

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2009 - 2010 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: OLSEN MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Kim Flynn

SAC Chair: Kerri Kerr and Shelly Toth

Superintendent: James F. Notter

Date of School Board Approval: 12/01/09

Last Modified on: 09-03-2009

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commission
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32395

Dr. Frances Haithcock, Chance
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32395

VISION and MISSION STATEMENTS

We Believe:

- that each individual is capable of learning through a diversified approach.
- that students have a right to learn in a safe and secure environment.
- that all individuals should be treated with respect.
- that the school learning environment should be one that fosters creativity, pride, high expectations, and critical thinking.
- that student achievement is enhanced through cooperation between the home, community, school, and students.
- that school programs should reflect the needs of our Multicultural population.
- that students should be prepared to function in a technological society and therefore that technology should be used throughout the curriculum.

We, the teachers, staff, parents, students, and community of Olsen Middle School are committed to ensure that all students receive a quality education within a safe and secure learning environment.

The School Board of Broward County, Florida is dedicated to meeting the educational needs of all students in a safe learning environment.

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

SCHOOL PROFILE/DEMOGRAPHICS

Brief History and Background of the School

- Olsen Middle School is located in Dania Beach, Florida. The City of Dania Beach borders Ft. Lauderdale to the north and Hollywood to the south.
- Olsen was originally built in 1954 and a replacement building was finished in 1994. The original building continues to be used as a center, which houses sixth grade students. Construction is scheduled for summer 2009 for a replacement for the 1954 building. When this building is complete, the original building will be demolished to make room for playing fields for sports and physical education.
- Olsen Middle School is a Title I school with a 72% free and reduced lunch rate.

Unique School Strengths for Next Year

- Annual Yearly Progress was met in the 2008-2009 school year in 92% of the categories. AYP was missed in only 3 reading categories.
- Mrs. Flynn, Principal, was named Principal of the Year in 2008-2009 for her ability to lead Olsen to gains in all academic areas.
- Olsen has nine National Board Certified Teachers and three teachers who have successfully completed the Broward County Recognition program.
- Olsen has three full-time coaches: one reading coach, one mathematics coach, and one writing coach. In addition, there is a half-time science coach and the social studies department head receives release time each day.
- Students are scheduled to teams of teachers with common planning whenever possible.

Unique School Weaknesses for Next Year

- Olsen Middle School is a SINI school and has not met Annual Yearly Progress for 6 years. The school implemented restructuring in the 2008-2009 school year.
- Sixty-seven percent of AYP categories were met.
- Increase in students eligible for free and reduced lunch rates by five percent.

- The district cut 8% of Olsen’s budget for the 2009-2010 school year.
- One instructional and seven non-instructional staff members were surplus due to budget cuts for the 2009-2010 school year.
- The staff cuts included the reduction of the number of assistant principals from four to three.
- Two of the remaining assistant principals were reassigned and two new assistant principals were assigned to the school.

Student Demographics

- Total students – 1106
- White – 34.9%
- Black – 28.8%
- Hispanic – 31.5%
- Asian – 1.98%
- Multiracial – 2.38%
- ELL percentage – 9.14%
- ESE percentage – 14.2%
- Free / reduced lunch percent is 71.8%

Student Attendance Rates

- 90.1 in 2009
- 91.5 in 2008

Student Mobility

- 31.4 in 2009
- 37.9 in 2008

Student Suspension Rates

- 25.4 in 2009
- 17.2 in 2008

Student Retention Rates

- 2.48 in 2008
- 2.4% in 2009

Class Size

- 21.17 in 2009
- 21 in 2008

Academic Performance of Feeder Pattern

- Colbert Elementary: 4% of population, 2008-2009: "C" grade, AYP 87%, 2007-2008: "C" grade, AYP 82%
- Collins Elementary: 7% of population, 2008-2009: "A" grade, AYP 92%, 2007-2008: "C" grade, AYP 92%
- Dania Elementary: 20% of population, 2008-2009: "A" grade, AYP 95%, 2007-2008: "A" grade, AYP 95%
- Hollywood Central Elementary: 20% of population, 2008-2009: "A" grade, AYP 100%, 2007-2008: "A" grade, AYP 100%
- Hollywood Hills Elementary: 11% of population, 2008-2009: "A" grade, AYP 97%, 2007-2008: "A" grade, AYP 100%
- Oakridge Elementary: 17% of population, 2008-2009: "A" grade, AYP 95%, 2007-2008: "A" grade, AYP 90%
- Orange Brook Elementary: 5% of population, 2008-2009: "A" grade, AYP 95%, 2007-2008: "A" grade, AYP 97%
- Sheridan Hills Elementary: 3% of population, 2008-2009: "A" grade, AYP 95%, 2007-2008: "A" grade, AYP 100%

Partnerships and Grants

- Olsen received the 21ST Century Learning Grant beginning in the fall of 2008. The grant provides aftercare services including tutoring and summer programs for Olsen students.
- Olsen Middle School is partners with Publix Supermarket and Lee’s Bicycle Shop which provide incentives and rewards for students for academic achievement.

