, Econ. Disadvantage, SWD did not make AYP in Math  
 Writing--90% met state standards in writing  
 Science--39% scored at or above grade level

Hollywood Hills Elem--A--97% of criteria satisfied  
 Reading: 89% of students met high standards; All subgroups met AYP criteria  
 Math: 88% of students met high standards; SWD did not make AYP in Math  
 Writing--95% of students met state standards in writing  
 Science--71% scored at or above grade level

Sheridan Hills Elem--A--95% of criteria satisfied  
 Reading--80% of students met high standards in reading; SWD students did not make AYP in Reading  
 Math--82% of students met high standards; SWD students did not make AYP in Math  
 Writing--96% of students met state standards in writing  
 Science--50% scored at or above grade level

**Partnerships and Grants**

McDonalds, Oakwood Plaza—provides student incentives and donates food items for Family Unity Nights

Memorial Hospital—donates free book bags for students, and provides daily, free after school care and summer camp to students who are economically disadvantaged.

Papa Johns Pizza—provided honor roll coupons to students, donated and discounted food times for school events throughout the year.

City of Hollywood—participated in beatification project and donated butterfly garden through the Science department; partnered with Communications and Broadcast Arts magnet program to create and produce video segments as promo for the city and school.

**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA**

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

[School Grades Trend Data](#)

[Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Trend Data](#)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\) Trend Data](#)

**HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS**

| Position        | Name             | Degree(s)/ Certification(s)  | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record *  |
|-----------------|------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Assis Principal | Shannon R. Burch | BA/Elementary Education, Florida Atlantic University;<br>MS/ Human Resource Development, Florida International University;<br>FL Certification/ Ed. Leadership, Florida Atlantic | 2                            | 1                              | 2008-09<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 63%<br>Math Mastery: 61%<br>Science Mastery: 31%<br>Writing Mastery: 97%<br>AYP: Total, Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading;<br>Total, White and Black did not make AYP in Math.<br><br>2007-08<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 62%<br>Math Mastery: 58%<br>Science Mastery: 35%<br>Writing Mastery: 94%<br>AYP: Hispanic did not make AYP in Reading;<br>Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Math. |
|                 |                  | BA, Psychology, Ithaca College<br>MA, Industrial Psychology, Fairleigh   |                              |                                | 2008-09<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 63%<br>Math Mastery: 61%<br>Science Mastery: 31%<br>Writing Mastery: 97%<br>AYP: Total, Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading;<br>Total, White and Black did not make AYP in   |

|                 |                 |   |   |    |   |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|----|---|
| Assis Principal | Terry Tait      | Dickinson University<br><br>Certification:<br>Educational Leadership<br>Nova University   | 2 | 2  | Math.<br><br>2007-08<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 62%<br>Math Mastery: 58%<br>Science Mastery: 35%<br>Writing Mastery: 94%<br>AYP: Hispanic did not make AYP in Reading;<br>Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Math  |
| Assis Principal | Pete Cazas      | B.S. Early Childhood<br>FIU<br>M.S.<br>Admin/Supervision<br>K-12<br>Nova SE<br><br>Ed. Specialist<br>Multilingual<br>Multicultural<br>Education 5-12<br>FSU<br><br>Certifications:<br>Early Childhood,<br>Elementary Ed,<br>Math,(6th--9th),<br>Administration<br>Supervision (k--<br>12th grade),<br>ESOL (K-12th<br>grade | 1 | 18 | Apollo Middle<br>2006-07-Grade C --82% AYP<br>8th Grade--Reading 43%; Math 58% ;Writing 82% ;Science 23 %<br><br>2007--08 Grade -C --74% AYP<br>6th Grade--Reading 41%; Math 32%.<br><br>2008- 09 grade -A 90% met AYP<br>7th Grade--Reading, 56% , and Math 59%.<br><br>2009-2010—Beginning first year at Attucks Middle   |
| Principal       | CarlethaB. Shaw | B.A. Education<br>University of Florida<br><br>Master of Education<br>University of Florida<br><br>Ed. Specialist,<br>Education<br>Leadership<br>Florida Atlantic<br>University   | 5 | 10 | 2008-09<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 63%<br>Math Mastery: 61%<br>Science Mastery: 31%<br>Writing Mastery: 97%<br>AYP: Total, Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading;<br>Total, White and Black did not make AYP in Math.<br><br>2007-08<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 62%<br>Math Mastery: 58%<br>Science Mastery: 35%<br>Writing Mastery: 94%<br>AYP: Hispanic did not make AYP in Reading;<br>Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Math<br><br>2006-07<br>Grade: C<br>Reading Mastery: 53%<br>Math Mastery: 53%<br>Science Mastery: 29%<br>Writing Mastery: 92%<br>AYP: Hispanic did not make AYP in Reading and Math<br>Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading Math<br>Blacks did not make AYP in Reading and Math<br>SWD students did not make AYP in Reading and Math<br><br>2005-06<br>Grade: B<br>Reading Mastery: 55%<br>Math Mastery: 55%<br>Science Mastery: N/A<br>Writing Mastery: 81%<br>AYP: Hispanic did not AYP in Math<br><br>SWD Did not make AYP in both Reading and Math |

\* Note: Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades and AYP information along with the associated school year)

#### HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

| Subject Area  | Name           | Degree(s)/ Certification(s)  | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as a Coach | Prior Performance Record *  |
|---------------|----------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Reading Coach | Melissa Zavala | Professional Educator's: Elementary Education K-6<br>ESOL Endorsement, Reading | 3                            | 2                     | 2007-08 -Grade A<br>The Hispanic subgroup did not meet AYP in reading.<br>2008-09 -Grade A<br>The Blacks and Economically Disadvantage did not make AYP in reading. |

\* Note: Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades and AYP information along with the associated school year)

## HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

| Description of Strategy  | Person Responsible         | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Advertisements of teacher vacancies and shortages have been made via the district, Employment Information website, teacher recruitment job fairs, and in cities throughout the United States where teachers are being laid off | Principal                  | August of each year       |   |
| Staff development workshops are held in the area of reading to provide a vehicle by which secondary teachers and elementary reading coaches may become endorsed.   | Principal/Asst. Principals | Ongoing                   |   |
| A program through which Title I schools use Title I funds to pay for a Masters in Reading for teachers on staff who want to become reading teachers.   | Principal/Asst. Principals | Ongoing                   |   |
| New teachers meet regularly with Peer Coaches and Assistant Principals   | Asst. Principals           | Ongoing                   |   |
| New Teachers are partnered with veteran teachers based on their individual needs and the veteran teachers' expertise   | Asst. Principals           | September                 |   |
| Teachers are required to attend monthly Instructional Focus meetings   | Dept Chairs                | Ongoing                   |   |
| Teachers and mentors attend monthly NESS Meetings to discuss strategies, instructional plans, technology integration, gradebook, classroom management, etc.  | Dept Chairs/Instr. Coaches | Ongoing                   |   |

## Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

| Name              | Certification      | Teaching Assignment | Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified   |
|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Clarence Peterson | Physical Education | Physical Education  | Department leaders assist non-highly qualified teachers with curriculum support geared specifically to the standards and benchmarks, lesson plan development, and lesson delivery. They work with the Instructional Focus Calendar to fully assist the teacher with development of rigorous classroom activities. |

## Staff Demographics

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Qualified | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 55                                  | 15                       | 42   | 27  | 16   | 44                                  | 98                 | 10                          | 5                                   | 52              |

## Teacher Mentoring Program

| Mentor Name  | Mentee Assigned                | Rationale for Pairing   | Planned Mentoring Activities   |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Kimberly Mohorne<br>New Educator Coordinator<br>Social Studies | Wilyan Jones<br>Social Studies | Mr. Jones was a first year Social Studies teacher. Mrs. Mohorne has excellent classroom mgt and integrates reading in the content area. | The mentor and mentee meetings were conducted each month throughout the school year.<br>The Group worked on:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom Management,</li> <li>• Schoolwide procedures vs. rules</li> <li>• Strategies for teaching bell to bell</li> <li>• Steps to get 5-year Certification</li> <li>• Professional Growth Plans</li> <li>• Effective Teacher Discipline Techniques</li> <li>• Curriculum Mapping</li> <li>• Effective lesson planning</li> <li>• Content Area strategies.</li> </ul> |

|  |                                |  |   |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Tosha Kerobo<br>Science                | Erin Sellner<br>Math           | Ms. Kerobo teaches Science and Ms. Sellner, Math. The two were paired to assist in classroom mgt, procedures and rules.  | <p>The mentor and mentee meetings were conducted each month throughout the school year.</p> <p>The Group worked on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom Management,</li> <li>• Schoolwide procedures vs. rules</li> <li>• Strategies for teaching bell to bell</li> <li>• Steps to get 5-year Certification</li> <li>• Professional Growth Plans</li> <li>• Effective Teacher Discipline Techniques</li> <li>• Curriculum Mapping</li> <li>• Effective lesson planning</li> <li>• Content Area strategies.</li> </ul> <p>in addition to Effective Teacher Discipline Techniques, and Professional Learning Community in content area and curriculum support geared specifically to standards and benchmarks.</p> |
| Sandy Boisrond<br>Science              | Stephanie Singleton<br>Science | Ms. Singleton is new to the district and the school. Ms. Boisrond assists with strategies in the content area. (Science) | <p>The mentor and mentee meetings were conducted each month throughout the school year.</p> <p>The Group worked on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pinnacle Gradebook</li> <li>• Schoolwide procedures vs. rules</li> <li>• Strategies for teaching bell to bell</li> <li>• Steps to get 5-year Certification</li> <li>• Professional Growth Plans</li> <li>• Effective Teacher Discipline Techniques</li> <li>• Curriculum Mapping</li> <li>• Effective lesson planning</li> <li>• Content Area strategies.</li> </ul>   |
| Su Shy<br>Math                         | Sheree Ledgister<br>Math       | Ms Ledgister is new to the district and school. Ms. Shy assists with curriculum mapping, rules and procedures            | <p>The mentor and mentee meetings were conducted each month throughout the school year to work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pinnacle Gradebook</li> <li>• Schoolwide procedures vs. rules</li> <li>• Strategies for teaching bell to bell</li> <li>• Professional Growth Plans</li> <li>• Effective Teacher Discipline Techniques</li> <li>• Curriculum Mapping</li> <li>• Effective lesson planning</li> <li>• Content Area strategies, standards and benchmarks.</li> </ul>   |
| Nicole Kasuboske<br>Science Dept Chair | Lori Marcu<br>Science          | Ms. Marcu is first year teacher, Ms. Kasuboske assists with classroom mgt, and teaching the content                      | <p>The mentor and mentee meetings were conducted each month throughout the school year to work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pinnacle Gradebook</li> <li>• Schoolwide procedures vs. rules</li> <li>• Strategies for teaching bell to bell</li> <li>• Professional Growth Plans</li> <li>• Effective Teacher Discipline Techniques</li> <li>• Curriculum Mapping</li> <li>• Effective lesson planning</li> <li>• Content Area strategies, standards and benchmarks</li> </ul>  |
|  |                                | Ms. Mohorne  | <p>The mentor and mentee meetings were conducted each month throughout the school year to work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pinnacle Gradebook</li> <li>• Schoolwide procedures vs. rules</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| Kimberly Mohorne<br>Social Studies            | Woodrow<br>Shivers                      | is able to assist Mr. Shivers with certification.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies for teaching bell to bell</li> <li>• Professional Growth Plans</li> <li>• Effective Teacher Discipline Techniques</li> <li>• Curriculum Mapping</li> <li>• Effective lesson planning</li> <li>• Content Area strategies, standards and benchmarks.</li> </ul>   |
| Tracy Jiles<br>Language Arts                  | Ameerah Reed<br>Language Arts           | Ms. Reed is new teacher, Ms. Jiles assisted with Language Arts strategies and staff development in Writing.  | <p>The mentor and mentee meetings were conducted each month throughout the school year to work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pinnacle Gradebook</li> <li>• Schoolwide procedures vs. rules</li> <li>• Strategies for teaching bell to bell</li> <li>• Professional Growth Plans</li> <li>• Effective Teacher Discipline Techniques</li> <li>• Curriculum Mapping</li> <li>• Effective lesson planning</li> <li>• Content Area strategies, standards and benchmarks.</li> </ul> |
| Melissa Zavala<br>Reading Coach<br>Dept Chair | Tiffany Mckenna<br>Reading              | Ms. McKenna began teaching mid year. Ms. Zavala assisted with establishing rules and procedures for an existing class and embedding strategies in the content area, Reading. | <p>The mentor and mentee meetings were conducted each month throughout the school year to work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pinnacle Gradebook</li> <li>• Schoolwide procedures vs. rules</li> <li>• Strategies for teaching bell to bell</li> <li>• Professional Growth Plans</li> <li>• Effective Teacher Discipline Techniques</li> <li>• Curriculum Mapping</li> <li>• Effective lesson planning</li> <li>• Content Area strategies, standards and benchmarks.</li> </ul> |
| Charles Mulling<br>Magnet Elective Teacher    | Trenae Floyd<br>Magnet Elective Teacher | Ms. Floyd is new to teaching. Mr. Mulling was able to assist with rules and procedures, classroom mgt and certification issues.  | <p>The mentor and mentee meetings were conducted each month throughout the school year to work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pinnacle Gradebook</li> <li>• Schoolwide procedures vs. rules</li> <li>• Strategies for teaching bell to bell</li> <li>• Professional Growth Plans</li> <li>• Effective Teacher Discipline Techniques</li> <li>• Curriculum Mapping</li> <li>• Effective lesson planning</li> <li>• Content Area strategies, standards and benchmarks.</li> </ul> |

