FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: PRINCETON HOUSE CHARTER

District Name: Orange

Principal: Kim Gelalia

SAC Chair:

Superintendent: Barbara Jenkins

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 11/9/2012



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner Florida Department of Education 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor K-12 Public Schools Florida Department of Education 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Kim Gelalia	B.S Child Development M.A. Varying Exceptionalities Florida Certification Educational Leadership ESE (K-12) Early Childhood (K-3) Autism Endorsement	16	8	
Assis Principal	Melissa Jones	Bachelors degree in Communicative Disorders Masters degree in Communicative	16	1	

Disorders		
ESE (K-12) Speech Language		

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
	We do not have coaches				

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Provide support services to teachers in order to meet HQT standards	Administration	ongiong	
2	Assist with opportunities for 20 professional development hours per year	Administration	ongiong	
3	Certification assistance for teachers and paraprofessionals	Administration	ongoing	
4	Strong team decision making for instructional materials and strategies	Administration, teachers and therapists	ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out- of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
ESOL/E-7	
Autism/E-1	
ESOL/E & Autism/E-5	Require teachers to enroll
Autism/E&ESOL/E&Gifted/E -1	in the ESOL courses and begin the Autism endorsement coursework.
ESOL/E&Elem.ED.K- 6/Autism/E-1	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers		% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
20	10.0%(2)	45.0%(9)	45.0%(9)	0.0%(0)	25.0%(5)	95.0%(19)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	10.0%(2)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee	Rationale	Planned Mentoring
	Assigned	for Pairing	Activities
Shana Giroux	Dianna Sykes Ashley Stokes Andrew Palmisano Stephanie Trencansky	Autism	Professional Development Activities Regularly Scheduled Observations Collaborative Teaching Team Meetings

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

rograms, nousing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applical	DIC.
tie i, rait A	
itle I, Part C- Migrant	
itle I, Part D	
itle II	
itle III	
itle X- Homeless	
tte A- Homeless	
upplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)	
iolence Prevention Programs	
utrition Programs	

Housing Programs
Head Start
Tread Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)
-School-based MTSS/RtI Team-
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.
The student population at Princeton House is comprised of 100% students identified as ESE. Therefore we do not implement RtI strategies.
Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?
ANTOO I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
MTSS I mplementation Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics,
science, writing, and behavior.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
Describe the plan to support MTSS.

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team-

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

dentify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
what will be the major mittatives of the LET this year:
ublic School Choice
Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment
Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
escribe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as pplicable.
Grades 6-12 Only
ec. 1003.413(b) F.S.
or schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.
High Schools Only
ote: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.
ow does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and elevance to their future?
ow does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that tudents' course of study is personally meaningful?
ostsecondary Transition
ote: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
escribe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High Schoo</u> eedback Report

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		a, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identif	y and define areas in need
1a. FCAT2.0: Students streading. Reading Goal #1a:	t Level 3 in	N/A. The majority of our student population particpates in the FAA.			
2012 Current Level of P		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	ance:	
N/A		N/A			
	Problem-Solving Pr	rocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
for				Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		

	d on the analysis of studen provement for the following		eference to "Guiding	Questions", identify and	define areas in need	
Stud	Torida Alternate Assessnents scoring at Levels 4, ling Goal #1b:		students will inc	By the end of the school year 2013, 80% of the targeted students will increase their reading level performance by at least 1 performance level.		
2012	2 Current Level of Perforr	nance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:		
In 20	112, 29% scored at a level	4, 5, or 6 in reading.	students will inc	By the end of the school year 2013, 80% of the targeted students will increase their reading level performance by at least 1 performance level.		
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier Strategy R		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	Characteristics and cognitive deficits associated with Autism Spectrum Disorder	Intensive instruction in small group (1:3) adult to student ratios in all academic settings.	Collaborative team of administrators, curriculum resource teacher, therapists and ESE teachers.		FAA	
2	Maladaptive Behaviors	Individual Positive Behavior Improvement Plans for students in need and social skills training for all students.	Collaborative team of administrators, curriculum resource teacher, behavior analysts, therapists and ESE teachers.	Review progress every nine weeks.	Behavior Data Collection ABLLS	
	Communicative Disorders	Integrated Speech and Language Interventions		Review progress every nine weeks.	Goal data collection	

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

3		Use of augmentative and alternative modes of	analysts, therapists and ESE		Speech Language Assessments
---	--	--	---------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. NA Reading Goal #2a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: NA NA Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.