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 *
		Bachelors of Science: Middle			

Principal	Kim Flynn	School Mathematics Additional Certifications: Social Studies, Educational Leadership	14	23	2007-2008: Grade of "A", 92% of AYP categories met, 2008-2009: Grade of "B", 67% of AYP categories met
Assis Principal	Kathy Keith	Bachelors of Science: Social Sciences Educational Leadership	1	9	2007-2008: Grade of "C", 8th grade Reading 43% level 3 and above Math 66% level 3 and above, 90% FCAT Writes 2008-2009 Grade of "B", 67% of AYP categories met, FCAT Writes 97% proficient
Assis Principal	Corey Montgomery	Bachelor of Arts: Social Science, Master of Education: Exceptional Student Education / ESOL and Educational Leadership Certifications: Educational Leadership, Social Science, Elementary Education, Gifted, ESOL, and Reading Endorsement		4	2006-2007: Grade of "C", 77% of AYP categories met, 2007-2008: Grade of "D", 74% of AYP categories met, 2008-2009: Grade of "C", 82% of AYP categories met
Assis Principal	Gwendolwyn Lampkin	Bachelor of Science: Business Administration, Masters: Educational Leadership, Certifications: Middle School Mathematics, Educational Leadership		11	2007-2008: Grade of "A", 95% of AYP categories met, 2008-2009: Grade of "A", 95% of AYP categories met

* 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	Stephanie Amara	Bachelor of Science: Elementary Education, Reading K-12, Pre Kindergarten / Primary Education ages 3 to grade 3			Worked at district level
Mathematics	Janice March	Bachelor of Science: Education / Mathematics, Masters: Education / Mathematics, Mathematics 6-12, Mathematics 5-9			2007-2008: Grade of "B", Learning Gains 77%, 2008-2009: Grade of "C", Learning Gains 72%
Science	Kathryn Stone	Bachelor of Science: Animal Science/Biology 6-12	11	1	2006-2007: Grade of "C", 38% proficient in science, 2007-2008: grade of "A", 43% proficient in science, 2008-2009: grade of "B", 39% proficient in science

* 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)
1. New Educator Support System	NESS Liaison	N/A	On Going
2. Teaming	Assistant Principals	N/A	On Going
3. Professional Development , Professional Learning Communities	Professional Development Coordinators	N/A	On Going

4. Buddy System	Guidance Director	August 2009	On Going
5. Safe and orderly environment	Principal, Assistant Principals, Security Specialists, and BSO	N/A	On Going
6. Department Release Days, Professional Learning Communities	Department Chairpersons	N/A	On Going

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
77	0	19	45	35	51	100	16	17	64

Teacher Mentoring Program

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Title I, Part A

- 2.5 Teachers plus 4 additional periods
- Professional Development
- Parental Involvement

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

- One period each for 4 AC I / AC II teachers

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

- Afterschool and Saturday Tutoring
- One teacher for 1 period

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

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.

- The school-based RtI Leadership Team consists of three guidance counselors, the ESE specialist, the school social worker (s), and the school psychologist.
- The principal, assistant principals, family counselor, support facilitators, and teachers are members of the team as needed.

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

- The school-based RtI Leadership Team meets once a week to find ways to meet the needs of students with special academic needs or circumstances.
- The guidance director leads the team and creates an agenda with input from the other members of the group.
- Each counselor prepares for the meeting by doing the necessary background work to become familiar with the child being discussed. The guidance counselor is also well versed in all interventions that have already been tried and their success rate.
- The information collected is presented to the group for discussion and decision making.
- Action steps are assigned to members of the group who report back to the group in a timely manner.

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

- The school-based RtI Leadership Team is knowledgeable of the academic goals set in the school improvement plan.
- The school-based RtI Leadership Team is also aware of the action steps being taken to meet those goals. Additional resources are available to the members of the group.

RtI Implementation

Describe the data management system used to summarize tiered data.

- The guidance data specialist keeps records of all assessment results at the school.
- Individual and team scores are made available to all members of the Olsen faculty and staff as needed.
- AYP sub-groups are tracked by team to ensure interventions are available to the targeted groups of students.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

- The guidance director and guidance counselors will be trained first at the school.
- School social workers, psychologists, and the ESE specialist will either be trained by the district or by the guidance director.
- The school-based RtI Leadership Team will be responsible for training the rest of the faculty and staff at the school.

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?

- 58% of sixth grade students (2009) performed below grade level in mathematics. The low strands were measurement and algebraic thinking.
- 47% of seventh grade students (2009) performed below grade level in mathematics. The low strand was geometry.
- 45% of sixth grade students (2009) performed below grade level in reading. The low strand was reference and research.
- 43% of seventh grade students (2009) performed below grade level in reading. The low strands were words / phrases and reference / research.

Instructional Calendar Development

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

- Instructional Focus Calendars are developed by county departments and given to the schools.
- The coaches and department chairpersons are responsible for the implementation of these calendars.
- Teachers at each grade level, along with the coach or department chair modify the county IFCs to meet the specific needs of the students at the school as shown in various assessments including but not limited to BAT I, BAT II, and mini BATs.
- IFCs are monitored by the coaches, assistant principals, and department chairs through classroom observations and periodic lesson plan checks.
- Classroom Walkthroughs are also conducted on a weekly basis by the support staff.