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Title I, Part A

- Attucks Middle School uses Title I funds to provide additional teachers to assist students, particularly low performing students, with additional academic support during the instructional day.
- -Title I funds are used to provide professional development for teachers of reading, mathematics and science to increase student achievement, motivate students and assist parents with helping their children at home.
- -Title I funds are used to increase parent involvement. Attucks Middle School uses Title I funds for parent training and to purchase refreshments for parent trainings and meetings. Parental activities are planned to assist parents in helping their children improve their academic performance.
- -Attucks Middle School uses funds to purchase materials and technology to support student academic achievement.
- -The district coordinates with Title I, Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

**Title I, Part C- Migrant**

N/A

**Title I, Part D**

N/A

**Title II**

Provide substitute cover for teacher training activities and professional development.

**Title III**

English Language Learners (ELL) are instructed in the subject area of reading five times per week by a certified ESOL instructor who also serves as a support facilitator for ELL in their other core classes.

**Title X- Homeless**

N/A

**Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)**

- SAI funds are used to provide additional tutoring before and after school and for additional instructional support during the school day and to provide the salary for the Behavior Specialist. The Behavior Specialist works directly with students in the areas of violence prevention, anti bullying and discipline.

**Violence Prevention Programs**

Attucks offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that includes field trips, community services, and counseling.

Attucks implements the student code of conduct and the discipline matrix as they relate to the welfare of all students. Attucks has a zero tolerance policy for bullying and assists the students in non-violence through programs such as GREAT with the Hollywood Police Department and SUPERB through NOVA University.

**Nutrition Programs**

The school sponsors a Health Expo annually. The school sponsors a Health Expo annually which gives the 6th grade students an opportunity to create multi-media presentations representing all areas of health, including: Food and nutrition, exercise, and healthy lifestyles. Attucks also offers a nutritional breakfast and lunch program in accordance with federal, state, and county guidelines.

**Housing Programs**

N/A

**Head Start**

N/A

**Adult Education**

N/A

**Career and Technical Education**

N/A

**Job Training**

N/A

**Other**

N/A

**Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)**

**School-based RtI Team**

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

Leadership Team is comprised of:  
Principal, Assistant Principals (6,7 8 grade), Magnet Coordinator, Guidance Director, ESE specialist, Department Chairs of Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, Language Arts, Media Specialist and Reading Coach

Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g. meeting processes and roles/functions).

The leadership team focuses on staff and student needs utilizing data to assess individual student needs. The previous years

FCAT Reading and Math scores, along with BAT 1 and BAT 2 data are analyzed to assist in the direction of instruction for all students. Monthly meetings are held by the leadership team to plan staff development activities pertinent to student need. Classroom walkthroughs are done daily to ensure that the teachers are utilizing the methods and information gained from trainings, both school and district based.

Describe the role of the school-based RTI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan

The leadership team meets with School Advisory Council and the Principal to assist in the development of the school improvement plan. Based on the SIP and SAC staff development needs are assessed and trainings are provided school based and district based, based on need by department and individual staff needs. To ensure implementation, department chairs, coaches, and administrators visit the classrooms to assist, model, mentor, and coach teachers.

### RtI Implementation

Describe the data management system used to summarize tiered data.

Baseline data FCAT 08-09  
Benchmark Assessment 1 & 2 08-09  
Mid Year-DAR, Fluency  
End of Year-FCAT  
Individual teacher/student data is analyzed for individual learning gains and strengths/weaknesses of individual students which allows students to be appropriately scheduled by the master scheduler.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

Professional Development is provided two-three times per week in the morning based on Reading Benchmarks and individual staff needs. The RTI team will evaluate additional professional development needs as standardized tests are taken and as individual student/staff needs become evident.

## School Wide Florida's Continuous Improvement Model

### Plan

#### Data Disaggregation 2008-2009 FCAT Data

What strengths and weaknesses were identified in the 2009 data by grade level, subject area, and clusters/strands?

Reading: Sixth grade student performance matched District and State performance in all clusters.

Seventh grade students performed below the district average in Words/Phrases with a proficiency of 57% as compared to the District and State average of 71%. Seventh grade students also fell below District and State average in the area of Main Idea/Authors Purpose with an average of 67% as compared to 71%.

Eighth grade students fell below the district average in three of the four clusters. Eighth graders averaged 58% in Main Idea/Authors Purpose as compared to the District and State average of 63%. Eighth graders also averaged 53% in the area of Comparisons as the District and State average was 60%. Students averaged 50% in the area of Reference and Research as compared to the District and State average of 75%.

Math: Sixth grade student performance was below the District average of 67% but matched the State average of 56% in the cluster of Number Sense. In the clusters of Measurement, Geometry, and Algebraic Thinking sixth graders matched the District and State average of 56%, 67%, and 63% respectively. Sixth graders averaged 56% in the cluster of Data Analysis as compared to the District and State average of 67%.

Seventh grade student performance matched the District and State averages in Number Sense and Geometry with an average of 56% and 50% respectively. Seventh graders fell below the District average of 67% in the cluster of Measurement as well as Algebraic Thinking but matched the State average of 56%. In the cluster of Data Analysis the seventh grade students matched the State with an average of 67% but fell below the district average of 78%.

Eighth grade student performance fell below the District and State averages of 67% in Number Sense and 50% in Measurement with averages of 58% and 42% respectively. In the cluster of Geometry, eighth graders fell below the district average of 58% but matched the State average of 50%. In the clusters of Algebraic Thinking and Data Analysis, eighth grade students fell below the District average of 58% and the state average of 50% with a school average of 42%.

Writing: Eighth grade student scores indicate that students increased by three percentage points with a combined score of 94% of students meeting high standards on the 2008 FCAT Writing to 97% of students meeting high standards on the 2009 FCAT Writing. In the area of Expository Writing, students fell below the District average of 95% but were above the State average of 90% with a score of 94% scoring a 3.5 or above. In the area of Persuasive Writing students fell below the District average of 94% but were above the State average of 89% with a score of 93% scoring a 3.5 or above. The writing scores do not reflect the percent of students at 3.0 and 4.0, as there were two readers in 2009, where there will only be one reader for

2010 and students will need to obtain a score of 4.0 for proficiency.

Science: Eighth grade student's total percent proficient on the 2009 Science FCAT had a decrease of 9% from the 2008 Science FCAT. Students scored below the State average of 41%. Students maintained a mean scale score of 7 in the content area of Physical/Chemical which was below the District average of 8 and maintained a mean scale score of 5 in the content area of Earth Space which was also below the District average of 6. Students decreased by 2 points in the Life Environment content area from a mean scale score of 8 to 6 points which was below the District average of 7. Students also decreased by 1 point in the content area of Scientific Thinking from 8 points to 7 points which was below the District average of 8.

### Instructional Calendar Development

What is the process for developing, implementing, and monitoring an Instructional Focus Calendar for reading, writing, mathematics, and science?

Using student data and the Sunshine State Standards, grade level specifications and annually assessed benchmarks, the Instructional Focus Calendar takes shape. Instruction is aligned to the curricular focus and assessments using question stems to ensure students are exposed to format. As students master material they are moved along the curriculum map. Attucks Middle School has created curriculum maps for the last four years. Each year, a team of teachers work fourth quarter and over the summer to tweak the maps, as they are a work in progress. As they work on their particular content in the summer, they will refer to the reading map and ensure they are embedding the reading strategies into their content as well as the 9 high yield strategies, thinking maps etc. This will support the middle school concept and interdisciplinary teaching and learning.

A reading team consisting of all members of the reading department work collaboratively during the fourth quarter and over the summer to tweak curriculum maps, as they must be redone each year to address needs of the students. All teachers will refer to the reading map and ensure they are embedding the reading strategies into their content as well as the 9 high yield strategies, thinking maps etc.

All teachers are required to follow the instructional focus outlined in the curriculum maps. During morning professional learning communities, time is designated for teachers to discuss the maps and share best practices. Additionally, during classroom walk-through visits, administrators carry a copy of the map with them to monitor whether teachers are following the instructional focus. Again, based on data received such as the BAT I and II, the maps may be refocused and adjustments made throughout the school year.

When analyzing the FCAT Reading, Math, Writing, Science data, and individual student BAT 1 and BAT 2 data the administrators, department heads, coaches and teachers assess and continuously reassess the individual needs of the students. Staff Development aligned to the Curriculum Maps in specific areas of student weaknesses is provided school based. Teachers across all content areas have access to all student data and are able to adjust their curriculum accordingly. All content area teachers embed reading into their core curriculum and utilize technology integration as an integral part of the classroom instruction. Technology is infused through the magnet programs as well, in that all sixth grade students are exposed to the individual magnet themes, learning how to utilize the technology offered at Attucks Middle School. Attucks dual magnet themes of CITE and CBA expose students to the digital world of the 21st century. In addition, teachers use color coded seating charts to identify areas of student weaknesses to assist in the remediation process. Students have the opportunity to attend before and after school remediation camps to strengthen their targeted areas of weakness on a particular benchmark. In these small classroom settings, teachers can focus on individual weaknesses of students, as provided by the data. In Science, laboratories are set up and students participate in weekly labs which includes a lab report as well as class participation. The lab reports assist in the writing process and force students to use their writing skills across the content areas.

Which instructional Benchmarks will be given priority focus, based on need, for each content area (reading, writing, mathematics, and science)?

Those students not mastering content/benchmarks are provided with interventions. In particular, all teachers embed reading strategies in their content and students get extended learning of the reading benchmarks through their content area teachers. Data shows students require additional practice with Words/Phrases and Reference/Research Benchmarks across all grade levels.

What is the process to ensure instruction is based on individual students' needs, as opposed to the master schedule?