Reading Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

In 2012, 33% scored at a level 7 or above in reading.

By the end of the school year 2013, 80% of the students that scored at a level 7 and 8 will increase their reading level performance by at least 1 performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

By the end of the school year 2013, 80% of the students that scored at a level 7 and 8 will increase their reading level performance by at least 1 performance level.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Characteristics and cognitive deficits associated with Autism Spectrum Disorder	small group (1:3) adult to		Results of 2013 FAA	FAA
2	Maladaptive Behaviors	Individual Positive Behavior Improvement Plans for students in need and social skills training for all students.		Review progress every nine weeks.	Behavior Data Collection ABLLS

	Communicative Disorder	Language Interventions	nine weeks.	Goal data collection
3		Use of augmentative and alternative modes of communication.		Speech Language Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. N/A Reading Goal #3a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: N/A N/A Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

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

reading.	By the end of the school year 2013, 50% or more of the student population will make reading gains in order for the school to receive at least a maintaining rating.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	By the end of the school year 2013, 50% or more of the student population will make reading gains in order for the school to receive at least a maintaining rating.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Characteristics and cognitive deficits associated with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)	small group (1:3) adult to student ratios in all	Collaborative team of administrators, curriculum resource teacher, therapists and ESE teachers.		FAA
2	Maladaptive Behaviors	Behavior Improvement Plans for students in need and social skills		nine weeks.	Behavior Data Collection ABLLS

I	I	I	teachers.		
3	Communicative Disorders	Language Interventions provided daily. Use of augmentative and alternative modes of communication.	of administrators, curriculum resource		Goal data collection Speech Language Assessments
4	Students with ASD have weaker skills with processing auditory information than neurologically typical peers.	individuals with ASD generally have stronger visual processing	of administrators, curriculum resource teacher, therapists and ESE teachers.	Review results of the FAA reading portion along with mastery of reading related curriculum and learning IEP goals.	FAA IEP

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:							
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:			N/A				
2012 Current Level of Po	erformance:		2013 Expe	ected Level of Performar	nce:		
N/A			N/A				
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy							
	No Data Submitted						

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target										
5A. Ambitious Measurable Ob school will red by 50%.	ojectives (AMO	s). In six year	Reading Goal # N/A 5A:			<u></u>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017				

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making

satisfactory progress in reading.				N/A					
Reading Goal #5B:									
2012 Current Level of Performance:					2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
N/A					N/A				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease St	uden	t Achievement		
for			Dete	ess Used to rmine ctiveness of tegy	Eval	uation Tool			
			Λ	No Data	Submitted				
	on the analysis of provement for the fo		t achievement data, ai subgroup:	nd refer	ence to "Gu	iiding	Questions", identify	and o	define areas in need
satisf	nglish Language L actory progress i ng Goal #5C:		s (ELL) not making ng.		N/A				
2012	Current Level of I	Perform	nance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
N/A				N/A					
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease St	uden	t Achievement		
Antic	ipated Barrier	Strat	egy	Posit Resp for	on or ion ionsible toring	Dete	ess Used to rmine ctiveness of tegy	Eval	uation Tool
		'	Λ	<u> </u>	a Submitted				
Based	on the analysis of	student	t achievement data, aı	nd refer	rence to "Gu	iidina	Questions" identify	and o	define areas in need
of imp	rovement for the for	ollowing	subgroup:	110 10101					
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:			100% of our students are identified as students with disabilities. Our school goals target reading and are stated in sections 1b,2b,and 3b of this report.						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
N/A			N/A						
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease St	uden	t Achievement		
	Anticipated Ba	rrier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible Monitorin	for	Process Used t Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool

1	Characteristics and cognitive deficits associated with Autism Spectrum Disorder	small group (1:3) adult to student ratios in all academic settings.		Reading Assessments, IEP checklists,	???
2	Maladaptive Behaviors	Behavior Improvement Plans for students in	Collaborative team of administrators, behavior analysts and ESE teachers.	3	Behavior Data, graphs

Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, and llowing subgroup:	l refer	ence to "Gı	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:			N/A			
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforr	mance:	
N/A			N/A			
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy						
	No Data Submitted					