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

- Reading: words in phrases and reference and research
- Writing: main idea
- Mathematics: measurement, geometry, and algebraic thinking
- Science: vocabulary development and low strand at each grade level

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

- Teachers meet periodically with administrative staff, coaches, and guidance personnel to disaggregate individual student data and determine areas of greatest needs.
- Data chats between teachers and coaches or department chairpersons include the discussion of specific strategies being implemented to impact student achievement.
- Professional Development in the area of Differentiated Instruction is offered by curriculum area to help teachers meet the individual needs of the students.
- Pull-out, push-in, and tutoring sessions both after school and on Saturdays focus on areas of deficiency.

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

- Courses such as Teen Health and Family and Consumer Science help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future.

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

- Guidance counselors visit classrooms on a quarterly basis to discuss career planning and course selection. Individual sessions are scheduled with students on as needed basis.
- ESE students and parents meet annually to discuss course selection as well as placement.
- ELL students meet individually and in groups with the ELL coordinator as well as their core teachers to discuss career planning as well as course selection.
- All 7th grade students complete an on-line career-planning program.
- Successful completion of required courses is tracked in ePEP.

DO

Direct the Instructional Focus

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

- Instructional Focus Calendars are created by subject area and applied by grade level.

- Horizontal teaming is used to ensure instructional delivery is aligned across the grade level in each curriculum area.
- Vertical teaming by department is also used to ensure consistency across grade levels.

How are instructional focus lessons developed and delivered?

- Departments meet regularly for information sessions, horizontal teaming, and best practice sessions.
- Members of each grade level within the department work to ensure alignment in lesson presentation and share strategies and lessons which have been successful in increasing student achievement.

How will instructional focus lessons be revised and monitored?

- Lessons are developed and delivered using information from BAT I, BAT II, and mini assessments.
- Classroom Walkthroughs are conducted on a weekly basis by support staff members including principal, assistant principals, coaches, and department heads.
- Assistant principals are responsible for individual feedback to teachers.
- Using information gathered in Classroom Walkthroughs and other observations in the classroom, department chairpersons assist in the revisions of instructional focus lesson plans.

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.

- BAT I and BAT II will be administered to all students in reading, mathematics, and science.
- Mini BAT assessments will also be administered in reading, mathematics, and science.
- Strand Assessments will be administered in mathematics.
- Writing samples will be administered biweekly in eighth grade and monthly in sixth and seventh grade.
- The FAIR assessments will be used on a routine basis to measure progress in reading.

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

- BAT I results offer the most up to date information on mastery at the beginning of the school year.
- Areas of need are determined from these results and remediation and spiraling reviews offer further instruction in these areas.
- Mini BAT tests and Strand Assessments are used to assess mastery in areas of need.
- BAT II results offer further information on mastery and drive instruction through to FCAT.

Maintenance

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

- Instructional Focus Calendars developed by the district include a primary benchmark for instruction.
- Spiraling review covers related benchmarks and remediation covers areas that are not yet at mastery.

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.

- Data chats with administrative staff and department chairs / coaches are conducted with cross curricular teams in September and again in November.
- Data chats with the department chair / coach are schedule after each additional assessment.
- Continued areas of weakness are determined and possible instructional modifications are discussed.

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.

- Classroom Walkthroughs are conducted on a weekly basis by the principal and the leadership team.
- Data collected in these observations is discussed by the entire team to identify both effective and ineffective trends.
- Appropriate action steps are discussed and a plan of action is determined to remedy any deficiencies.
- Feedback is provided to individual teachers or entire departments as needed following the observations.

ACT

Supplemental and Intensive Instruction/Interventions

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

- All students are scheduled into reading, mathematics, science, language arts and social science classes according to FCAT results and teacher recommendation. Elective classes are scheduled by student / parent choice and are waved to provide additional academic time.
- Students are provided additional academic time during elective classes on an as needed basis by their core teachers.

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

- During the second quarter, students are pulled during their elective time for additional mathematics and reading instruction on an as needed basis.
- During the third quarter, students are pulled during their elective time three times a week for additional mathematics and reading instruction on an as needed basis.
- During the second and third quarters, ELLs, SWD, and struggling writers are pulled on an as needed basis by the writing coach and instructed in areas of need.

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

- Professional Learning Communities are formed by grade level and department.
- Learning communities disaggregate data and focus on instructional strategies that will improve academic performance.
- Classroom Walkthrough and PGP data is used to determine professional development needs for the staff.

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

- Level I and II students and cusp students in both reading and mathematics are targeted for interventions.
- Students who qualify for more than one AYP category are targeted.

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

- The effectiveness of interventions will be measured through periodic assessments including but not limited to BAT I, BAT II, and mini BAT assessments.

Enrichment

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

- The master schedule includes opportunities for enrichment and acceleration in the form of classes for students who are gifted, high achievers and advanced.
- In the general classroom, differentiated instruction is used to meet the academic needs of all students and create learning opportunities, which are both challenging and meaningful.
- Project-based learning with an emphasis on technology is offered through the GLIDES project.
- SMART classrooms have been provided to various teachers to facilitate instruction that is enhanced by technology.

Describe how students are identified for enrichment strategies.

- Students who have consistently shown proficiency in periodic assessments are targeted for enrichment activities and / or are assigned to gifted or STAR teams.