Periodic data conferences are held with teachers along with their department heads to reflect on gaps in student learning and how the current instructional focus addresses the needs of students in whole, individually and as within subgroups. As data paints a picture of student progress, the SIP are revisited to ensure we are on track to meeting students achievement goals

Teachers are able to monitor student growth based on the answers to the day's essential question. The information obtained via these daily assessments is used to drive instruction in order to ensure concept mastery is focused on with fidelity.

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

Attucks Middle School is total school magnet for Communications/Broadcast Arts and Instructional Technology. All students have full access to our magnet programs through the specialized electives but especially through the core content. As a result, teachers and students utilize technology naturally in the classroom as a teaching and learning tool.

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?

All 6th grade students are placed on the elective wheel, giving them the opportunity to experience all magnet classes, including: TV Production, Desktop Publishing, and Graphic/Web Design. During fourth quarter, all 6th graders are enrolled in a Health through Technology Program. Using the reading, writing and technology skills learned in previous quarters, students create health projects using the technology medium of their choice. In 7th and 8th grades, students choose their full year, specialized elective strand.

## DO

### Direct the Instructional Focus

How are lesson plans and instructional delivery aligned across grade levels and subject areas?

All members of the leadership team, including the department chairs, have attended a formal training on curriculum mapping. The sessions provided the leadership team an opportunity to develop essential questions and align curriculum according to the Reading Instructional Focus. Departments then meet throughout the summer to review the Instructional Focus calendar to review and make necessary changes to each grade level calendar. Throughout the school year, teachers meet as a department twice a month to monitor the instructional focus calendar and utilize the mini-BATS and teacher-made assessments to determine if further enrichment is necessary. The Standards & Benchmark PLC at the onset of the month will introduce the faculty to the reading focus for the month and provide the practice opportunities during daily staff development. Teachers will then meet as a department the following week to develop activities that embed the monthly instructional focus. Teachers then meet by department and grade level to monitor implementation and determine if revisions should be made. In addition, teachers meet as a team to develop integrated, cross-curricular activities that provide exposure of reading strategies in the various subject areas.

How are instructional focus lessons developed and delivered?

Instructional focus lessons are developed based on the SBBC curriculum maps and then tailored to meet the needs of Attucks students. Each department meets five times a month to develop lessons that embed the monthly Reading Instructional Focus. Teachers utilize textbook ancillary resources, internet activities offered through BEEP, computer-based programs such as Compass Odyssey, Renzulli Learning, Podcasting, Inspiration, iMovie, Garage Band, and Microsoft Office whereby students develop spreadsheets, visual presentations, word processing documents, and graphic design documents.

Lesson development occurs school wide as teachers meet five times a month to disaggregate student data and collaborate to create and plan lessons that incorporate the monthly instructional focus.

Practice opportunities will be provided to teachers during the Professional Learning Communities, referred to as Learning Community by Department. In addition, teachers have the opportunity to share how they are able to integrate specific strategies within their specific content. The teachers will then meet to discuss the effectiveness of a specific lesson or strategy and determine where improvements can be made to create a more effective lesson.

How will instructional focus lessons be revised and monitored?

Instructional focus lessons will be revised on a student-need basis. Teachers will utilize mini-BAT data, BAT-I, Bat-II data, teacher-made assessments, portfolio development, short and extended responses, and writing prompts to determine the strengths and weaknesses of individual students. During the monthly Follow-up PLC, the teachers will share their data and student examples prompting further discussion of challenges that should be addressed and corrected during the weeks ahead. CWT's by administrators, coaches, and department chairs in addition to student mini-assessments will provide the leadership team an opportunity to determine if mastery has occurred.

Probing questions from teachers and the leadership team members to students during class, evaluation of short and extended student responses by the leadership team, and periodic data conferences with teachers helps to fuel further conversation regarding student achievement.

## CHECK

### Assessment

Describe the types of ongoing formative assessments to be used during the school year to measure student progress in core, supplemental, and intensive instruction/intervention.

The assessments utilized include:

- FCAT Reading (annually)
- FCAT Math (annually)
- Florida Writes (annually)
- FCAT Science (annually)
- BAT I (annually)
- BAT II (annually)
- Mini-BATS (Reading, Math, & Science only/monthly)
- Writing prompts (monthly)
- Fluency (three times a year)
- San Diego (pre/post)
- SRI (pre/post)
- TLA (annually)

The number of questions for each benchmark varies based on the type of assessment. On average, the Mini-BAT exams contain 3-7 multiple choice questions per benchmark; BAT I & II, and the SSS FCAT contain 5-12 multiple choice/gridded/short & extended response questions per benchmark depending on the subject area and grade level.

How are assessments used to identify students reaching mastery and those not reaching mastery?

Teachers are required to attend data conferences with their administrators whereby they identify the levels of their students from FCAT Data and identify the percentage of students earning learning gains. Teachers are then required to complete a questionnaire which asks them to disaggregate their class data, determine predicted proficiency, and compare their levels to the district, state, and school averages. Teachers are then asked to reflect in essay format their ideas on enrichment and rigor for their students in their own classrooms. Teachers discuss their findings, ideas, and needs with their administrator (both grade level and subject area) three times throughout the school year (beginning of school year, after BAT I results, and following BAT II results).

In the beginning of the school year, FCAT data and previous BAT 1 and 2 data is analyzed by administrator/teacher/student to assess individual student needs. The data is broken down by cluster to see where students in a particular grade level need remediation and further broken down by individual student. Teachers are then able to focus on individual student needs based on their data from the prior school year. The Reading Coach is then able to further assist all content areas with these clusters. After the BAT 1 data becomes available, administrators, teachers, and students are then able to reassess individual student progress and continue the process of teaching, assessment, and re-teaching as necessary.

#### Maintenance

How is ongoing assessment and maintenance of Benchmark mastery for each grade level and content area built into the Instructional Focus Calendar?

As teachers meet at least five times per month, the Instructional Focus Calendar remains at the forefront of discussion. Teachers collaborate not only as a department, but also as grade level teachers and individual teams to ensure that gaps that may exist between subject areas are filled. In order to maintain successful differentiation, teachers discuss within their teams the specific needs of certain groups of students (i.e. ESE, gifted, high achievers, bubble students, etc.) Instructional lessons may include project-based learning, brain-based learning, activities that target the Multiple Intelligences and support Webb's Depth of Knowledge.

Describe the process and schedule for teams to review progress monitoring data (summative and mini assessments) to identify the required instructional modifications that are needed to increase student achievement.

Teachers will meet at least five times per month to discuss both formative and summative data. Our Professional Learning Communities are designed to address concerns and challenges that arise during data conferences. During Curriculum Council PLC and Train the Trainer PLC, the leadership team confers and examines the progress and process of the Instructional Focus Calendar and the Professional Learning Communities. If the Leadership Team determines that the planned monthly focus should be readdressed, then the Reading Coach and Department Chairs will encourage and promote further discussion within their respective departments. The teachers will then go back to their respective teams and discuss the necessary changes that must take place in lesson development to ensure the benchmarks are being mastered by the students.

All Professional Learning Communities at Attucks Middle School are facilitated by the teachers themselves. The Professional Learning Community environment is spearheaded by the Leadership Team, but is promoted by the teachers. The administrative team encourages professional development in regards to the specific needs of individual teachers (i.e. conversations regarding classroom management, lesson development, and instructional strategies), while simultaneously encouraging whole group learning through professional readings, off-site trainings, and summer staff development.

#### Monitoring

Describe the Principal's and Leadership Team's roles as instructional leaders and how they will be continuously involved in the

teaching and learning process.

The Principal along with the Administrative and Leadership team attended TeachFirst which provided them the necessary tools to effectively promote a PLC culture within the school environment. Once established, the Leadership Team prompts the development of an Instructional Focus Calendar that addresses the weaknesses of our students and gaps in achievement. The PLCs provide the teachers successful strategies and tools that can effectively meet the needs of students. The Standards & Benchmark PLC at the beginning of the month provides an opportunity for the department chairs to introduce the monthly instructional focus and offer techniques that the teachers can utilize within their specific content area and grade level. At PLCs throughout the month, teachers reflect on the best practices and determine the ones they deemed most effective within their classrooms. Department Chairs then share their findings with the Leadership Team at the Train the Trainer PLC and Curriculum Council PLC to determine if further teacher training is necessary.

## ACT

### Supplemental and Intensive Instruction/Interventions

Identify the core, supplemental, and intensive instruction and interventions.

Students are provided a six-period class day with a core curriculum that includes Math, Science, Social Studies, Language Arts, Reading, & Electives. Students that maintain a Level 5 are provided the opportunity to opt for a dual elective or supplemental class in place of a Reading course.

Students that score below Level 3 and have specific ESE classifications, including, but not limited to: SLD, EBD, OHI, test scores, and required services based on IEP are scheduled in a small-group Math and/or Reading class with their respective ESE teacher. Other Level 1 and Level 2 ESE students not in the small-group classes, that are in the inclusion courses are provided additional academic support with their ESE facilitators during an alternative class period. Individual plans are created for each inclusion student based on academic achievement and disability. ESE facilitators assist the classroom teacher and pull out students based on the necessary interventions/accommodations. Teachers utilize color-coded seating charts to identify students who have gaps in specific benchmarks. Color-coding affords the teachers the ability to have specific student information at a glance. Student data is re-evaluated after each BAT test and again after FCAT testing, whereas the process begins again.

All teachers meet with their Assistant Principals bi-annually following BAT Testing to identify those students who are considered bubble students (Level 3 students in danger of falling to Level 2 status and Level 2 students who are on the cusp of Level 3 status). Teachers and Assistant Principals discuss specific interventions that can assist these students. Interventions include, but are not limited to, enrichment activities, project-based learning activities that reinforce graphic organizers, student placement in the classroom, and heterogeneous cooperative learning activities. Parents are contacted by phone personally to invite students to attend extended learning opportunities such as Peer Tutoring, afterschool FCAT Camp, and Saturday School. In addition, parents are invited to attend a conference with their child's teachers to determine an action plan at home to facilitate student individual success.

How are supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions and tutorials structured to re-teach non-mastered target areas?

To re-teach non-mastered target areas, students will be provided with problem-based learning scenarios, project and brain-based learning opportunities, and cooperative laboratory/hands-on activities in both Science and Social Studies classes. In addition, discovery learning resources such as Springboard, Brain Pop, Compass Odyssey, Renzulli Learning, EasyTech, and Vernier Probeware will be provided to all grade levels.

Resources from textbook adoptions include enrichment activities that reinforce reading strategies, incorporate graphic organizers, and encourage the use of manipulatives to ensure comprehension and application of learning.

How does the school identify staff's professional development needs to improve their instructional strategies?

Administrators, coaches, and department chairs complete CWTs, initiate discussions with all teachers through bi-annual data chats, as well as teacher data chats with specific students. The curriculum council meets throughout the summer months to disaggregate the data and ensure that the monthly staff development calendar addresses whole-school weaknesses.

As the month progresses and mini-BAT data is disaggregated, the Curriculum Council meets to determine if the previous month's Standard & Benchmark strategy was addressed throughout the various content areas. The Curriculum Council records successes that were witnessed in the many classrooms visited and what weaknesses exist. Teachers are encouraged to reflect on the strategy and share out at the final PLC of the month. Teachers bring samples from classwork, projects, and writing samples to share with the faculty and everyone is able to see the different methods utilized to implement the strategy throughout the various content areas and grade levels. Individual teacher needs are met where district training is provided and encouraged. Teachers and administrators together determine what training would be most effective for the individual teacher. Staff Development on the school-based and district-based levels is encouraged as teaching is a continuous learning process for all.