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teacher training for effective use of technology- interactive whiteboards	K-5		K-5	Start of school year with periodic trainings	Classroom observations and student progress	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Teachers
Grade level Team meetings	PK-5		School-wide	Monthly	Walk throughs, teacher surveys	Administration and CRT
Unique Learning Systems Training	K-5		K-5	Fall 2012	Review of Lesson Plans Reading Block Observations	Administration and CRT
FAA training	3-5	District Staff	3-5	Fall 2012	Monitoring Testing	Administration and CRT
					Review of Lesson	

Education City Training	K-5	Archipelago	K-5	Fall 2012		Administration and CRT
PMAP Training	K-5	District Staff	K-5	Fall 2012	J 1	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Teachers

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Mater	ial(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
Research supports that individuals with ASD generally have stronger visual processing capabilities as compared to other modes of processing information. Therefore the school purchased tablets and interactive whiteboards for classroom use in order to present information in a visually rich manner.	Education City, Reading A to Z	School Budget	\$2,036.00
			Subtotal: \$2,036.0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Research supports that individuals with ASD generally have stronger visual processing capabilities as compared to other modes of processing information. Therefore the school purchased tablets and interactive whiteboards for classroom use in order to present information in a visually rich manner.	Interactive whiteboards	Grant and School Budget	\$12,775.00
		•	Subtotal: \$12,775.0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
Provide training to teachers during planning times and grade level meetings. Support staff in attending district trainings	PD 360, OCPS and FDLRS trainings, grade level meetings	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
		Gı	and Total: \$14,811.0

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

st When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70	<i>0% (35</i>	5))
---	---------------	-----

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.				
CELLA Goal #1:	N/A			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				

I/A					
	Problem-Solving Problem-Solvin	ocess to Ir	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monit	on onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	ubmitted		
Students read in English	n at grade level text in a	manner sir	nilar to n	on-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring p	roficient in reading.		N/A		
CELLA Goal #2:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
N/A					
	Problem-Solving Problem-	ocess to Ir	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monit	on onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S			
Students write in Englis	h at grade level in a mar	nner similar	to non-E	LL students.	
3. Students scoring p	roficient in writing.				
CELLA Goal #3:			N/A		
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient	in writing:			
N/A					
	Problem-Solving Problem-	ocess to Ir	crease S	Student Achievement	·
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monit	on onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	-	-		1	•

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

	ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students s mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	scoring at Achievement Leve	The majority of our students participate in the FAA.				
2012 Current Level of Po		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
N/A			N/A			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for			on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted						

	d on the analysis of studen provement for the following		eference to "Guiding	Questions", identify and o	define areas in need	
Stud	lorida Alternate Assessn ents scoring at Levels 4, ematics Goal #1b:			In 2013, at least 80% of the targeted students will show an increase of at least 1 point in their performance score in mathematics.		
2012	Current Level of Perforn	nance:	2013 Expected	Level of Performance:		
	12, 30% of students asses or 6 in mathematics.	ssed with the FAA scored a		st 80% of the targeted stu east 1 point in their perform		
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process t	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	Characteristics and cognitive deficits associated with Autism Spectrum Disorder	Intensive instruction in small group (1:3) adult to student ratios in all academic settings.	Collaborative team of administrators, curriculum resource teacher, and ESE teachers.		FAA	
2	Maladaptive Behaviors	Individual Positive Behavior Improvement Plans for students in need and social skills training for all students.	Collaborative team of administrators, curriculum resource teacher, behavior analysts, and ESE teachers.	nine weeks	Data collection ABLLS	
	Communicative Disorders Integrated Speech and Language Interventions provided daily. Use of augmentative and alternative modes of	Language Interventions provided daily. Use of augmentative and	of administrators, curriculum resource		Goal data collection Speech Language Assessments	

3	communication. Programming of context specific vocabulary with assistive technology for communication. Collaborative team of administrators, curriculum resource teacher, behavior analysts, therapists and ESE teachers. Review progress every nine weeks. Goal data collection Speech Language Assessments	specific vocabulary with assistive technology for communication.	teachers.		
4	Students with ASD have weaker skills with processing auditory information than neurologically typical peers.	Research supports that individuals with ASD generally have stronger visual processing capabilities as compared to other modes of processing information. Therefore the school purchased tablets and interactive whiteboards for classroom use in order to present information in a visually rich manner.	teacher, and ESE teachers.	2013 FAA results Math related IEP goal progress	FAA IEP

	on the analysis of student rovement for the following	achievement data, and regroup:	ference to "Guiding	Questions", identify and o	define areas in need	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:			NA NA			
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
NA			NA	NA		
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	NA					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	By the end of the school year 2013, 80% of the students that scored at a level 7 and 8 will increase their math level performance by at least 1 performance level.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			

In 2012, 20% of students assessed with the FAA scored a level 7 or above in mathematics.