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)
Mathematics, by grade level	Stan Leone and Jan March	Monthly	3rd week of each month	Curriculum Alignment, Data Analysis, Lesson Study, Implementation of IFC, and Item Specification Training
Reading, by grade level	Stephanie Amara and Margaret Delatorre	Monthly	3rd week of each month	Curriculum Alignment, Data Analysis, Lesson Study, Implementation of IFC, and Item Specification Training
Language Arts Teachers	Thomas Correll	Monthly	3rd week of each month	Curriculum Alignment, Data Analysis, Lesson Study, Implementation of IFC, and Item Specification Training
Science, by grade level	Kathryn Stone	Monthly	3rd week of each month	Curriculum Alignment, Data Analysis, Lesson Study, Implementation of IFC, and Item Specification Training

NCLB Public School Choice

Note: For Title I schools only

- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status
[Show Attached Notification of \(School in Need of Improvement\) SINI Status](#)
- Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification
[Show 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:	<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		
2009 reading proficiency of 54% for the Total Population		62% of the Total Population will be proficient on the 2010 reading FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. After school tutoring	1. Reading Teacher	1. Scheduled classroom assessments	1. Strand Assessments
2	2. Small group pull-out tutoring sessions by strand	2. Reading Teacher and Stephanie Amara	2. Scheduled classroom assessments	2. Mini Benchmark Assessments and FAIR
3	3. Differentiated Instruction	3. Reading Coach	3. CWT	3. CWT data
4	4. Frequent progress monitoring using FAIR and the Teachers Tool Kit	4. Stephanie Amara and reading teachers	4. Scheduled progress checks	4. FAIR
5	5. Online resources such as BEEP lesson plans	5. Stephanie Amara and Margaret Delatorre	5. Monitor lesson plans	5. CWT and classroom observations
6	6. Instructional Focus Calendars	6. Stephanie Amara and Margaret Delatorre	6. CWT	6. CWT data
7	7. REWARDS instruction for below level intervention	7. Stephanie Amara and Margaret Delatorre	7. Monitor lesson plans	7. CWT and classroom observations

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 reading proficiency of 36% for the Black AYP subgroup		47% of the Black AYP subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 reading FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. After school tutoring	1. Reading Teacher	1. Scheduled classroom assessments	1. Strand Assessments
2	2. Small group pull-out tutoring sessions by strand	2. Stephanie Amara and Margaret Delatorre	2. Scheduled classroom assessments	2. Mini Benchmark Assessments and FAIR
3	3. Differentiated Instruction	3. Stephanie Amara	3. CWT	3. CWT data

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 reading proficiency was 50% for the Hispanic AYP subgroup		58% of the Hispanic AYP subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 reading FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool

1	1. Support Facilitation	1. Assistant Principal	1. Scheduled assessments	1. BAT, Mini Benchmark Assessments
2	2. Youth Development Program after school program	2. Program Coordinator	2. Assessments	2. Alternative and Project based assessments
3	3. Differentiated Instruction	3. Stephanie Amara	3. CWT	3. CWT data

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 reading proficiency of 23% for the ELL AYP subgroup		34% of the ELL AYP subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 reading FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Sheltered Scheduling by ELL classification	1. Assistant Principal	1. Scheduled assessments	1. BAT, Mini Benchmark Assessments and FAIR
2	2. Youth Development Program after school program	2. Program Coordinator	2. Assessments	2. Alternative and Project based assessments
3	3. Differentiated Instruction	3. Reading Coach	3. CWT	3. CWT data
4	4. Utilize ELL strategies from ELL Matrix	4. ELL contact	4. Monitoring Lesson Plans	4. CWT , classroom observations

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 reading proficiency was 33% for the SWD AYP subgroup		44% of SWD AYP subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 reading FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Weekly pull-out or in class assistance from Support Facilitators	1. Support Facilitators	1. Ongoing assessment in the classroom	1. DAR and FAIR
2	2. Differentiated Instruction	2. Stephanie Amara	2. CWT	2. CWT data
3	3. After school tutoring	3. Reading Teacher	3. Scheduled classroom assessments	3. Strand Assessments
4	4. Small group pull-out tutoring sessions by strand	4. Reading Teacher and Stephanie Amara	4. Scheduled classroom assessments	4. Mini-Benchmark Assessments and FAIR
5	4. Inclusion and Title I SWD teams	5. ESE Specialist	5. Scheduled classroom assessments	5. DAR, Mini-Benchmark assessments, and FAIR

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 reading proficiency was 48% for the SES AYP subgroup		59% of the SES AYP subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 reading FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. 21st Century Learning after school program	1. Grant Coordinator	1. Assessments	1. Alternative and Project based assessments
2	2. SES Tutoring	2. SES Coordinator	2. Period Assessments	2. Assessments from participating companies
3	3. After school tutoring	3. Reading Teacher	3. Scheduled classroom assessments	3. Strand Assessments
4	4. Small group pull-out tutoring sessions by strand	4. Reading Teacher and Stephanie Amara	4. Scheduled classroom assessments	4. Mini-Benchmark Assessments