Which students will be targeted for supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions?

As a result of progress monitoring (class work assignments and assessment results) and observations (classroom teacher, instructional coach, administrators, counselors, etc.) students who consistently demonstrate academic difficulty will receive supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions. All students will be targeted in the appropriate program as identified through test scores. Level 4 and Level 5 students will be targeted through enrichment programs in their individual classes. Level 2 and Level 3 bubble students will be given remediation through the regular classroom programs, as well as before and after school extended learning opportunities. These same students will be targeted with enrichment activities of targeted benchmarks. AYP subgroups are identified as to bubble students in the various subgroups to ensure all students are being targeted for remediation and enrichment activities.

Teachers will also meet weekly during their planning to determine specific students who are struggling. The parents of these individuals will be contacted by phone and invited to school to discuss their progress and areas of improvement.

Students are provided an Individual Academic Plan and are made aware of the plan. Students meet with their teachers to discuss their specific goals and decide how best to accomplish these goals. Parents are also encouraged to consider FCAT Camp, Peer Tutoring, as well as supplemental Education Services.

How will the effectiveness of the interventions be measured throughout the year?

The effectiveness of these interventions will be measured through improvement of overall assessments and classroom performance. Classroom Walk Throughs (CWT) are conducted daily by administrators, department heads, and coaches to ensure the teachers are following curriculum maps and individualizing instruction for all students. Feedback is provided to teachers. Administrators assess teachers twice a year using the FPMS instrument and provide feedback as to performance. Assistance is provided by the department heads, coaches, and administrators to teachers in need as based on these instruments. Student work is assessed by teachers and the Language Arts administrator reads monthly writing prompts at all grade levels to provide the necessary feedback to students and Language Arts teachers. BAT 1, BAT 2, and Mini Assessments are utilized to effectively evaluate student progress at all levels and the cycle of teaching, assessing, and re-teaching can continue.

**Enrichment**

Describe alternative instructional delivery methods to support acceleration and enrichment activities.

Those individual students that exceed mastery levels, i.e. Level 4 or 5, may opt of the Reading course and take an additional elective. While this option is not always encouraged by the teacher or guidance counselor, the parent may request this plan.

In addition, students in the gifted/high-achievers category are provided with brain-based learning strategies as well as cooperative learning opportunities that foster creative and critical thinking skills. In addition, all students are afforded the opportunity for off-campus learning activities that reinforce the Sunshine State Standards.

Describe how students are identified for enrichment strategies.

FCAT results, in addition to student progress in a specific course, as well as assessment results that demonstrate consistent proficiency/mastery are used to determine placement in higher level courses and academic programs. Teacher recommendation is also taken into consideration. Parent conferences are held with the recommending teacher, instructional coach, guidance counselor, and a member of the leadership or administrative team. The parents are counseled on the expectations for the student in the higher level course, as well as their continued parental involvement.

**Professional Learning Communities**

| PLC Organization (grade level, subject, etc.)           | PLC Leader   | Frequency of PLC Meetings | Schedule (when)                        | Primary Focus of PLC (include Lesson Study and Data Analysis)  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| Standards and Benchmark Professional Learning Community | Reading Coach<br>Melissa Zavala,<br>Dept Reading<br>Dept Leader                | First week of the month   | First week of the month<br>(7:45-8:25) | Members identify the monthly instructional focus & participate in activities to reinforce skills teachers can use in everyday instruction to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vocabulary</li> <li>• Main Idea</li> <li>• Compare and Contrast</li> <li>• Cause and Effect</li> <li>• Short and Extended Response</li> <li>• Research and Reference</li> </ul> |
| Professional  | Department Leaders<br><br>Math: Sandra Bouknight<br>S. Studies: Danielle Rosen |                           | Second week of the                     | Members discuss and learn content  |

|   |   |         |   |   |
|---|---|---------|---|---|
| Learning Community by Department                                  | Science: Nicole Kasuboske<br>Reading: Melissa Zavala<br>Language Arts: Gia Roberts<br>Electives: Karen Blount   | Monthly | month (7:45-8:25)                       | specific practices, skills, and strategies to utilize in the classroom & sustain continuous improvement   |
| Professional Learning Community by Dept./Grade                    | Department Leaders<br><br>Math: Sandra Bouknight<br>S. Studies: Danielle Rosen<br>Science: Nicole Kasuboske<br>Reading: Melissa Zavala<br>Language Arts: Gia Roberts<br>Electives: Karen Blount | Monthly | Second week of the month (7:45-8:25)    | During the second dept. meeting, teachers are divided by department & grade level. Members discuss the monthly instructional focus and refine the strategy. Members continue applying the skill or strategy in the classroom  |
| Professional Learning Community by Team                           | Team Leader   | Monthly | Third week of the month (7:45-8:25)     | Members within the same team identify instructional practices and analyze student work to support student academic success  |
| Faculty Learning Community Professional Reading                   | Administrators<br>Ms. Shaw, Ms. Burch, Ms. Tait, Mr. Cazas  | Monthly | Fourth week of the month (7:45-8:25 am) | Provides resources to support adult learning and collaboration. Deepening educators' content knowledge and providing research-based instructional strategies.   |
| Standards and Benchmark Professional Learning Community Follow-up | Reading Dept Leader<br>Melissa Zavala   | Monthly | Fourth week of the month (7:45-8:25 am) | Members discuss how the strategy is working, Teachers share student work products & review monthly instructional focus.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vocabulary</li> <li>• Main Idea</li> <li>• Compare and Contrast</li> <li>• Cause and Effect</li> <li>• Short and Extended Response</li> <li>• Research and Reference</li> </ul> |

### NCLB Public School Choice

Note: For Title I schools only

- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status  
**No Attached Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status**
- Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification  
**No Attached Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification**
- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status  
**Show Attached Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

### Pre-School Transition

n/a

### Postsecondary Transition

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

n/a

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goal

**Needs Assessment:** Based on School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:

Did the total percent proficient increase or decrease? What is the percent change?

What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed decrease in proficiency?

Did all student subgroups meet AYP targets? If not, which subgroups did not meet the targets?

Did 50% or more of the lowest 25% make learning gains? What is the percent of the lowest 25% of students making learning gains?

Did 50% or more of the total number tested make learning gains? What is the percent of students making learning gains?

| Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement  |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Based on the 2009 FCAT data, 63% of students achieved mastery. Level 3 and above in Reading.</p> <p>Grade 6<br/>           Numbers of students tested: 279<br/>           Mean Scale Score – 307<br/>           Words/Phrases – 5<br/>           Main Idea/Purpose – 14<br/>           Comparisons – 7<br/>           Reference/Research – 4</p> <p>Grade 7<br/>           Numbers of students tested: 220<br/>           Mean Scale Score – 310<br/>           Words/Phrases – 4<br/>           Main Idea/Purpose – 14<br/>           Comparisons – 7<br/>           Reference/Research – 4</p> <p>Grade 8<br/>           Numbers of students tested: 278<br/>           Mean Scale Score – 301<br/>           Words/Phrases – 5<br/>           Main Idea/Purpose – 14<br/>           Comparisons – 8<br/>           Reference/Research – 2</p> <p>Based on FCAT Reading data, sixth grade student performance matched District and State performance in all clusters.</p> <p>Seventh grade students performed below the district average in Words/Phrases with a proficiency of 57% as compared to the District and State average of 71%. Seventh grade students also fell below District and State average in the area of Main Idea/Authors Purpose with an average of 67% as compared to 71%.</p> <p>Eighth grade students fell below the district average in three of the four clusters. Eighth graders averaged 58% in Main Idea/Authors Purpose as compared to the District and State average of 63%. Eighth graders also averaged 53% in the area of Comparisons as the District and State average was 60%. Students averaged 50% in the area of Reference and Research as compared to the District and State average of 75%.</p> |   | <p>In grades 6-8 , 66% of the students will achieve mastery for reading on the 2010 FCAT Reading Test</p> |  |  |
|  | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step   | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1  | 1.Continue to use BAT 1, BAT 2, and Mini-Assessments to monitor student progress. Pre and Post San Diego tests as | All action steps will be monitored by the Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach               | 1.Review BAT 1, BAT 2, and Mini- Assessment data to ensure teachers are assessing students.<br>2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during | 1. Printout assessments for all students.<br>2. Administration will be aware of the IFC's upcoming focus and |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>well as pre, post, and midyear fluency tests are given to students to assess progress. All Level 1 students who are on a forth grade level or below are given the DAR test twice a year as a pre and post test to assess progress. All Level 1 and Level 2 students with a Fluency level of 120 or below will be placed in a 90 minute reading block.</p> <p>2. Include higher order questions in lesson plans.</p> <p>3. Develop an Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading and all Content Areas</p> |  | <p>classroom walkthroughs</p> <p>3. Administration will be aware of the IFC's upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs</p> | <p>monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs</p> <p>3. Effectiveness will be determined through BAT 1, BAT 2, and mini-assessment data as well as end of the year FCAT Reading data.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| <b>Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement</b>   |  | <b>Objective Linked to Area of Improvement</b>  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>In grades 6-8, 67% of students achieved learning gains on the 2009 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.</p> |  | <p>In grades 6-8, 70% of students will achieve learning gains on the 2010 on the FCAT Rdg Test.</p>   |   |   |
|  | <b>Action Step</b>   | <b>Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step</b>  | <b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step</b>   | <b>Evaluation Tool</b>  |
| 1  | <p>1. Student Achievement Chats will be conducted with all students following assessments.</p> <p>2. Content Area teachers will explicitly infuse the reading benchmarks in lesson plans and instructional delivery</p> <p>3. Use K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan to place students in appropriate reading courses in the master schedule.</p> <p>4. Utilize the DIAP to align student needs to appropriate reading programs and strategies to fill gaps.</p> <p>5. Teachers will participate in various PLC meetings to learn BEEP, RTI model, reading strategies such as 9 High Yield strategies, Think Alouds, Thinking Maps/graphic organizers, etc.</p> <p>6. Teachers will integrate Technology as a tool to enhance student learning, i.e. the Internet, multimedia projects, FCAT Explorer, etc.</p> | <p>1. Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach</p> <p>2. Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach</p> <p>3. Reading Coach and AP in charge of Master Schedule.</p> <p>4. Reading Coach and RTI team</p> <p>5. Reading Coach, Leadership team, Classroom teachers</p> <p>6. Instructional Technology Coach, Reading Coach, Leadership team, classroom teachers</p> | <p>1. Administrators will review log for Student Achievement Chats</p> <p>2. When visiting content area classrooms, administrators will focus their attention to the frequency of explicitly teaching to the reading benchmarks</p> <p>3. Teachers will use criteria to ensure students will report</p> <p>4. Assistant Principals and Dept Leaders will use CWT instruments. Additionally, discussions in weekly PLC's will allow teachers and administrators to monitor strategies and programs.</p> <p>5. CWT feedback, Leadership Team meetings, student work samples, BEEP and BAT results.</p> <p>6. Student work samples and CWT</p> | <p>1. Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if data chats are successful</p> <p>2. Assessments will be disaggregated by content area teachers to determine the effectiveness of reading benchmark instruction in the classroom</p> <p>3. Master Schedule, CWT and PLC</p> <p>4. Student work, CWT and PLC</p> <p>5. student work samples BEEP and BAT results.</p> <p>6. Student work samples</p> |

| Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement                        |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Based on the 2009 FCAT Reading data, 53% of Black Students scored at or above Level 3. |  | Increase the percent of Blacks scoring at or above a Level 3 from 53% to 66% on the 2010 FCAT Reading                |  |   |
|  | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step   | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1  | <p>1. Determine core instructional needs by reviewing all assessment data for Blacks. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within 90-minute reading block.</p> <p>2. Plan supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of F data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p> <p>3. Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be evidence-based, matched to students needs and provided in addition to core</p> | <p>1. Reading Coach and Dept Chair</p> <p>2. Reading Coach and Dept Chair</p> <p>3. Reading Coach and Dept Chair</p> | <p>Student progress is assessed using all assessments. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated</p> <p>2. Student progress is assessed using all assessments Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p> <p>3. Student progress is assessed using all assessments and/or DIBELS data biweekly for all students receiving targeted intervention</p> | <p>1. Data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2, then FCAT</p> <p>2. Data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark towards Benchmark 2, then FCAT</p> <p>3. DIBELS data when appropriate will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2, then FCAT</p> |

**Professional Development Aligned with Objective:**

| Objective Addressed   | Content/Topic  | Facilitator                         | Target Date       | Strategy for Follow-up/ Monitoring | Person Responsible for Monitoring                      |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| In grades 6-8 , 68% of the students will achieve mastery for reading on the 2010 FCAT Reading Test. | Effective Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar | Reading Coach<br>Reading Dept Chair | Aug 2009- Ongoing | Lesson Plans<br>Classroom Visits   | Asst. Principal<br>Reading Coach<br>Reading Dept Chair |

**For Schools with Grades 6-12, Describe the Plan to Ensure the Responsibility of Teaching Reading for Every Teacher**

The Reading Coach will conduct a PLC on a bi-weekly basis to build the knowledge base of all teachers, as well as conduct classroom walk-throughs. Instructional Focus Calendars will also be used in Social Studies and aligned with the reading instructional focus. Grade level reading teachers have chosen core novels that will be tied-in to Social Studies curriculum.