By the end of the school year 2013, 80% of the students that scored at a level 7 and 8 will increase their math level performance by at least 1 performance level.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Characteristics and cognitive deficits associated with Autism Spectrum Disorder	Intensive instruction in small group (1:3) adult to student ratios in all academic settings		Results of 2013 FAA	FAA
2	Maladaptive Behaviors	Individual Positive Behavior Improvement Plans for students in need and social skills training for all students.	Collaborative team of administrators, curriculum resource teacher, behavior analysts, therapists and ESE teachers.	Review progress every nine weeks.	Behavior Data Collection ABLLS
3	Communicative Disorders	Integrated Speech and Language Interventions provided daily. Use of augmentative and alternative modes of communication. Programming of context specific vocabulary with assistive technology for communication.	Collaborative team of administrators, curriculum resource teacher, behavior analysts, therapists and ESE teachers.	Review progress every nine weeks.	Goal data collection Speech Language Assessments
4	Students with ASD have weaker skills with processing auditory information than neurologically typical peers.	Research supports that individuals with ASD generally have stronger visual processing capabilities as compared to other modes of processing information. Therefore the school purchased tablets and interactive whiteboards for classroom use in order to present information in a visually rich manner.	of administrators, curriculum resource teacher, and ESE teachers.	FAA results from math section. Math related goals under the curriculum and learning domain.	FAA IEP

Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, and Ilowing group:	d refer	ence to "Gi	uiding Questions", identif	y and define areas in need
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:		ng	N/A		
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Ехр	ected Level of Perform	ance:
N/A			N/A		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data S	Submitted		

of improvemen	it for the foll	owing group:							
Percentage of mathematics	Bb. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:				N/A				
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		2	2013 Expe	ected Leve	el of Performar	nce:	
		opulation made n from the previous			N/A				
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to In	icrease St	udent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated B	Barrier	Strategy		Person Position Respons for Monito	on onsible	Process U Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eval	luation Tool
			No	Data S	ubmitted				
of improvemen 4. FCAT 2.0: F making learni Mathematics	t for the follows: Percentage ing gains in Goal #4:	owing group: of students in L n mathematics.		,	N/A				define areas in need
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:			2013 Expe	ected Leve	el of Performar	nce:	
N/A				1	N/A				
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to In	icrease St	udent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated B	Barrier	Strategy		Person Position Respons for Monito	on onsible	Process L Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eval	luation Tool
			No	Data S	ubmitted				
Based on Ambi	itious but Ad	chievable Annual					Reading and Ma	ith Pe	erformance Target
5A. Ambitious Measurable Ob school will redu by 50%.	jectives (AM	10s). In six year	Elementary N/A 5A:	School	Mathemat	ics Goal #			<u></u>
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2	014	2014	-2015	2015-2016)	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups Hispanic, Asian, Americ satisfactory progress in			N/A			
Mathematics Goal #5B:						
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ince:	
N/A	N/A					
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, and llowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
satisfactory progress ir			N/A			
Mathematics Goal #5C:						
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ince:	
N/A			N/A			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	rudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion ionsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No) Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, and Ilowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
5D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress ir Mathematics Goal #5D:			disabilities	ur students are identified . Our school goals target ections 1b and 2b of this	mathematics and are	
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ince:	
N/A	Deplace Calif. 5		N/A	undanah Asia kuma		
İ	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		

of improvement for the following subgroup:

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data Submitted		

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	student achievement data, and lowing subgroup:	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:			N/A		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expe	ected Level of Performar	nce:
N/A			N/A		
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I r	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monit	ion onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data S	Submitted		