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
All areas	Test Item Specifications training to facilitate the presentation of the IFC	Stephanie Amara	September and October 2009	Lesson Plans alignment with IFC and item specification	Stephanie Amara and Margaret Delatorre
All areas	Grade level collaboration to maximize the presentation of the IFCs	Margaret Delatorre	August through June	Classroom Observations of IFC presentation	Grade level administrator
All areas	FAIR implementation and data disaggregation	Stephanie Amara	September 2009 through March 2010	Data Chats	Stephanie Amara

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

- All content area teachers' curriculum will align with reading standards.
- A school-wide instructional focus calendar will ensure every teacher is aware of and incorporates a reading focus in their lessons.
- The reading coach will model reading strategies in content area classrooms.
- The reading coach will coach reading teachers to ensure they are using various reading strategies in their classroom.
- The reading coach will model reading strategies to the support staff. This will help make CWTs more effective.

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
90 Rewards Books	General Budget	\$400.00
		Total: \$400.00
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
6 Document Cameras	General Budget	\$4,800.00
		Total: \$4,800.00
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Adolescent Literacy by Beers, Probst, and Rief (1 for each teacher in the department)	General Budget	\$55.00
4 SDE Workshops	General Budget	\$520.00
		Total: \$575.00
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
After school and Saturday small group tutoring	SAI - General Budget	\$10,000.00
Novels	Accountability Funds	\$3,400.00
		Total: \$13,400.00
		Final Total: \$19,175.00

End of Reading Goal

Mathematics 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		
2009 mathematics proficiency was at 53% for the Total Population		61% of the Total Population will be proficient on the 2010 mathematics FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. After school tutoring	1. Mathematics Teacher	1. Scheduled classroom assessments	1. Strand Assessments
2	2. Small group pull-out tutoring sessions by strand	2. Mathematics Teacher and Jan March	2. Scheduled classroom assessments	2. Strand Assessments
3	3. Differentiated Instruction	3. Jan March	3. CWT	3. CWT data
4	4. On-line resources such as BEEP lesson plans	4. Jan March	4. Monitor lesson plans	4. CWT, Classroom observations
5	5. Instructional Focus Calendars	5. Jan March	5. CWT	5. CWT data

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 mathematics proficiency was 66% for the White AYP subgroup		74% of the White AYP subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 mathematics FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. After school tutoring	1. Mathematics Teacher	1. Scheduled classroom assessments	1. Strand Assessments
2	2. Small group pull-out tutoring sessions by strand	2. Mathematics Teacher and Jan March	2. Scheduled classroom assessments	2. Strand Assessments
3	3. Differentiated Instruction	3. Mathematics Coach	3. CWT	3. CWT data

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 mathematics proficiency was at 31 % for the Black AYP subgroup		42% of the Black AYP subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 mathematics FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. After school tutoring	1. Mathematics Teacher	1. Scheduled classroom assessments	1. Strand Assessments
2	2. Small group pull-out tutoring sessions by strand	2. Mathematics Teacher and Jan March	2. Scheduled classroom assessments	2. Strand Assessments
3	3. Differentiated Instruction	3. Jan March	3. CWT	3. CWT data

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 mathematics proficiency was 57% for the Hispanic AYP subgroup		65% of the Hispanic AYP subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 mathematics FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Support Facilitation	1. Assistant Principal	1. Scheduled assessments	1. BAT, Strand Assessments, mini BAT
2	2. Youth Development Program after school	2. Program Coordinator	2. Assessments	2. Alternative and Project based assessments

	program			
3	3. Differentiated Instruction	3. Jan March	3. Observation	3. CWT, Classroom observations

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 mathematics proficiency of 40% for the ELL AYP subgroup		51% for the ELL subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 mathematics FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Youth Development Program after school program	1. Program Coordinator	1. Assessments	1. Alternative and Project based assessments
2	2. Differentiated Instruction	2. Jan March	2. CWT	2. CWT data
3	3. Sheltered Scheduling by ELL classification	3. Assistant Principal	3. Scheduled assessments	3. BAT, Strand Assessments, mini BAT

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 mathematics proficiency was 29% for SWD AYP subgroup		41% of all SWD AYP subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 mathematics FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Weekly pull out or in class assistance from Support Facilitators	1. Support Facilitators	1. Ongoing assessment in the classroom	1. BAT, mini BAT, Strand Assessments
2	2. Differentiated Instruction	2. Jan March	2. CWT	2. CWT data
3	3. After school tutoring	3. Mathematics Teacher	3. Scheduled classroom assessments	3. Strand Assessments
4	4. Small group pull-out tutoring sessions by strand	4. Mathematics Teacher and Jan March	4. Scheduled classroom assessments	4. Strand Assessments
5	5. Inclusion and Title I / SWD teams	5. ESE Specialist	5. Scheduled classroom assessments	5. BAT and Mini Benchmark Assessments

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
2009 mathematics proficiency was 47% for the SES AYP subgroup		58% of the SES AYP subgroup will be proficient on the 2010 mathematics FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. 21st Century Learning after school program	1. Grant Coordinator	1. Assessments	1. Alternative and Project based assessments
2	2. SES Tutoring	2. SES Coordinator	2. Period Assessments	2. Assessments from participating companies
3	3. After school tutoring	3. Mathematics Teacher	3. Scheduled classroom assessments	3. Strand Assessments
4	4. Small group pull-out tutoring sessions by strand	4. Mathematics Teacher and Jan March	4. Scheduled classroom assessments	4. Strand Assessments