**Budget:**

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                         |                          |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Description of Resources              | Funding Source          | Available Amount         |
| FCAT Camps                            | FTE/Title I/Acct Funds  | \$5,000.00               |
|                                       |                         | <b>Total: \$5,000.00</b> |
| Technology                            |                         |                          |
| Description of Resources              | Funding Source          | Available Amount         |
| Promethean Boards/Digital Classroom   | FTE/Title I/Acct Funds  | \$2,000.00               |
| Software for Digital Classroom        | FTE/Title I/ Acct Funds | \$2,000.00               |
|                                       |                         | <b>Total: \$4,000.00</b> |
| Professional Development              |                         |                          |
| Description of Resources              | Funding Source          | Available Amount         |
| Curriculum Mapping                    | FTE/Title I/Acct Funds  | \$2,000.00               |
|                                       |                         | <b>Total: \$2,000.00</b> |
| Other                                 |                         |                          |
| Description of Resources              | Funding Source          | Available Amount         |
| No Data                               | No Data                 | \$0.00                   |
|                                       |                         | <b>Total: \$0.00</b>     |
| <b>Final Total: \$11,000.00</b>       |                         |                          |

*End of Reading Goal*

## Mathematics Goal

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Needs Assessment:</b> | <p>Based on School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:</p> <p>Did the total percent proficient increase or decrease? What is the percent change?</p> <p>What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed decrease in proficiency?</p> <p>Did all student subgroups meet AYP targets? If not, which subgroups did not meet the targets?</p> <p>Did 50% or more of the lowest 25% make learning gains? What is the percent of the lowest 25% of students making learning gains?</p> <p>Did 50% or more of the total number tested make learning gains? What is the percent of students making learning gains?</p> |
|--------------------------|---|

| Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |
|---|---|
| <p>Based on 2009 FCAT data, 61% of Students achieved mastery, Level 3 or above in Mathematics.</p> <p>The total percent proficient increased 3%</p> <p>The grade level that showed a decrease in proficiency was 8th grade. 8th grade decreased in proficiency by 7%.</p> <p>&gt; Our black and white subgroups did not meet the targets. 35% of the White students were not proficient and 48% of the black students were not proficient.</p> <p>&gt; 61% of the lowest 25% made learning gains.</p> <p>&gt;48% of the economically disadvantage did not make adequate yearly progress. which is a 3% improvement from previous year.</p> <p>&gt;Hispanic students made the target for AYP( 68%).</p> <p>&gt; 70% of the total number of students tested is making learning gains.</p> <p>6th Grade<br/>           Number of students being tested: 279<br/>           Number Sense – 5<br/>           Measurement – 5<br/>           Geometry – 6<br/>           Algebraic Thinking – 5<br/>           Data Analysis – 5</p> <p>7th Grade<br/>           Number of students being tested: 222</p> | <p>In grades 6-8, 68% of students will achieve mastery on the 2010 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.</p> |

Number Sense – 5  
 Measurement – 5  
 Geometry – 4  
 Algebraic Thinking – 5  
 Data Analysis – 6

8th Grade  
 Number of students being tested: 277  
 Number Sense – 7  
 Measurement – 5  
 Geometry – 6  
 Algebraic Thinking – 5  
 Data Analysis – 5

Sixth grade student performance was below the District average of 67% but matched the State average of 56% in the cluster of Number Sense. In the clusters of Measurement, Geometry, and Algebraic Thinking sixth graders matched the District and State average of 56%, 67%, and 63% respectively. Sixth graders averaged 56% in the cluster of Data Analysis as compared to the District and State average of 67%.

Seventh grade student performance matched the District and State averages in Number Sense and Geometry with an average of 56% and 50% respectively. Seventh graders fell below the District average of 67% in the cluster of Measurement as well as Algebraic Thinking but matched the State average of 56%. In the cluster of Data Analysis the seventh grade students matched the State with an average of 67% but fell below the district average of 78%.

Eighth grade student performance fell below the District and State averages of 67% in Number Sense and 50% in Measurement with averages of 58% and 42% respectively. In the cluster of Geometry, eighth graders fell below the district average of 58% but matched the State average of 50%. In the clusters of Algebraic Thinking and Data Analysis, eighth grade students fell below the District average of 58% and the state average of 50% with a school average of 42%.

|   | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step   | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | <p>1. Increase the use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematics concepts.</p> <p>2. Identify and closely monitor the progress of the lowest 25 percentile consistently; revise instruction and intervention groups as indicated by student progress.</p> <p>3. Through team PLC's teachers will cohesively work on common activities, lesson plans and quizzes through the use of the district IFC's . Best teaching practices will be shared so that all the students in that grade level will benefit.</p> | <p>1. Principal, Assistant Principal Mathematics Department Leader</p> <p>2. Principal, Assistant Principal Mathematics Department Leader</p> <p>3. Assistant Principal Mathematics Department Leader</p> | <p>1. Math Department Chair will assist teachers in the creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented through classroom walkthroughs and IPAS evaluation</p> <p>2. Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized; CWT</p> <p>3. Share best teaching practices; CWT and student work</p> | <p>1. Progress of students on assessments.</p> <p>2. Increased achievement between assessments</p> <p>3. Increased achievement and student progress</p> |

| Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement                       | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |
|---|--|
| In grades 6-8 70% of the students achieved learning gains on the 2009 FCAT Math test. | In grades 6-8 73% of the students will make learning gains on the 2010 Mathematics FCAT. |

|   | <b>Action Step</b>  | <b>Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step</b>  | <b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step</b>  | <b>Evaluation Tool</b>   |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | <p>1. Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students within bottom quartile. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions</p> <p>2. Plan supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction. Plan targeted intervention for students. RtI Team Grade-level teams will review results of Mini BAT assessment data bi-weekly to</p> <p>3. Assessments tied to Next Generation Math Standards responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.</p> <p>4. Use technology based activities such as United Streaming, Geogebra, Riverdeep, Distance learning, Tabula Digita and on-line textbook</p> | <p>1. Principal, Assistant Principal and Mathematics Department Leader</p> <p>2. Principal, Assistant Principal and Mathematics Department Leader</p> <p>2. Principal, Assistant Principal and Mathematics Department Leader</p> <p>2. Principal, Assistant Principal and Mathematics Department Leader; Instructional Technology Coach</p> | <p>1. Grade-level teams will review results of all assessment data every six weeks to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment).</p> <p>2. Grade-level teams will review results of all Mini BAT assessment data every four weeks to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment).</p> <p>3. Grade-level teams will review results of Mini BAT assessment data bi-weekly to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment).</p> <p>4. CWT, student projects</p> | <p>1. Mini BAT Assessments tied to Next Generation Math Standards administered weekly</p> <p>2. Mini BAT Assessments tied to Next Generation Math Standards administered weekly</p> <p>3. Mini BAT Assessments tied to Next Generation Math Standards administered weekly</p> <p>4. Student projects and presentations</p> |

**Professional Development Aligned with Objective:**

| <b>Objective Addressed</b>  | <b>Content/Topic</b>   | <b>Facilitator</b>    | <b>Target Date</b> | <b>Strategy for Follow-up/ Monitoring</b> | <b>Person Responsible for Monitoring</b> |
|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| In grade 6-8, 68% of students will achieve mastery on the 2010 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test. | Effective Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar | Math department chair | August 2009        | Modeling of Lessons Classroom Visits      | Principal, Mathematics Department Leader |

|  |  |                       |                |   |  |
|--|--|-----------------------|----------------|---|--|
| In grades 6-8 73% of the students will make learning gains on the 2010 Mathematics FCAT. | Effective Use of Manipulatives and Hands-On Activities | Math Department chair | September 2009 | Observation of center use and documentation in lesson plans | Principal, Mathematics department chair. |
|--|--|-----------------------|----------------|---|--|

**Budget:**

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)  |                             |                                |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source              | Available Amount               |
| Manipulatives and Various Math supplies (ie calculators)                       | Title I                     | \$5,000.00                     |
|  |                             | <b>Total: \$5,000.00</b>       |
| Technology   |                             |                                |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source              | Available Amount               |
| Software Upgrades  | FTE/Title II/Accountability | \$1,000.00                     |
|  |                             | <b>Total: \$1,000.00</b>       |
| Professional Development   |                             |                                |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source              | Available Amount               |
| Substitute teachers to provide temporary Coverage for Professional Development | Title II                    | \$2,000.00                     |
|  |                             | <b>Total: \$2,000.00</b>       |
| Other  |                             |                                |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source              | Available Amount               |
| No Data  | No Data                     | \$0.00                         |
|  |                             | <b>Total: \$0.00</b>           |
|  |                             | <b>Final Total: \$8,000.00</b> |

End of **Mathematics** Goal

**Science Goal**

**Needs Assessment:**

Based on School Grade Data:

Did the total percent proficient increase or was the percent proficient maintained?