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

* when using percentages,	include the number of s	students the perc	entage repr	esenis (e.g., 70% (35)).	
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in need
1a. FCAT2.0: Students mathematics.	scoring at Achiever	ment Level 3 in			
Mathematics Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data :	Submitted		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Seased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need in mathematics. Anticipated Barrier Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement word 4 in mathematics. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Evaluation Tool Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Evaluation Tool Process Used to Determine Evaluation Tool Anticipated Barrier Strategy Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Determine Evaluation Tool Strategy Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy Strategy Evaluation Tool First Evaluation Tool Firs	of improvement for the fo	llowing group:				
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process to Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Anticipated Barrier Strategy No Data Submitted Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Process Used to Petermine Effectiveness of Strategy Process Used to Peterm	1b. Florida Alternate As	ssessment:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy Person or Position Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy Responsible Evaluation Tool Strate	Students scoring at Lev	els 4, 5, and 6 in matl	nematics.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible Information Increase Student Achievement No Bata Submitted No Bata Submitted No Bata Submitted No Bata Submitted Strategy No Bata Submitted Strategy No Bata Submitted Description Effectiveness of Strategy No Bata Submitted Strategy No Bata Submitted Description Increase Student Strategy No Bata Submitted Strategy Person or Position Process to Increase Student Achievement Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy No Bata Submitted Person or Position Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy No Bata Submitted No Bata Submit	Mathematics Goal #1b:					
Anticipated Barrier Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Data Submitted No Data Submitted Process Used to Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used Increase Student Achievement Anticipated Barrier Strategy Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted No Da	2012 Current Level of P	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:
Anticipated Barrier Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Problem-Solving at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics. Note that the following group: No Data Submitted No D						
Anticipated Barrier Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Problem-Solving at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics. Note that the following group: No Data Submitted No D						
Anticipated Barrier Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Data Submitted No Data Submitted Process Used to Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used Increase Student Achievement Anticipated Barrier Strategy Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted No Da		Problem-Solving	Process to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Sub			100033 to 1		Tadent Hernevernent	
Responsible frectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted					Process Used to	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Monitoring No Data Submitted Person or Position Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp for	onsible	Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
f improvement for the following group: a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: O12 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Paragon or Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Acticipated Barrier No Data Submitted Acticipated Barrier Student Achievement Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Acticipated Barrier Student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need f improvement for the following group: 10. Florida Alternate Assessment: 3. Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in anathematics. 3. Mathematics Goal #2b: 3. Supported Level of Performance: 2. Supported Level of Performance:		_				
f improvement for the following group: a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: O12 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Paragon or Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Acticipated Barrier No Data Submitted Acticipated Barrier Student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need f improvement for the following group: b. Florida Alternate Assessment: students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in anathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: O12 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
f improvement for the following group: a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: O12 Current Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Paragon or Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Acticipated Barrier No Data Submitted Acticipated Barrier Student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need f improvement for the following group: b. Florida Alternate Assessment: students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in anathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: O12 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:	Donad on the second of	aki akan kan aki tari			udalia a Occasiona III III III	for and define and
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Take on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need improvement for the following group: 10. Florida Alternate Assessment: tudents scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in nathematics. Alathematics Goal #2b: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:			ia, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	ıy and define areas in need
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Taked on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need in improvement for the following group: the Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in nathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:	2a. FCAT 2.0: Students Level 4 in mathematics		chievement			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Evaluation Tool Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Evaluation Tool Strategy Evaluati	Mathematics Goal #2a:					
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Rased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need if improvement for the following group: 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: 1. Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:	2012 Current Level of P	Performance:		2013 Ехр	pected Level of Perform	nance:
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Assed on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need fimprovement for the following group: 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: 1. Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. 1. Mathematics Goal #2b: 1. O12 Current Level of Performance: 2. O13 Expected Level of Performance:						
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Assed on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need fimprovement for the following group: 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: 1. Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. 1. Mathematics Goal #2b: 1. O12 Current Level of Performance: 2. O13 Expected Level of Performance:						
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Frocess Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Evaluation Tool Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Frocess Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Evaluation Tool Evaluation Tool Strategy Frocess Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Evaluation Tool Strategy Evaluation Tool		Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted No Data Submitted Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted Responsible for Strategy Evaluation Tool Evaluation Tool Evaluation Tool Evaluation Tool Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Evaluation Too					Process Used to	
No Data Submitted Fased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need in improvement for the following group: Substitute the provided Alternate Assessment: Substitute the provided Altern	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp for	onsible	Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
dased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need in improvement for the following group: ab. Florida Alternate Assessment: atudents scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
f improvement for the following group: tb. Florida Alternate Assessment: students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in nathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
f improvement for the following group: tb. Florida Alternate Assessment: students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in nathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:			ta, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need
Mathematics Goal #2b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:	2b. Florida Alternate As	ssessment:				
2013 Expected Level of Performance:	Students scoring at or a mathematics.	above Achievement Le	evel 7 in			
	Mathematics Goal #2b:					
Droblem Calving Decrease to Leaves a Charles LA	2012 Current Level of P	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:
Droblem Calvin a December to Lance of Charles L.A. L.						
Droblem Calidre Decrease to Jacobs Charles 1.4.1.1						
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement		Problem-Solving F	Process to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	