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
All areas	Test Item Specifications training to facilitate the presentation of the IFC	Jan March	September and October 2009	Lesson Plans alignment with IFC and Item Specification	Stan Leone
	Next Generation			Lesson Plans	

All areas	Standards training to prepare students for future mathematics success	Mathematics Teachers	March 2010	alignment with IFC and Next Generation Standards	Jan March
All areas	Grade level collaboration to maximize the presentation of the IFCs	Stan Leone	August through June	Classroom Observations of IFC presentation	Grade level administrator

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Release Time for Teachers	General Budget	\$3,000.00
Total: \$3,000.00		
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
After school and Saturday small group tutoring	SAI - General budget	\$10,000.00
Total: \$10,000.00		
Final Total: \$13,000.00		

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		
2009 Science Proficiency was at 39%		50% of all 8th grade students will be proficient on the 2010 Science FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Science Coach Schedule for Push-in and Small Group Assistance	1. Assistant Principal	1. CWT	1. CWT data
2	2. Weekly Science Word	2. Science Coach	2. CWT	2. CWT data
3	3. Hands On Learning - Laboratory Work	3. Science Department Chair	3. CWT	3. Lab Report
4	4. Preferential Seating	4. Classroom Teacher	4. Assessment	4. Mini-BAT
5	5. Differentiated Instruction	5. Classroom Teacher	5. Assessment	5. Work Samples
6	6. Technology Usage including online resources and interactive slates	6. Science Coach	6. CWT	6. CWT data
7	7. IFC activities and resources	7. Science Coach	7. CWT	7. Lesson Plans and Work Samples
8	8. Higher order Questioning	8. Classroom Teacher	8. Lesson Plan Development	7. Lesson Plans

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
Low mean by content area in Physical and Chemical (54%) on the 2009 Science FCAT		62% mean points in Physical and Chemical on the 2010 Science FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Spiraling Review with Supplemental Materials	1. Science Department Chair	1. Assessment	1. BAT I and BAT II
2	2. Differentiated Instruction	2. Science Department Chair	2. Observation	2. CWT/ Work Samples
3	3. Extended Learning Opportunities	3. ELO coordinator	3. Assessment	3. Mini-BAT

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
Low mean by content area in Life and Environment (54%) on the 2009 Science FCAT		62% mean points in Life and Environment on the 2010 Science FCAT		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Spiraling Review with Supplemental Materials	1. Science Department Chair	1. Assessment	1. BAT I and BAT II
2	2. Differentiated Instruction	2. Science Department Chair	2. Observation	2. CWT/ Work Samples
3	3. Extended Learning Opportunities	3. ELO coordinator	3. Assessment	3. Mini-BAT

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/ Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Overall Students	Test Item Specifications	County Curriculum Specialist	September 2009	Lesson Plan Development	Science Department Chair
Science Overall Students	Science Department Release Day	Science Department Release Day	September 2009	Classroom Walkthrough	Assistant Principal
All Students	Curriculum Alignment, Data Analysis, Lesson Study, Implementation of IFC, and Item Specification Training	Kathryn Stone	September 2009 - May 2010	Classroom Walkthrough	Support Staff

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Total: \$0.00		
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Release Time for Teachers	General Budget	\$2,280.00
Total: \$2,280.00		
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Consumable Laboratory Materials	Accountability Funds	\$4,000.00

After school and Saturday small group tutoring	SAI - General budget	\$4,000.00
		Total: \$8,000.00
		Final Total: \$10,280.00

End of Science Goal

Writing 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	
In 2009, 85% Non-Gifted ESE Population was proficient on the writing FCAT			95% of the Non-Gifted ESE Population will be proficient on the 2010 writing FCAT	
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Inclusion Team	1. ESE Specialist	1. Bi-weekly Writing Assessments	1. Writing Prompt
2	2. Co-Teaching Model with Writing Coach	2. Writing Coach	2. Bi-weekly Writing Assessments	2. Writing Prompt
3	3. Small Group Pull-out Instruction	3. Writing Coach	3. Five Day Instructional Series	3. Writing Prompt
4	4. Small Group Pull-out Instruction	4. Support Facilitator	4. Five Day Instruction Series	4. Writing Prompt
5	5. On line resources and IFCs	5. Writing coach	5. Teachers made assessments	5. Teacher made tests

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement			Objective Linked to Area of Improvement	
In 2009 87% of the ELL Population was proficient on the Writing FCAT.			97% of ELL students will be proficient on the 2010 Writing FCAT.	
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Sheltered Scheduling	1. ELL Contact	1. Bi-weekly Writing Assessments	1. Writing Prompt
2	2. ELL Team as determined by ELL clasification	2. Assistant Principal in Charge of Scheduling	2. Bi-weekly Writing Assessments	2. Writing Prompt
3	3. Coaching Reinforcement within Classroom completed monthly	3. Writing Coach	3. Monthly teacher assessment	3. 6-Traits individual assessment
4	4. Small Group Pull-out Instruction	4. Writing Coach	4. Five Day Instructional Series	4. Writing Prompt
5	5. On line resources and IFCs	5. Writing Coach	5. Teacher assessments	Teacher made tests