What clusters/strands showed decrease in proficiency?

| Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |
|---|---|
| <p>Based on 2009 FCAT Science data, 28% of 8th grade students achieved level three and above.</p> <p>Needs Assessment: FCAT Science Assessment - 28% of students achieved a level 3 or above in the science FCAT.</p> <p>Number of students tested: 277<br/> Mean scale score - 286<br/> Physical/Chemical - 7<br/> Earth/Space - 5<br/> Life Environment - 6<br/> Scientific Thinking - 7</p> <p>Based on School Grade Data:<br/> The total percent of students proficient decreased by 9%.<br/> Life Environment decreased by 2 points and Scientific Thinking decreased by 1 point.</p> <p>Eighth grade student's total percent proficient on the 2009 Science FCAT had a decrease of 9% from the 2008 Science FCAT. Students scored below the State average of 41%. Students maintained a mean scale score of 7 in the content area of Physical/Chemical which was below the District average of 8 and maintained a mean scale score of 5 in the content area</p> | <p>Given instruction based on the Sunshine State Standards, 43% of 8th grade students will score at level three or above on the 2010 FCAT Science Assessment.</p> |

of Earth Space which was also below the District average of 6. Students decreased by 2 points in the Life Environment content area from a mean scale score of 8 to 6 points which was below the District average of 7. Students also decreased by 1 point in the content area of Scientific Thinking from 8 points to 7 points which was below the District average of 8.

|   | <b>Action Step</b>   | <b>Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step</b>   | <b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step</b>  | <b>Evaluation Tool</b>  |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | <p>1. Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments that adheres to the school-wide lab report template and accompanying rubric at least once per week using the 5E model and cooperative learning opportunities. Activities and experiments will be garnered from BEEP lesson plans and district-adopted textbook resources as outlined on the county-based Instructional Focus Calendars.</p> <p>2. . Provide real-world science experiences and engaging project-based learning opportunities that integrates technology in the science lab classroom, specifically Vernier Probeware</p> <p>3. Provide daily FCAT Daily warm-ups and/or Problem of the Day that correlate to the Sunshine State Standards. Warm-ups can be located on BEEP and in the county-adopted textbook resources that correlate to the district-based Instructional Focus Calendar.</p> <p>4. Provide weekly short and/or extended response questions that correlate to the Sunshine State Standards addressed in the weekly lessons. Practice questions can be located on BEEP and in the county-adopted textbook resources that correlate to the district-based Instructional Focus Calendar.</p> <p>5. Provide field trip activities, speakers/experts in their fields of study, and virtual learning opportunities that address the components of the Sunshine State Standards correlating to specific grade levels.</p> <p>6. Provide afterschool and Saturday Extended Learning Opportunities for 8th grade students that score Level 1 or 2 in Reading &amp; Math. ENI activities, BEEP lessons, and activities from the county-adopted textbook resources that correlate to the district-based Instructional Focus Calendar will be utilized to engage learners in the extended learning opportunities.</p> <p>7. Provide all students with Summer and Winter Break</p> | <p>1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Coach</p> <p>2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Coach</p> <p>3. Assistant Principal, Science Coach</p> <p>4. Assistant Principal, Science Coach</p> <p>5. Assistant Principal, Science Coach</p> <p>6. Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Coach</p> <p>7. Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Coach</p> <p>8. Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Coach</p> | <p>1. Lesson plans will be developed with fidelity in alliance with the district-based Instructional Focus Calendar, curriculum map, reviewed by the Science Coach during CWT's, and monitored by the Assistant Principal and Principal. The Science Coach and the Assistant Principal will monitor the student portfolios to ensure lab report samples adhere to the school-wide lab report template. The Science Department will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment).</p> <p>2. Teachers will utilize the Summer Science strategy to assist students with development of a Science Fair Project that will be due by mid-December, 2009.</p> <p>3. During CWT's, the Science Coach, Assistant Principal, &amp; Principal will monitor the proper implementation of warm-up activities. The Science Department will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment).</p> <p>4. During CWT's, the Science Coach, Assistant Principal, &amp; Principal will monitor the proper implementation of the RAP strategy, utilization of the Science department rubric, and grading of students responses. Follow-up within the department will occur during morning department/grade-level PLC's. The Science Department will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment).</p> <p>5. The teachers and Science Coach will provide journaling exercises and/or short-extended response questions that allow students an opportunity to reflect on their experiences and raise any questions or ideas for further discussion</p> | <p>1. Progress will be measured using the school-wide lab report template and accompanying rubric. Effectiveness will be determined through portfolio evaluations and results from district-based mini-assessments and teacher-created assessments.</p> <p>2. Improvement on the number of students participating in the Science Fair as well as the quality of projects submitted for competition.</p> <p>3. Improvement on the district-based mini-assessments and teacher-created assessments that will be a required component of the Science portfolio.</p> <p>4. Improvement on the district-based mini-assessments, teacher-created assessments, and short/extended response submissions that will be a required component of the Science portfolio.</p> <p>5. Improvement on the district-based mini-assessments and teacher-created assessments that will be a required component of the Science portfolio.</p> <p>6. Increased scores from the Pre-Test provided at the onset of the Camp in addition to improvement on the district-based mini-assessments and teacher-created assessments that will be a required component of the Science portfolio.</p> <p>7. Improvement on the district-based mini-assessments and teacher-created assessments that will be a required component of the Science portfolio.</p> <p>8. Improvement on the district-based mini-assessments and teacher-created assessments that will be a required component of the Science portfolio.</p> |

|  |   |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|
|  | <p>Learning Opportunities that encourage hands-on learning and reinforce reading within the content area.</p> <p>8. Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process and implementing technology resources such as Compass Learning Odyssey and Renzulli. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.</p> |  | <p>with their peers. The Science Department will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment).</p> <p>6. During CWT's of the Camp, the Science Coach, Assistant Principal, &amp; Principal will monitor the proper implementation of Follow-up between the teachers and the Science Coach will occur during designated afterschool meeting times/provided planning time.</p> <p>7. During departmental PLC's following the break, the Science Coach &amp; Assistant Principal will monitor the teacher discussion and review student work samples prompting reflection and improvements for the following year.</p> <p>8. The department will meet bi-weekly to review the district-based Instructional Focus Calendar and determine those enrichment activities that will be implemented to address the benchmarks not being mastered.</p> |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|

**Professional Development Aligned with Objective:**

| Objective Addressed  | Content/Topic                                 | Facilitator | Target Date  | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring  | Person Responsible for Monitoring             |
|--|---|-------------|--------------|--|---|
| Given instruction based on the Sunshine State Standards, 43% of 8th grade students will score at level three or above on the 2010 FCAT Science Assessment. | Florida Continuous Improvement Model Training | HRD         | August, 2009 | Morning PLC's will be monitored to ensure quality discussion regarding data trends, lesson development, laboratory experiments, and classroom management issues.   | Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Coach |
| Given instruction based on the Sunshine State Standards, 43% of 8th grade students will score at level three or above on the 2010 FCAT Science Assessment. | 6th Grade New Standards Training              | HRD         | June, 2010   | Department will meet during morning PLC's and Early Release Professional Development to discuss changes to the 6th grade Curriculum Maps and address gaps in lesson development that are occurring prior to 8th grade. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Coach |

**Budget:**

| <b>Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)</b>   |   |                  |
|--|---|------------------|
| Description of Resources                       | Funding Source                            | Available Amount |
| Measuring Up Science Level H                   | FTE/Accountability/Title I/District Funds | \$2,000.00       |
| FCAT Camp (Extended Learning Opportunity)      | FTE/Accountability/Title I/District Funds | \$2,000.00       |
| <b>Total: \$4,000.00</b>                       |   |                  |
| <b>Technology</b>                              |   |                  |
| Description of Resources                       | Funding Source                            | Available Amount |
| Vernier Probeware (sensors/monitoring devices) | FTE/Accountability/Title I/District Funds | \$700.00         |
| <b>Total: \$700.00</b>                         |   |                  |
| <b>Professional Development</b>                |   |                  |

| Description of Resources  | Funding Source                            | Available Amount               |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Substitute teachers to provide temporary coverage for Professional Development. | FTE/Accountability/Title I/District Funds | \$1,500.00                     |
|   |   | <b>Total: \$1,500.00</b>       |
| <b>Other</b>  |   |                                |
| Description of Resources  | Funding Source                            | Available Amount               |
| Hands-on and Laboratory supplies  | FTE/Accountability/Title I/District Funds | \$2,000.00                     |
|   |   | <b>Total: \$2,000.00</b>       |
|   |   | <b>Final Total: \$8,200.00</b> |

End of *Science Goal*

## Writing Goal

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Needs Assessment:</b> | Based on School Grade Data:<br><br>Did the total percent proficient increase or was the percent proficient maintained?<br><br>What clusters/strands showed decrease in proficiency? |
|--------------------------|---|

| Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement  |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Based on the 2009 Administration of the FCAT Writing Test data 97% of the students in 8th grade scored level 3.5 or above in writing</p> <p>8th Grade<br/>Total number of students tested: 274<br/>Percentage of students scoring level 3.5 or above – 93</p> <p>Expository Essay<br/>Total number of students tested: 141<br/>Percentage of students scoring level 3.5 or above – 94</p> <p>Persuasive Essay<br/>Total number of students tested: 133<br/>Percentage of students scoring level 3.5 or above - 92</p> <p>Eighth grade student scores indicate that students increased by three percentage points with a combined score of 94% of students meeting high standards on the 2008 FCAT Writing to 97% of students meeting high standards on the 2009 FCAT Writing. In the area of Expository Writing, students fell below the District average of 95% but were above the State average of 90% with a score of 94% scoring a 3.5 or above. In the area of Persuasive Writing students fell below the District average of 94% but were above the State average of 89% with a score of 93% scoring a 3.5 or above. The writing scores do not reflect the percent of students at 3.0 and 4.0, as there were two readers in 2009, where there will only be one reader for 2010 and students will need to obtain a score of 4.0 for proficiency.</p> |   | <p>On the 2010 Administration of the FCAT Writing Test, 98% of the 8th grade students will achieve a 3.5 or above.</p>   |   |
| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step   | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Principal</li> <li>Language Arts Administrator</li> <li>LA Department Chair</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will adhere to a set schedule for turning in sample student FCAT writing prompts and writing prompt score sheets.</li> <li>During Professional Learning Communities, teachers will use tracking sheet to as a planning tool and to assess student progress.</li> <li>Students will keep these conference sheets in their writing portfolio.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will receive feedback from the Language Arts administrator</li> <li>Teachers will bring tracking sheet to PLC's</li> <li>Turn in Writing Progress Forms.</li> </ol> |

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| 3. 8th grade teachers will meet with students on a bi-monthly basis to discuss their writing process. |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

| Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement  |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 100% of students who attended FCAT Writing Camp during the 2008-2009 school year passed the FCAT Writing Test. |   | Based on the Benchmark Writing Assessment, students will be identified who might benefit from additional writing support and remediation. |   |   |
|  | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1  | 1. Secure funding for FCAT Writing Camp<br>2. Secure dates and teachers to work FCAT Writing Camp<br>3. Create and Provide a copy of the FCAT Writing Camp Curriculum to all FCAT Writing Camp teachers | 1. Principal<br>2. Language Arts Assistant Principal<br>3. Department Chair   | 1. FCAT Writing Camp is included Title 1 annual budget.<br>2. Email staff via Cab Conference about the FCAT Writing Camp two months prior to training date to secure workers and date<br>3. All teachers will have a copy of the FCAT Writing Camp curriculum one month prior to FCAT Writing Camp. | 1. Funding for teachers to work FCAT Writing camp is secure.<br>2. Create a roster of teachers who have agreed to work FCAT Writing Camp. Give a copy of roster to Language Arts Administrator. FCAT Writing Camp is listed on Staff Development Calendar.<br>3. Classroom Walkthroughs |

| Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement                       |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| Teachers who are trained in the school-wide writing plan can support writing process. |   | To ensure that all Language Arts, Reading, Social Studies, and Elective teachers are trained in our 6-8 writing plan and are able to holistically grade and assess student essay writing using the FCAT writing rubric criteria. |   |   |
|   | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | 1. Secure funding for WOW writing training from Title 1<br><br>2. Advertise and make training available to all interested staff members<br><br>3. Provide Training- -The WOW writing training is a compilation of several district-approved programs, which include Six Traits, FCAT Writing, and Writers Workshops that addresses the patterns of deficiency in our students' writing. | 1. Principal; Language Arts Administrator<br>2. Language Arts Administrator;<br>Department Chair<br>3. Department Chair and/or Administration  | 1. WOW Training is included Title 1 annual budget.<br><br>The WOW writing training is a compilation of several district-approved programs, which include Six Traits, FCAT Writing, and Writers Workshops that addresses the patterns of deficiency in our students' writing.<br><br>2. Email staff via Cab Conference about the WOW training two months prior to training date<br>3. Trainee Evaluation | 1. Funds are secure for training.<br>2. Receipt of attendance confirmation from staff members<br>3. Classroom Walkthrough |