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

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

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	tudent achievement data, an lowing group:	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #3a:					
2012 Current Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Expe	ected Level of Performar	nce:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool					
	No	o Data S	Submitted		

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	tudent achievement data, a lowing group:	nd refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	, and define areas in need
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #3b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I r	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy					
	N	No Data S	Submitted		

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #4:							
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
	Problem-Solving	g Process to	I ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Res for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Process l Determin Effective Strategy	ie	Evaluatio	on Tool
		No Data	Submitted				
Based on Ambitious but A	Achievable Annual Mea	asurable Objec	tives (AMOs	s), AMO-2,	Reading and Ma	ath Perforn	nance Target
5A. Ambitious but Achiev Measurable Objectives (A school will reduce their a by 50%.	able Annual MOs). In six year	ddle School Ma	thematics G	Goal #			A
Baseline data 2010-2011 2011-20	12 2012-2013	2013-2014	2014	2014-2015 2015-2016 2016			2016-2017
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the for		data, and refe	rence to "Gi	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and define	areas in need
5B. Student subgroups Hispanic, Asian, Americ satisfactory progress i	can Indian) not maki						
Mathematics Goal #5B	:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Ехр	ected Leve	el of Performa	ince:	
	Problem-Solving	g Process to	I ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Res for	son or ition ponsible itoring	Process l Determir Effective Strategy	ie	Evaluatio	on Tool
		No Data	Submitted				
Based on the analysis of		data, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and define	e areas in need
of improvement for the for 5C. English Language L satisfactory progress i	earners (ELL) not m	aking					
Mathematics Goal #50							

2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ance:
	Problem-Solving Proc	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1		Submitted	1	
Based on the analysis of softimprovement for the fo	student achievement data, a	and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas in nee
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	vilities (SWD) not making n mathematics.				
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ance:
	Problem-Solving Proc	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	ı	No Data :	Submitted		
of improvement for the fo	antaged students not mak		ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas in nee
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ance:
	Problem-Solving Proc	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data :	Submitted		

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentage:	s, include the number of	students the p	percentage	represents next to the pe	ercentage (e.g., 70% (35)).
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement			eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
1. Florida Alternate A	ssessment: Student	s scoring at			
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in r	mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #1	:				
2012 Current Level of	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
		Pers	on or		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
			Submitted		
Based on the analysis of improvement			eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
		-			
Florida Alternate A or above Level 7 in m		s scoring at			
Mathematics Goal #2					
2012 Current Level of	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		
Based on the analysis on the analysis of the contract of the c	of student achievement t for the following grou	nt data, and r up:	eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
3. Florida Alternate A making learning gain		of students			
Mathematics Goal #3					

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Ex	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
No Data Submitted						

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

Based on Amb	itious but Ac	chievable Annual	Measurable C	bjecti	ves (AMOs), AMO-2, I	Reading and Ma	th Perforr	mance Target
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Mathematics 5A:	Goal	#				A
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2 2012-2013	2013-20	2013-2014 2014-2015 2015-2016 2					2016-2017
		tudent achieveme owing subgroup:	ent data, and	refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and defin	e areas in need
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: 2012 Current Level of Performance:					2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performar	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	vina Process	s to Lr	ocroaso St	udent Ach	nievement		
		Froblem-30i	virig Frocess	5 (0 11	ici ease 3t	duem Aci			
Anticipated E	3arrier	Strategy	Perso Posit Respo for Monit		on onsible	Process U Determin Effective Strategy	е	Evaluati	on Tool
	No Data Submitted								