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement			Objective Linked to Area of Improvement	
On initial assessment in spring of 2009, 80% of incoming 8th grade students were proficient.			by June 2010, 98% of all students will be proficient on the FCAT Writing.	
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Small Group Pull-out Instruction	1. Writing Coach	1. Five Day Instructional Series	1. Writing Prompt
2	2. Differentiated Instruction	2. Classroom Teacher	2. Bi-weekly Writing Assessment	2. Writing Prompt

3	3. Coaching Reinforcement within Classroom every other month	3. Writing Coach and classroom teacher	3. Teacher assessments based on student needs	3. 6-Traits individualized lessons
4	4. On line resources and IFCs	4. Writing Coach	4. Teacher assessments	4. Teacher made tests

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Implementation of the writing process	PLC: Language Arts teachers by grade level	Tommy Correll	September 2009 – March 2010	Bi-weekly Writing Assessment, FCAT Writing Results, and FAIR results	Assistant Principal in Charge of Writing
Implementation of the writing process	Understanding implementation of FAIR and developing Stem questions	Stephanie Amara	October 2009	FAIR results	Writing Coach

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Interactive Readers	General Budget	\$1,300.00
Novels to support IFC	Accountability Funds	\$2,500.00
		Total: \$3,800.00
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		Total: \$0.00
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teacher Release Time for Data Disaggregation	General Budget	\$2,700.00
		Total: \$2,700.00
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Saturday small group tutoring	SAI - General Budget	\$4,000.00
		Total: \$4,000.00
		Final Total: \$10,500.00

End of Science Goal

Parent Involvement Goal

Needs Assessment:	<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		
Overall parent participation in school activities was below desired levels		By June 2010, 80% of all families will participate in a school activity		
Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool	
1. Two Open Houses	1. Assistant Principal	1. Record of Attendance	1. Parent Sign-In	

2	2. Report Card Pick Up	2. Assistant Principal	2. Record of Attendance	2. Parent Sign-In
3	3. Great Start Breakfast	3. Volunteer Coordinator	3. Record of Attendance	3. Parent Sign In
4	4. Straight A Breakfast	4. Assistant Principal	4. Record of Attendance	4. Parent Sign-In
5	5. Awards Night	5. Assistant Principal	5. Record of Attendance	5. Parent Sign-In
6	6. Disseminate Student Planners and outline daily use by team	6. Classroom Teacher	6. Teacher Monitoring of Use	6. Teacher Observation

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
Parent participation of ELL parents in school activities was below desired levels		By June 2010, 80% of ELL families will participate in a school activity		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Information sent home in native language	1. ELL contact	1. Survey	1. Title 1 Parent Survey
2	2. On-Site interpreters	2. ELL Contact	2. Survey	2. Title 1 Parent Survey

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
Parent participation of parents of SES students in school activities was below desired levels		By June 2010, 80% of SES families will participate in a school activity		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Parent Contact through Youth Development Program	1. On-Site Facilitator	1. Survey	1. Title 1 Parent Survey
2	2. Parent Contact for Student Supplemental Services	2. Grade Level Assistant Principal	2. Contact Log	2. Team Spreadsheet
3	3. Fall and Winter Open House	3. Team Leader	3. Record of Attendance	3. Parent Sign-In

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
All Students	Orientation for Open House and Conferences	Assistant Principal	September 2009	Observation	Assistant Principals
All Students	Disseminate Student Planners and outline daily use by team	Team Leaders	September 2009	Checking student planners	Classroom teachers

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Student Planners	Title I - Parent Involvement	\$6,004.00
		Total: \$6,004.00
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		Total: \$0.00
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		Total: \$0.00
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		Total: \$0.00
		Final Total: \$6,004.00

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	90 Rewards Books	General Budget	\$400.00
Writing	Interactive Readers	General Budget	\$1,300.00
Writing	Novels to support IFC	Accountability Funds	\$2,500.00
Parental Involvement	Student Planners	Title I - Parent Involvement	\$6,004.00
			Total: \$10,204.00
Technology			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	6 Document Cameras	General Budget	\$4,800.00
			Total: \$4,800.00
Professional Development			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Adolescent Literacy by Beers, Probst, and Rief (1 for each teacher in the department)	General Budget	\$55.00
Reading	4 SDE Workshops	General Budget	\$520.00
Mathematics	Release Time for Teachers	General Budget	\$3,000.00
Writing	Teacher Release Time for Data Disaggregation	General Budget	\$2,700.00
Science	Release Time for Teachers	General Budget	\$2,280.00
			Total: \$8,555.00
Other			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	After school and Saturday small group tutoring	SAI - General Budget	\$10,000.00
Reading	Novels	Accountability Funds	\$3,400.00
Mathematics	After school and Saturday small group tutoring	SAI - General budget	\$10,000.00
Writing	Saturday small group tutoring	SAI - General Budget	\$4,000.00
Science	Consumable Laboratory Materials	Accountability Funds	\$4,000.00
Science	After school and Saturday small group tutoring	SAI - General budget	\$4,000.00
			Total: \$35,400.00
			Final Total: \$58,959.00