**Professional Development Aligned with Objective:**

| Objective Addressed   | Content/Topic                       | Facilitator                 | Target Date    | Strategy for Follow-up/ Monitoring  | Person Responsible for Monitoring     |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| On the 2010 administration of the FCAT Writing Test, 98% of the 8th grade students will achieve a 3.5 or above. | Writing/ Monthly Writing Assessment | Principal, Department Chair | September 2009 | Monitor student writing portfolios<br><br>The students will self monitor their own writing process by tracking their monthly writing progress | Assistant Principal, Department Chair |
|   |                                     |                             |                | During FCAT Writing camp students will take two sample FCAT writing   |                                       |

|  |                               |                                       |                |   |                                       |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 100% of all students who attend FCAT Writing Camp during the 2009-2010 school year, will pass the FCAT Writing Assessment. | Writing/ Writing Camp         | Assistant Principal, Department Chair | November 2009  | prompts to monitor their progress.<br>FCAT Writing Camp teachers will identify student weakness and work based on their individual needs. | Assistant Principal, Department Chair |
| Professional Development – Teachers who are trained in the school-wide writing plan can support writing process.           | Writing/ The 6-8 writing Plan | Assistant Principal                   | September 2009 | During Classroom Walk-throughs, the Assistant Principal will evaluate whether the 6-8 writing plan is being implemented.                  | Assistant Principal                   |

**Budget:**

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)                                  |                                |                                 |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source                 | Available Amount                |
| Writing Camp   | FTE/Categorical/ Title I/Grant | \$5,000.00                      |
|  |                                | <b>Total: \$5,000.00</b>        |
| Technology   |                                |                                 |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source                 | Available Amount                |
| Software/Hardware  | FTE/Categorical/ Title I/Grant | \$1,000.00                      |
|  |                                | <b>Total: \$1,000.00</b>        |
| Professional Development   |                                |                                 |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source                 | Available Amount                |
| Writing Training--30 hours for 15 teachers @\$15.00 each and materials | FTE/Categorical/ Title I/Gran  | \$7,500.00                      |
|  |                                | <b>Total: \$7,500.00</b>        |
| Other  |                                |                                 |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source                 | Available Amount                |
| Writing/ Monthly Writing Assessment                                    | Title I                        | \$1,000.00                      |
|  |                                | <b>Total: \$1,000.00</b>        |
|  |                                | <b>Final Total: \$14,500.00</b> |

*End of Science Goal*

## Parent Involvement Goal

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Needs Assessment:</b> | <p>Based on information from School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:</p> <p>Were parent involvement activities and strategies targeted to areas of academic need?</p> <p>Based on information from surveys, evaluations, agendas, or sign-ins:</p> <p>Was the percent of parent participation in school activities maintained or increased from the prior year?</p> <p>Generally, what strategies or activities can be employed to increase parent involvement?</p> |
|--------------------------|---|

| Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement  |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement                |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Increase Parental Involvement in FCAT Science Night  |  | Increase attendance by 30%                             |  |  |
| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step                  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step | Evaluation Tool  |  |
| 1. Provide incentives for students and parents<br>2. Follow up telephone calls through Parent Link<br>3. Provide student entertainment for parents | 1. Title I Liaison<br>2. Science Dept Chair<br>3. Science Teachers | Review of Parent sign-in logs                          | 1. Parent attendance sign-in sheet<br>2. Title I monthly Parent Involvement Report |  |

| Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
|---|--|---|--|--|

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Increase parent participation in the Annual Customer Survey |  | Increase the number of parents who complete the district survey by 30% |  |  |
|   | <b>Action Step</b>   | <b>Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step</b>               | <b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step</b>                        | <b>Evaluation Tool</b>   |
| 1   | 1. Provide incentives for students and parents<br>2. Follow up telephone calls through Parent Link | 1. Title I Liason<br>2. Survey Coordinator<br>3. Classroom Teachers    | 1. Review Parent Log<br>2. Collect participation data<br>3. Conduct analysis of data | 1. Parent attendance sign in sheet<br>2. Title I monthly Parent Involvement Report |

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement</b> |   | <b>Objective Linked to Area of Improvement</b>  |   |   |
| Increase participation in Title I Parent Public Meeting by 30 %.       |   | Increase the number of parents who participate in the Title I parent information meeting. |   |   |
|  | <b>Action Step</b>  | <b>Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step</b>                                  | <b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step</b> | <b>Evaluation Tool</b>  |
| 1  | 1. More frequent parent contact to celebrate students' successes; send flyers home<br>2. Maintain parental telephone logs and activity reports to document increase parent participation in Title I Parent Information Meeting<br>3. Provide incentives to parents and students for participation; Provide childcare to encourage participation in parent information meeting | Title I Coordinator, Asst Principals  | Review parent logs<br>Collect participation data              | Parent attendance sign in sheets<br>Title I monthly Parent Involvement report |

**Professional Development Aligned with Objective:**

| Objective Addressed   | Content/Topic                 | Facilitator               | Target Date | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring        | Person Responsible for Monitoring          |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|--|
| Increase participation in the Title I Parent Public Meeting | Increasing Parent Involvement | Office Parent Involvement | Ongoing     | Attendance logs for parent participation | Title I Coordinator<br>Assistant Principal |

**Budget:**

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)            |                |                          |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|
| Description of Resources                         | Funding Source | Available Amount         |
| Parent Resources                                 | Title I        | \$500.00                 |
| Extended Day Learning Opportunities for Students | Title I        | \$5,000.00               |
|  |                | <b>Total: \$5,500.00</b> |
| Technology                                       |                |                          |
| Description of Resources                         | Funding Source | Available Amount         |
| No Data  | No Data        | \$0.00                   |
|  |                | <b>Total: \$0.00</b>     |
| Professional Development                         |                |                          |
| Description of Resources                         | Funding Source | Available Amount         |
| Professional Reading Materials                   | Title I        | \$1,500.00               |
|  |                | <b>Total: \$1,500.00</b> |
| Other  |                |                          |
| Description of Resources                         | Funding Source | Available Amount         |

|                                       |             |                                 |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|
| Printing of Monthly Parent Newsletter | Title I/FTE | \$8,000.00                      |
|                                       |             | <b>Total: \$8,000.00</b>        |
|                                       |             | <b>Final Total: \$15,000.00</b> |

*End of Parent Involvement Goal*

---

# Other Goals

No Other Goals were submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |   |   |                                 |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Goal                                  | Description of Resources  | Funding Source                            | Available Amount                |
| Reading                               | FCAT Camps  | FTE/Title I/Acct Funds                    | \$5,000.00                      |
| Mathematics                           | Manipulatives and Various Math supplies (ie calculators)                        | Title I                                   | \$5,000.00                      |
| Writing                               | Writing Camp  | FTE/Categorical/ Title I/Grant            | \$5,000.00                      |
| Science                               | Measuring Up Science Level H  | FTE/Accountability/Title I/District Funds | \$2,000.00                      |
| Science                               | FCAT Camp (Extended Learning Opportunity)                                       | FTE/Accountability/Title I/District Funds | \$2,000.00                      |
| Parental Involvement                  | Parent Resources  | Title I                                   | \$500.00                        |
| Parental Involvement                  | Extended Day Learning Opportunities for Students                                | Title I                                   | \$5,000.00                      |
|                                       |   |   | <b>Total: \$24,500.00</b>       |
| Technology                            |   |   |                                 |
| Goal                                  | Description of Resources  | Funding Source                            | Available Amount                |
| Reading                               | Promethean Boards/Digital Classroom   | FTE/Title I/Acct Funds                    | \$2,000.00                      |
| Reading                               | Software for Digital Classroom  | FTE/Title I/ Acct Funds                   | \$2,000.00                      |
| Mathematics                           | Software Upgrades   | FTE/Title II/Accountability               | \$1,000.00                      |
| Writing                               | Software/Hardware   | FTE/Categorical/ Title I/Grant            | \$1,000.00                      |
| Science                               | Vernier Probeware (sensors/monitoring devices)                                  | FTE/Accountability/Title I/District Funds | \$700.00                        |
|                                       |   |   | <b>Total: \$6,700.00</b>        |
| Professional Development              |   |   |                                 |
| Goal                                  | Description of Resources  | Funding Source                            | Available Amount                |
| Reading                               | Curriculum Mapping  | FTE/Title I/Acct Funds                    | \$2,000.00                      |
| Mathematics                           | Substitute teachers to provide temporary Coverage for Professional Development  | Title II                                  | \$2,000.00                      |
| Writing                               | Writing Training--30 hours for 15 teachers @\$15.00 each and materials          | FTE/Categorical/ Title I/Gran             | \$7,500.00                      |
| Science                               | Substitute teachers to provide temporary coverage for Professional Development. | FTE/Accountability/Title I/District Funds | \$1,500.00                      |
| Parental Involvement                  | Professional Reading Materials  | Title I                                   | \$1,500.00                      |
|                                       |   |   | <b>Total: \$14,500.00</b>       |
| Other                                 |   |   |                                 |
| Goal                                  | Description of Resources  | Funding Source                            | Available Amount                |
| Writing                               | Writing/ Monthly Writing Assessment   | Title I                                   | \$1,000.00                      |
| Science                               | Hands-on and Laboratory supplies  | FTE/Accountability/Title I/District Funds | \$2,000.00                      |
| Parental Involvement                  | Printing of Monthly Parent Newsletter   | Title I/FTE                               | \$8,000.00                      |
|                                       |   |   | <b>Total: \$11,000.00</b>       |
|                                       |   |   | <b>Final Total: \$56,700.00</b> |

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Intervene
  Correct II
  Prevent II
  Correct I
  Prevent I
  NA

[Show Attached school's Differentiated Accountability Checklist of Compliance](#)

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business

and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school.

✓ **Yes. Agree with the above statement.**

| <b>Projected use of SAC Funds</b> | <b>Amount</b> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Staff Development                 | 5000          |
| Student Incentives                | 3000          |
| Community Activities              | 1000          |
| School Improvement Projects       | 2000          |

Describe the Activities of the School Advisory Council for the Upcoming Year

The School Advisory Council (SAC) is the sole body responsible for final decision-making at the school relating to implementation of the provisions of Sections 1001.42(16) and 1008.345, F.S.

All stakeholders are notified via newsletter, web site, student take home notices and the automated phone system, Parent Link. Officers are elected according to the By-Laws with other members being appointed by the Chair as deemed necessary to meet the criteria. The School Advisory Council (SAC) creates committees to develop the school improvement goals and objectives. These committees consist of faculty members, parents and members of the community. Committee members are developed for reading, math, writing, science, school personnel, technology, parental and community involvement. Committees are in charge of developing objectives and the action steps required to meet said objectives. Assistant Principals, Department chairs and various other staff are responsible for the coordination of each action step. In addition, allocation of funds are identified if deemed necessary. All budgetary reports must be approved by the SAC.

## SAC Members

### Members

- 1) Carletha B. Shaw, Principal
- 2) Karen W. Blount, SAC Chair
- 3) Nicole Kasaboske, Teacher
- 4) Donna Bailey, Parent
- 5) Wanda Robinson, Parent
- 6) Karen Forshee, Parent
- 7) Carolyn Jones, Community Member
- 8) Ross Unger, Union Steward
- 9) Terry Tait, Assistant Principal

# AYP DATA

| 2008-2009 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2  |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |   |      |  | Broward ATTACKS MIDDLE SCHOOL 0343  |                     |   |     |   |  |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|---|-----|--|-----|--|------|---|------|--|---|---------------------|---|-----|---|--|--|----------------------|---|------|-------------------|------|-----|--|
| Number of students enrolled in the grades tested:<br><a href="#">Click here to see Number of students in each group</a>   |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |   |      |  | Read: 791<br>Math: 791  |                     | 2008-2009<br>School Grade <sup>1</sup> : A    |     | Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress?<br>NO |  |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c <sup>2</sup> ). |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |   |      |  | This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b <sup>2</sup> ). |                     |   |     |   |  | This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model. |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| Group   | Reading Tested 95% of the students? |     | Math Tested 95% of the students? |     | 65% scoring at or above grade level in Reading? |     | 68% scoring at or above grade level in Math? |     | Improved performance in Writing by 1%? |      | Increased Graduation Rate <sup>3</sup> by 1%? |      | Percent of Students below grade level in Reading |   | Safe Harbor Reading | Percent of Students below grade level in Math |     | Safe Harbor Math                                    | % of students on track to be proficient in reading |  | Growth model reading | % of students on track to be proficient in math |      | Growth model math |      |     |  |
|   | 2009                                | Y/N | 2009                             | Y/N | 2009  | Y/N | 2009   | Y/N | 2008                                   | 2009 | Y/N   | 2007 | 2008   | Y/N   | 2008                | 2009  | Y/N | 2008  | 2009   | Y/N  | 2009                 | Y/N   | 2009 | Y/N               | 2009 | Y/N |  |
| TOTAL <sup>4</sup>  | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 58  | N   | 57   | N   |  | Y    |   |      | NA   | 43  | 42                  | N   | 47  | 43  | N  | 57   | N                    | 58  | N    |                   |      |     |  |
| WHITE   | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 67  | Y   | 65   | N   |  | Y    |   |      | NA   | 28  | 33                  | NA  | 31  | 35  | N  | 62   | NA                   | 66  | N    |                   |      |     |  |
| BLACK   | 99                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 53  | N   | 52   | N   |  | Y    |   |      | NA   | 47  | 47                  | N   | 53  | 48  | N  | 52   | N                    | 52  | N    |                   |      |     |  |
| HISPANIC  | 100                                 | Y   | 100                              | Y   | 62  | N   | 62   | N   |  | Y    |   |      | NA   | 50  | 38                  | Y   | 51  | 38  | Y  | 64   | NA                   | 65  | NA   |                   |      |     |  |
| ASIAN   |                                     | NA  |                                  | NA  |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| AMERICAN INDIAN   |                                     | NA  |                                  | NA  |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED  | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 54  | N   | 53   | N   |  | Y    |   |      | NA   | 49  | 46                  | N   | 53  | 47  | Y  | 54   | N                    | 55  | NA   |                   |      |     |  |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS   | 99                                  | Y   | 100                              | Y   |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES  | 98                                  | Y   | 97                               | Y   |   | NA  |  | NA  |  | Y    |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |

| 2007-2008 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2  |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |   |      |  | Broward ATTACKS MIDDLE SCHOOL 0343  |                     |   |     |   |  |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|---|-----|--|-----|--|------|---|------|--|---|---------------------|---|-----|---|--|--|----------------------|---|------|-------------------|------|-----|--|
| Number of students enrolled in the grades tested:<br><a href="#">Click here to see Number of students in each group</a>   |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |   |      |  | Read: 803<br>Math: 803  |                     | 2007-2008<br>School Grade <sup>1</sup> : A    |     | Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress?<br>NO |  |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c <sup>2</sup> ). |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |   |      |  | This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b <sup>2</sup> ). |                     |   |     |   |  | This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model. |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| Group   | Reading Tested 95% of the students? |     | Math Tested 95% of the students? |     | 58% scoring at or above grade level in Reading? |     | 62% scoring at or above grade level in Math? |     | Improved performance in Writing by 1%? |      | Increased Graduation Rate <sup>3</sup> by 1%? |      | Percent of Students below grade level in Reading |   | Safe Harbor Reading | Percent of Students below grade level in Math |     | Safe Harbor Math                                    | % of students on track to be proficient in reading |  | Growth model reading | % of students on track to be proficient in math |      | Growth model math |      |     |  |
|   | 2008                                | Y/N | 2008                             | Y/N | 2008  | Y/N | 2008   | Y/N | 2007                                   | 2008 | Y/N   | 2006 | 2007   | Y/N   | 2007                | 2008  | Y/N | 2007  | 2008   | Y/N  | 2008                 | Y/N   | 2008 | Y/N               | 2008 | Y/N |  |
| TOTAL <sup>4</sup>  | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 57  | N   | 53   | N   |  | Y    |   |      | NA   | 51  | 43                  | Y   | 51  | 47  | N  | 53   | NA                   | 62  | Y    |                   |      |     |  |
| WHITE   | 99                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 72  | Y   | 69   | Y   |  | Y    |   |      | NA   | 37  | 28                  | NA  | 39  | 31  | NA   | 60   | NA                   | 75  | NA   |                   |      |     |  |
| BLACK   | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 53  | N   | 47   | N   |  | Y    |   |      | NA   | 58  | 47                  | Y   | 59  | 53  | Y  | 51   | NA                   | 57  | NA   |                   |      |     |  |
| HISPANIC  | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 50  | N   | 49   | N   |  | Y    |   |      | NA   | 53  | 50                  | N   | 51  | 51  | N  | 51   | N                    | 62  | Y    |                   |      |     |  |
| ASIAN   |                                     | NA  |                                  | NA  |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| AMERICAN INDIAN   |                                     | NA  |                                  | NA  |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED  | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 51  | N   | 47   | N   |  | Y    |   |      | NA   | 59  | 49                  | Y   | 57  | 53  | N  | 50   | NA                   | 57  | N    |                   |      |     |  |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS   | 100                                 | Y   | 99                               | Y   |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES  | 99                                  | Y   | 97                               | Y   |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |

| 2006-2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2  |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |   |      |  | Broward ATTACKS MIDDLE SCHOOL 0343  |                     |   |     |   |  |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|---|-----|--|-----|--|------|---|------|--|---|---------------------|---|-----|---|--|--|----------------------|---|------|-------------------|------|-----|--|
| Number of students enrolled in the grades tested:<br><a href="#">Click here to see Number of students in each group</a>   |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |   |      |  | Read: 1003<br>Math: 1003  |                     | 2006-2007<br>School Grade <sup>1</sup> : C    |     | Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress?<br>NO |  |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c <sup>2</sup> ). |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |   |      |  | This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b <sup>2</sup> ). |                     |   |     |   |  | This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model. |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| Group   | Reading Tested 95% of the students? |     | Math Tested 95% of the students? |     | 51% scoring at or above grade level in Reading? |     | 56% scoring at or above grade level in Math? |     | Improved performance in Writing by 1%? |      | Increased Graduation Rate <sup>3</sup> by 1%? |      | Percent of Students below grade level in Reading |   | Safe Harbor Reading | Percent of Students below grade level in Math |     | Safe Harbor Math                                    | % of students on track to be proficient in reading |  | Growth model reading | % of students on track to be proficient in math |      | Growth model math |      |     |  |
|   | 2007                                | Y/N | 2007                             | Y/N | 2007  | Y/N | 2007   | Y/N | 2006                                   | 2007 | Y/N   | 2005 | 2006   | Y/N   | 2006                | 2007  | Y/N | 2006  | 2007   | Y/N  | 2007                 | Y/N   | 2007 | Y/N               | 2007 | Y/N |  |
| TOTAL <sup>4</sup>  | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 49  | N   | 49   | N   | 90                                     |      | Y   |      |  | NA  | 51                  | 51  | N   | 51  | 51   | N  | 43                   | N   | 56   | Y                 |      |     |  |
| WHITE   | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 63  | Y   | 61   | Y   | 89                                     |      | Y   |      |  | NA  | 36                  | 37  | NA  | 37  | 39   | NA   | 48                   | NA  | 59   | NA                |      |     |  |
| BLACK   | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 42  | N   | 41   | N   | 89                                     |      | Y   |      |  | NA  | 59                  | 58  | N   | 60  | 59   | N  | 39                   | N   | 53   | N                 |      |     |  |
| HISPANIC  | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 47  | N   | 49   | N   | 89                                     |      | Y   |      |  | NA  | 56                  | 53  | N   | 54  | 51   | N  | 50                   | N   | 59   | Y                 |      |     |  |
| ASIAN   |                                     | NA  |                                  | NA  |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| AMERICAN INDIAN   |                                     | NA  |                                  | NA  |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED  | 99                                  | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 41  | N   | 43   | N   | 90                                     |      | Y   |      |  | NA  | 59                  | 59  | N   | 57  | 57   | N  | 40                   | N   | 55   | N                 |      |     |  |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS   | 100                                 | Y   | 100                              | Y   |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |   |      | NA   |   |                     |   |     |   | NA   |  |                      |   |      |                   |      |     |  |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES  | 95                                  | Y   | 95                               | Y   | 19  | N   | 18   | N   | 71                                     | 88   | Y   |      |  | NA  | 81                  | 81  | N   | 84  | 82   | N  |                      | NA  |      | NA                |      |     |  |

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

| Broward School District<br>ATTACKS MIDDLE SCHOOL<br>2008-2009 |   |      |         |         |                     |
|---|---|------|---------|---------|---------------------|
|   | Reading   | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |
| <b>% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)</b>      | 63%   | 61%  | 97%     | 31%     | 252                 |
| <b>% of Students Making Learning Gains</b>                    | 67%   | 70%  |         |         | 137                 |
|   | <b>Writing and Science:</b> Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.<br><b>3 ways to make gains:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul> |      |         |         |                     |

|   |           |           |  |  |          |  |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|--|----------|--|
| <b>Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?</b> | 75% (YES) | 66% (YES) |  |  | 141      | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| Points Earned   |           |           |  |  | 530      |  |
| Percent Tested = 99%                                  |           |           |  |  |          | Percent of eligible students tested  |
| <b>School Grade</b>                                   |           |           |  |  | <b>A</b> | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested   |

| <b>Broward School District<br/>ATTUCKS MIDDLE SCHOOL<br/>2007-2008</b> |           |           |         |         |                     |  |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|--|
|  | Reading   | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| <b>% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)</b>               | 62%       | 58%       | 94%     | 41%     | 255                 | <b>Writing and Science:</b> Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| <b>% of Students Making Learning Gains</b>                             | 66%       | 67%       |         |         | 133                 | 3 ways to make gains:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?</b>                  | 69% (YES) | 68% (YES) |         |         | 137                 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.   |
| Points Earned  |           |           |         |         | 525                 |  |
| Percent Tested = 99%   |           |           |         |         |                     | Percent of eligible students tested  |
| <b>School Grade</b>  |           |           |         |         | <b>A</b>            | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested   |

| <b>Broward School District<br/>ATTUCKS MIDDLE SCHOOL<br/>2006-2007</b> |           |           |         |         |                     |  |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|--|
|  | Reading   | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| <b>% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)</b>               | 53%       | 53%       | 92%     | 29%     | 227                 | <b>Writing and Science:</b> Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| <b>% of Students Making Learning Gains</b>                             | 57%       | 63%       |         |         | 120                 | 3 ways to make gains:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?</b>                  | 62% (YES) | 66% (YES) |         |         | 128                 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.   |
| Points Earned  |           |           |         |         | 475                 |  |
| Percent Tested = 99%   |           |           |         |         |                     | Percent of eligible students tested  |
| <b>School Grade</b>  |           |           |         |         | <b>C</b>            | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested   |