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #50:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	1	'	Submitted	1		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data ollowing subgroup:	, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas in need	
5D. Students with Disak satisfactory progress in	pilities (SWD) not making n mathematics.	g				
Mathematics Goal #5D:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data S	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data ollowing subgroup:	, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas in need	
E. Economically Disadv satisfactory progress i	antaged students not m n mathematics.	aking				
Mathematics Goal E:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
		Perso	on or	Duna and Harris		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

in need of improvement for the following group:

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

Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.					
Algebra Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving Proce	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	N	o Data	Submitted		
in need of improvement	f student achievement data for the following group:	a, and r	reference to	o "Guiding Questions", id	lentify and define areas
2. Students scoring at 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	t or above Achievement L	_evels			
Algebra doar // 2.					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
		Pers	on or	D	

Position

Responsible

Monitoring No Data Submitted Process Used to

Effectiveness of Strategy

Determine

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Evaluation Tool

Strategy

Anticipated Barrier

* When using percentages	, include the number of studer	nts the p	percentage :	represents (e.g., 70% (35	7)).
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	f student achievement data for the following group:	, and r	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", i	dentify and define areas
1. Students scoring at Geometry.	Achievement Level 3 in				
Geometry Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Ехр	ected Level of Perforr	nance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Positi Resp	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	o Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis or in need of improvement	f student achievement data for the following group:	, and r	reference to	o "Guiding Questions", i	dentify and define areas
 Students scoring at 4 and 5 in Geometry. 	t or above Achievement L	evels			

Geometry Goal #2: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade		PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Training for FAA	3-5	District Staff	3-5 ESE teachers	Fall 2012	Monitoring testing periods, review of	

administration					guidelines	
PDS online	PK-5		PK-5	Ongoing	Monitoring student progress	Administration and CRT
Ablenet- Equals online trainings	K-5	OCPS	K-5		Monitoring student progress, observation of use of instructional materials	Administration and

Mathematics Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		•	Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Research supports that individuals with ASD generally have stronger visual processing capabilities as compared to other modes of processing information. Therefore the school purchased tablets and interactive whiteboards for classroom use in order to present information in a visually rich manner.	Interactive white boards	Grant and school budget	\$12,775.00
		Sub	total: \$12,775.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Appropriate supplemental instructional materials for all grade levels and abilities supported by interactive software.	LakeShore supplemental materials	School Budget	\$1,153.00
		Su	btotal: \$1,153.0
		Grand 3	Total: \$13,928.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and definer areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A	N/A			

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

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

	of student achievement data rement for the following grou		reference	to "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:			N/A		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A			N/A		
	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:		N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A			
	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Posi Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool		Evaluation Tool	
	No Data Submitted				

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7

in science.		N/A			
Science Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to I			ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi for		son or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

3	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.					
Science Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Process	s to Ir	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responses		for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No Data Submitted				

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

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

* When using percentages, in	nclude the number of students th	e percentage represents	(e.g., 70%	(35)).
------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	------------	--------

* When using percentage:	s, include the number (of students t	he percenta	ge represents (e.g., 70%	5 (35)).
Based on the analysis of areas in need of improv			nd reference	e to "Guiding Question	s", identify and define
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.					
Biology Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	f Performance:		2013 Ex	pected Level of Perfo	ormance:
	Problem-Solving I	Process to	Increase S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Pos Res for	rson or sition sponsible nitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	a Submitted		
-					-
Rased on the analysis (of student achieveme	ent data ar	nd reference	to "Guiding Question	s" identify and define

Based on the analysis of areas in need of improv			reference	to "Guiding Question	ns", identify and define
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.					
Biology Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to I	ncrease S	itudent Achievemer	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible Itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

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

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

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
N/A					
2013 Expected Level of Performance:					

		N/	N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier		Person Positior Respon for Monitor	n Isible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. N/A Writing Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: N/A N/A Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible Evaluation Tool Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount	

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	-	-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	•	•	Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	f student achievement data, for the following group:	and r	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", id	lentify and define areas
1. Students scoring at	Achievement Level 3 in C				
Civics Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group:	eference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels4 and 5 in Civics.Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Progr	am(e)/ material(e)		A
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
·		·	Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Cource (EOC) Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas

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

in need of improvement	for the following grou	p:				
1. Students scoring a History.	t Achievement Level	3 in U.S.				
U.S. History Goal #1:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
					,	
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement			eference t	o "Guiding Questions", i	dentify and define areas	
2. Students scoring a 4 and 5 in U.S. History		ent Levels				
U.S. History Goal #2:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
		Pers	on or	Process Used to		

Monitoring

Strategy

Anticipated Barrier

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

Position

for

Responsible

No Data Submitted

Determine

Strategy

Effectiveness of

Evaluation Tool

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	-		Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference of improvement:	e to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need			
Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Continue to maintain attendance of at least 90% of students will have less than 10 unexcused absences.			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
100% of students have less that 10 unexcused absences.	95% of students will have less than 10 unexcused absences.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
0	0			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
1	0			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	tor	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
No Data Submitted						

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

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

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

			Given the nature of the student population, school suspensions are rarely encountered.			
2012 Total Number of	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions			ected Number of In-So	chool Suspensions	
0			N/A			
2012 Total Number of	Students Suspended In-So	chool	2013 Exp School	ected Number of Stud	ents Suspended In-	
0			N/A			
2012 Number of Out-o	f-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
1			N/A			
2012 Total Number of School	Students Suspended Out-	of-	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School			
1			N/A			
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No Data Submitted					

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School - F.S., Sec. 1003.53

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement:	Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and r in need of improvement:			"Guiding Questions", id	entify and define areas
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.		NA			
2012 Current Dropout	Rate:		2013 Ехр	ected Dropout Rate:	
NA		NA			
2012 Current Graduati	ion Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
NA			NA		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi for		on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and re in need of improvement:	ference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas
1. Parent I nvolvement	
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.	The parents will participate in learning opportunities on an individual basis based on their student's particular needs. School wide, parents will participate in classroom meetings, classroom volunteering and children/parent events.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
100%	100%

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	arri(s)/iwateriar(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. STEM					
STEM Goal #1:		N/A	N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

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

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

STEM Budget:

			Available
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

	*	When using percentages,	include ti	he number d	of students the	percentage re	presents (e.g.	., 70% ((35))
--	---	-------------------------	------------	-------------	-----------------	---------------	----------------	----------	-------

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:							
1. CTE							
CTE Goal #1:	CTE Goal #1:						
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy					Evaluation Tool		
No Data Submitted							

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

		Description of		
Available Amoun	Funding Source	Resources	Strategy	Goal
\$2,036.00	School Budget	Education City, Reading A to Z	Research supports that individuals with ASD generally have stronger visual processing capabilities as compared to other modes of processing information. Therefore the school purchased tablets and interactive whiteboards for classroom use in order to present information in a visually rich manner.	Reading
Subtotal: \$2,036.0				
				Гесhnology
Available Amoun	Funding Source	Description of	Strategy	Goal
Available Alliouri	Fullding Source	Resources		Goal
\$12,775.0	Grant and School Budget	Interactive whiteboards	individuals with ASD generally have stronger visual processing capabilities as compared to other modes of processing information. Therefore the school purchased tablets and interactive whiteboards for classroom use in order to present information in a visually rich manner.	Reading
\$12,775.00	Grant and school budget	Interactive white boards	Research supports that individuals with ASD generally have stronger visual processing capabilities as compared to other modes of processing information. Therefore the school purchased tablets and interactive whiteboards for classroom use in order to present information in a visually rich manner.	Mathematics
Subtotal: \$25,550.0				
			ment	Professional Develop
Available Amoun	Funding Source	Description of Resources	Strategy	Goal
\$0.00	N/A	PD 360, OCPS and FDLRS trainings, grade level meetings	Provide training to teachers during planning times and grade level meetings. Support staff in attending district trainings	Reading
Subtotal: \$0.0				
				Other
Available Amoun	Funding Source	Description of Resources	Strategy	Goal
\$1,153.00	School Budget	LakeShore supplemental materials	Appropriate supplemental instructional materials for all grade levels and abilities supported by	Mathematics
			interactive software.	

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	∱∩ Focus	jn Prevent	j m NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 11/9/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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



No. Disagree with the above statement.

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

In leu of a school advisory committee we have a parent activity committee.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

N/A

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found No Data Found No Data Found