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.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Student Materials and Supplies	6158

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

N/A

SAC Members

Members

- 1) Kim Flynn, Principal
- 2) Kerry Kerr, SAC Chair
- 3) Shelly Toth, SAC Chair
- 4) Catherine Curry, Teacher
- 5) Maris Darab, Business Member
- 6) Clara Martinez, Parent
- 7) Sandra Benz, Parent
- 8) William Lennox, Community Member
- 9) Nicholas Haugen, Union Steward

AYP DATA

2008-2009 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2														Broward OLSEN MIDDLE SCHOOL 0471													
Number of students enrolled in the grades tested: Click here to see Number of students in each group														Read: 1214 Math: 1214		2008-2009 School Grade ¹ : B		Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress?		NO							
This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c ²).														This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b ²).						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 ³ 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 ⁴	98	Y	98	Y	54	N	53	N			Y			NA	46	46	N	42	47	N	55	N	55	N			
WHITE	98	Y	98	Y	70	Y	66	N	94		Y			NA	33	30	NA	29	34	N	70	NA	67	N			
BLACK	97	Y	97	Y	36	N	31	N	94		Y			NA	58	64	N	62	69	N	38	N	34	N			
HISPANIC	98	Y	98	Y	50	N	57	N			Y			NA	53	50	N	44	43	N	52	N	58	N			
ASIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA			NA						NA							
AMERICAN INDIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA			NA						NA							
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	97	Y	97	Y	48	N	47	N			Y			NA	54	52	N	50	53	N	49	N	49	N			
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	97	Y	97	Y	23	N	40	N	83		Y			NA	75	77	N	51	60	N	33	N	47	N			
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	96	Y	97	Y	33	N	29	N	89	90	Y			NA	69	67	N	72	71	N	36	N	29	N			

2007-2008 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2														Broward OLSEN MIDDLE SCHOOL 0471													
Number of students enrolled in the grades tested: Click here to see Number of students in each group														Read: 1176 Math: 1176		2007-2008 School Grade ¹ : A		Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress?		NO							
This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c ²).														This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b ²).						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 ³ 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 ⁴	98	Y	98	Y	54	N	58	N	93		Y			NA	51	46	N	51	42	Y	51	N	64	NA			
WHITE	98	Y	98	Y	67	Y	71	Y	94		Y			NA	38	33	NA	39	29	NA	60	NA	73	NA			
BLACK	98	Y	98	Y	42	N	38	N	94	94	Y			NA	68	58	Y	69	62	Y	38	NA	45	NA			
HISPANIC	98	Y	98	Y	47	N	56	N	91		Y			NA	56	53	N	52	44	Y	48	N	66	NA			
ASIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA			NA						NA							
AMERICAN INDIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA			NA						NA							
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	98	Y	98	Y	46	N	50	N	92		Y			NA	59	54	N	58	50	Y	44	N	58	NA			
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	98	Y	97	Y	25	N	49	N	81	83	Y			NA	84	75	Y	65	51	Y	43	NA	66	NA			
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	96	Y	96	Y	31	N	28	N	67	89	Y			NA	80	69	Y	83	72	Y	31	NA	41	NA			

2006-2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2														Broward OLSEN MIDDLE SCHOOL 0471													
Number of students enrolled in the grades tested: Click here to see Number of students in each group														Read: 1310 Math: 1310		2006-2007 School Grade ¹ : C		Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress?		NO							
This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c ²).														This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b ²).						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 ³ 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 ⁴	99	Y	99	Y	49	N	49	N	93		Y			NA	49	51	N	45	51	N	43	N	56	Y			
WHITE	99	Y	99	Y	62	Y	61	Y			Y			NA	37	38	NA	31	39	NA	45	NA	57	NA			
BLACK	98	Y	98	Y	32	N	31	N	93	94	Y			NA	66	68	N	62	69	N	36	N	46	N			
HISPANIC	99	Y	99	Y	44	N	48	N	91		Y			NA	52	56	N	50	52	N	43	N	59	Y			
ASIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA			NA						NA							
AMERICAN INDIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA			NA						NA							
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	99	Y	99	Y	41	N	42	N	92		Y			NA	56	59	N	51	58	N	39	N	52	N			
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	99	Y	98	Y	16	N	35	N	89	81	N			NA	71	84	N	60	65	N	44	N	57	N			
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	97	Y	97	Y	20	N	17	N	78	67	N			NA	80	80	N	82	83	N	31	N	33	N			

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

Broward School District OLSEN MIDDLE SCHOOL 2008-2009					
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	58%	57%	98%	39%	252
% of Students Making Learning Gains	65%	62%			127
Writing and Science: 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. 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 					

Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	71% (YES)	61% (YES)			132	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					511	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District OLSEN MIDDLE SCHOOL 2007-2008						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	60%	62%	93%	43%	258	Writing and Science: 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.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	65%	73%			138	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	72% (YES)			139	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					535	
Percent Tested = 97%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District OLSEN MIDDLE SCHOOL 2006-2007						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	55%	55%	85%	38%	233	Writing and Science: 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.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	57%	61%			118	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	63% (YES)	58% (YES)			121	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
Points Earned					472	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested