Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Saint Johns Virtual School K-8	District Name: Saint Johns
Principal: Twila Powers	Superintendent: Joseph Joyner
SAC Chair: Katherine Jones	Date of School Board Approval: 11/13/2012

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.) Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.) High School Feedback Report K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Twila Powers	Educational Leadership English 6-12 Middle Grades Integrated Health K-12 Physical Education K-12 Reading Endorsed ESOL Endorsed	1	2	2005-2006-Gamble RogersLiteracy Coach—73% lower quartile reading gains—"A" School Status 2006-2009—Saint Augustine High School—Literacy Coach/ Registrar—Moved from 2 year "D" Status to "B, B, A" respectively. 2011-2012—Saint Johns Technical High—Dean of Students— Selected as highly qualified member of turnaround team.

Assistant Principal	N/A				
------------------------	-----	--	--	--	--

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
	N/A				

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	
1. Verification of credentials of K12 instructors.	Principal	Ongoing	
2. Review of K12 individual instructor evaluations	Principal	Ongoing	
3.			
4.			

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only). *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
None	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first- year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
2	0%	0%	50%	50%	50%	100%	0%	0%	50%

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.

Aentor Name Mentee Assigned		Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities	
N/A				

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head 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. N/A						
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? N/A						
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? N/A						
MTSS Implementation						
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. N/A						
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. N/A						
Describe the plan to support MTSS. N/A						

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team						
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). N/A						
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). N/A						
Describe now the school-based LET functions (e.g., needing processes and foles/functions). IV/A						
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? N/A						

Public School Choice

• Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

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

Reading is the emphasis of all teachers and courses. Our curriculum is set according to our agreement with FLVS as we are a franchise of their company and use their courses. Their courses have been evaluated and redesigned to meet all Common Core expectations. As Saint Johns County instructors, our teachers are trained through the district Common Core initiatives to enhance reading across the curriculum.

*High Schools Only

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

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

All FLVS courses have real life applications built into the curriculum.

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

Each student meets with a guidance counselor to discuss the necessary path of instruction that will begin the path to success in their career of choice. All underclassmen are placed in courses according to their customized learning path as well as their chosen major.

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S. Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u>.

At present, that report does not exist for Saint Johns Virtual School.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	aware of their lower level students	1A.1. Teachers will utilize the PMRN progress monitoring network to track student performance and remediate as needed.	1A.1. K12 Teachers	1A.1. Analyze Data	1A.1. FCAT Data	
<u> </u>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	88%	90%				

						1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	Maintaining Achievement Level of 4 or better.	Strengthening student comprehension of non-fiction material.	2A.1. K12 Instructors	2A.1. Analyze Data	2A.1. FCAT Data		
Reading Goal #2A: 90% of all students will perform at level 4 or better in reading.		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	88%	90% 2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

<u>Reading Goal #2B:</u> N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

		<u> </u>				۱	,
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	l .	
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		1	1
data and reference to						1	1
"Guiding Questions,"						1	1
identify and define areas						1	۱ ا
in need of improvement						l .	1
for the following group:	2.4.1	2.4.1	24.1	2.4.1	2.4.1	Į	ļ
	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	1	1
Percentage of	.					1	
students making	l .					l .	1
learning gains in						l .	1
reading.							
Reading Goal #3A:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of	1			Į i	
Data not available	Performance:*	Performance:*	1		1	Į i	
			1			Į i	
						1	
						1	
			1			1	
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
	ļ					1	
	l		<u> </u>			L	
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
						1	۱ ا
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
			20.1	20.1	20.1		ļ
CD. I IVII au	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	()	۱ I
Alternate	.		1			()	۱ I
Assessment:	.		1		1	()	۱ I
	.		1		1	()	۱ I
Percentage of	.		1			()	۱ I
students making	.				1	(i	۱ I
learning gains in	.				1	(i	۱ I
reading.	.				1	(i	۱ I
	2012 Current	2013 Expected		1		1	▶
Sour 75D.	Level of	Level of	1			l i	I I
N/A		Performance:*	1			l i	۱
n 17 d A			1			Į i	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
			1			l i	I I
			1		1	Į i	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
			1		1	Į i	
							1

	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0:	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
Percentage of							
students in lowest							
25% making							
learning gains in							
reading.							
Reading Goal #4:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
		Performance:*					
Data not available							
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
L	ļ		1				

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 87%	87% Common Core standards and expectations will be utilized by K12 instructors to enhance educational practices.	88% Common Core standards and expectations will be utilized by K12 instructors to enhance educational practices.	90% Common Core standards and expectations will be utilized by K12 instructors to enhance educational practices.	91% Common Core standards and expectations will be utilized by K12 instructors to enhance educational practices.	92% Common Core standards and expectations will be utilized by K12 instructors to enhance educational practices.	93% <u>Common Core</u> standards and <u>expectations will</u> be utilized by K12 instructors to enhance educational practices,
Reading Goal #5A: The students performing below satisfactory level will decrease from 14% to 7% in the next 6 years.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
subgroups by ethnicity (White,	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

Black: Hispanic: Asian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

0 01 English	Anticipated Barrier 5C.1.	Strategy 5C.1.	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring 5C.1.	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy 5C.1.	Evaluation Tool 5C.1.		
Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.							
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
				5C.3.		5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		

	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
Disadvantaged							
students not making							
satisfactory progress							
in reading.	2012 0	2012 5 1					
Reading Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
N/A		Performance:*					
4 17 A A							
		512.2	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E 0	5E.2.	
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	JE.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
			1	1			

<u>Reading Professional Development</u>

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

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)	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
All Professional Development is handled within the K12 Organization.					

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
<u>CELLA Goal #1:</u> _{N/A}	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.			1.3.
Students read grade- level text in English in a manner similar to non- ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

CELLA Goal #2: NA	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non- ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
proficient in writing.						
	2012 Current Percent of Students					
N/A	Proficient in Writing :					
1 4/2 #						
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent		Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at	Limited ability to grasp necessary concepts to show mastery.	monitoring of all students to ensure that sufficient growth is being made throughout the school year.	1A.1. K12 Instructor	1A.1. Comparison of progress monitoring data and course work.	1A.1. Mathematics diagnostic data.	
Mathematics Goal #1A: 80% of all students will	2012 Current	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
perform at Achievement level 3 or better in Mathematics.	75%	80%				

			1A.2.			1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1 <u>B:</u> N/A	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: Data not available.	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			2A.2. 2A.3.	2A.2. 2A.3.		2A.2. 2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

Mathematics Goal_ #2B: N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
Percentage of							
students making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal		2013 Expected					
#3A:	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
1.011							
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
		JA.J.	<i>JA.J.</i>	5A.5.	5A.5.	5A.5.	
3B. Florida	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
	2012 Current	2013 Expected					ļ
Mathematics Goal	Level of	Level of					
<u>#3B:</u>	Performance:*	Performance:*					
	i cironnance.	<u>i cirormanec.</u>					
N/A							

	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4: N/A	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years	Baseline data 2010-2011	<mark>82%</mark>	<mark>83%</mark>	<mark>85%</mark>	<mark>87%</mark>	<mark>88%</mark>	<mark>90%</mark>
school will reduce	000/			-		Instructors	Instructors
their achievement gap by 50%.	80%	Instructors will continue to implement and utilize Common	Instructors will continue to implement and utilize Common		Instructors will continue to implement and utilize	will continue to implement and	will continue to implement and
gap by 5070.		Core Strategies to enhance student performance.	Core Strategies to enhance student performance.	Common Core Strategies to enhance student performance.	Common Core Strategies to enhance student performance.	utilize Common Core Strategies to enhance student performance.	utilize Common Core Strategies to enhance student performance.
Mathematics Goal_ #5A:							
The percent of student performing below grade level will be reduced from 20% to 10% over the next 6 years.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student	5B.1. White:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
subgroups by	Black:						
ethnicity (White,	Hispanic:						
Black, Hispanic, Asian, American	Asian: American Indian:						
Indian) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5 <u>B:</u> N/A	Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

		-					
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:							
5C. English	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
e et English	50.1.	50.1.	50.1.	50.1.	56.1.		
Language Learners							
(ELL) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							
	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
mathematics obtai	Level of	Level of					
<u>#5C:</u>	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:							
	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
ob. Staating	50.1.	J J .1.	50.1.	50.1.	<i>51</i> .1.		
with Disabilities							
(SWD) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							
					L		

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D: N/A		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	data for current level of performance in	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
#5E	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

		•	-				
	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.		1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
#1 A ·	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1A.2.		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

1B. Florida	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
mathematics.							
		2013 Expected					
<u>#1B:</u>	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
IN/A							
	-						
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

						İ	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Students scoring							
at or above							
Achievement							
Levels 4 and 5 in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal		2013 Expected					
#2A:	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate	1						
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
or above Level 7 in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
#2B:	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
11/21							
1				1	1	1	1 1

	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A: N/A	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			3A.2. 3A.3.	3A.2. 3A.3.		3A.2. 3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

<u>Mathematic</u> : #3 <u>B:</u> N/A.		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
.1. 4.	A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
4	Δ 2	14 2	14.2	14.2	14.2	
4.	<i>n.2</i> .	1 Λ.2.	HA.2.	<i>τ</i> Λ.2.	η Λ.2.	
4.	A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
1	Barrier Barrier 1. 4 2 Current_rel of_formance:* P 4	Barrier 4A.1. 1. 4A.1. 2 Current 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Performance:* 4A.2.	Barrier Responsible for Monitoring 1. 4A.1. 2. Current rel of formance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 4A.2. 4A.2.	BarrierResponsible for MonitoringEffectiveness of Strategy1.4A.1.4A.1.4A.1.2. Current tel of formance:*2013 Expected Level of Performance:*Image: Comparison of the second s	Barrier Responsible for Monitoring Effectiveness of Strategy 1. 4A.1. 4A.1. 1. 4A.1. 4A.1. 2. Current 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Performance:* Image: Company of the second s	Barrier Responsible for Monitoring Effectiveness of Strategy 1. A.1. A.1. 1. A.1. 2. Current rel of 2013 Expected Level of 2. Current rel of 2013 Expected Level of 4. A.1. A.1. 4. A.2. A.2.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement	Baseline data 2010-2011						
gap by 50%.							
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5A:							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5 <u>B:</u> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

Black: Hispanic: Asian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian:					
	American Indian: 5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

		-					
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:							
5C. English	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
e et English	50.1.	50.1.	50.1.	50.1.	56.1.		
Language Learners							
(ELL) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							
	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
mathematics obtai	Level of	Level of					
<u>#5C:</u>	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:							
	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
ob. Staating	50.1.	J J .1.	50.1.	50.1.	<i>51</i> .1.		
with Disabilities							
(SWD) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							
					L		

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D: N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
Level of	Level of					
	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
	Barrier 5E.1. 2012 Current Level of Performance:*	Barrier 5E.1. 5E.1. 2012 Current 2013 Expected Level of Level of	BarrierResponsible for Monitoring5E.1.5E.1.2012 Current Level of Performance:*2013 Expected Level of Performance:*2012 Current Level of Performance:*2013 Expected Level of Performance:*2012 Current Level of Performance:*2013 Expected Level of Performance:*2012 Current Level of Performance:*2013 Expected Level of Performance:*2012 Current SE.2.2013 Expected SE.2.	BarrierResponsible for MonitoringEffectiveness of Strategy5E.1.5E.1.5E.1.5E.1.2012 Current Level of Performance:*2013 Expected Level of Performance:*SE.1.2012 Current Level of Performance:*2013 Expected Level of Performance:*SE.1.2013 Expected Level of Performance:*SE.1.SE.1.2014 Expected Level of Performance:*SE.1.SE.1.2015 Expected Level of Performance:*SE.2.SE.2.	Barrier Responsible for Monitoring Effectiveness of Strategy 5E.1. 5E.1. 5E.1. 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 5E.1. 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Image: Comparison of the second performance image: Comparison of the s	Barrier Responsible for Monitoring Effectiveness of Strategy 5E.1. 5E.1. 5E.1. 5E.1. 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 5E.1. 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Image: Selection of Strategy 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Image: Selection of Selection of Strategy 2014 Expected Selection of Selection of Sel

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

chool Mathema	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1: N/A	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1.2.		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2: N/A	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
						3.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #1:</u> N/A.	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.		1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in Algebra 1.							
		2013 Expected					
		Level of Performance:*					
	r errormanee.	renormance.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years,	Baseline data 2010-2011						
school will reduce							
their achievement							
gap by 50%.							
Algebra 1 Goal #3A:							
N/A							
Based on the analysis	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement data and reference to			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroups: 3B. Student	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
- Di Staatint	White:	55.1.	55.1.	00.1.	J.I.		
subgroups by	Black:						
ethnicity (White,	Hispanic:						
	Asian: American Indian:						
	American mutan.						
Indian) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in Algebra 1.							

Algebra 1 Goal #3B:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Black: Hispanic: Asian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.		3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.		3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	Level of					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: N/A	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			3E.2.	3E.2.		3E.2.	
End of Alashua I			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

<u>Geometry End-of-Course Goals (this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)</u>

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal #1:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			1.2.			1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
in need of improvement for the following group:							
2. Students scoring	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in Geometry.							
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
40% of students will perform above mastery level on the Geometry EOC.							
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

	2012-2013 Baseline data 2011- 2012	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
gap by 50%.						
Geometry Goal #3A:						
N/A						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	

Geometry Goal #3B: N/A	Level of Performance:*						
	Black: Hispanic: Asian: American	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: 3C. English Language Learners	Anticipated Barrier 3C.1.	Strategy 3C.1.	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring 3C.1.	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy 3C.1.	Evaluation Tool 3C.1.		
(ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.							
Geometry Goal #3C: N/A	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		20.2	20.2	20.2	202	20.2	
				3C.2.		3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		

Geo N/A	ometry Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional			
Development			
(PD) aligned with			
Strategies through			
Professional			
Learning			
Community (PLC)			
or PD Activities			
Please note that each			

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

<u>Mathematics Budget</u> (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions,"	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent Anticipated Barrier		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	1A.1.	14.1	1A.1.	14.1	14.1		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	Student mastery of science concepts as a result of inadequate comprehension skills.	to further explain science concepts.	IA.I. K12 Instructor	1A.1. Course mastery of content based on Unit Exams.	1A.1. K12 Curriculum material		
Science Goal #1A: 60% of students will perform at the mastery level in Science on the FCAT 2.0.		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	55%	60% 1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	

		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Science Goal #1B: N/A	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			1B.2.			1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier	Suategy	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation 1001		
data and reference to	Durrier						
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Students scoring	G. I	.					
, 1 [°]	Student mastery		K12 Instructor		Science FCAT 2.0		
		students to		exams in Science courses.			
		enroll in the advanced					
4 and 5 in science.		component					
		of all science					
		courses.					
Science Goal #2A:		2013Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
30% of students will	Performance:*	Performance:*					
perform above mastery							
level in Science on the							
FCAT 2.0.							
	25%	30%					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.2.	2P1.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2 M .2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
or above Level 7 in							
science.							

Stitlite Cour # 20.	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Science Goal #1:</u> N/A	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

	i					i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data, and reference to							
"Guiding Questions",							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
2. Florida Alternate	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
or above Level 7 in							
science.							
Science Goal #2:	2012 Current	2013Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
N/A	Performance:*	Performance:*					
1 1/2 #							
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
						2.2	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC	Problem-			
Goals	Solving			
	Process to			
	Increase			
	Student			
	Achievem			
	ent			

	i	i	í	Í.	i		
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
at Achievement							
Level 3 in Biology 1.							
Biology 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier	Suuregy	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to	Durrier		responsible for monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
	2.1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1		
	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in Biology 1.							
	2012 C		l	l			
Biology 1 Goal #2:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
1							

	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
All Professional Development provided by K12 Organization				Ongoing		K12 Personnel

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Science Goals

<u>Writing Goals</u>

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

	D 11	r	1	1		
Writing	Problem-					
Goals	Solving					
Guais	Process to					
	Increase					
	Student					
	Achievem					
	ent					
	ent					
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
student achievement data	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and						
define areas in need of						
improvement for the						
following group:						
	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
Students scoring at		T 14:1:	K12 instructors	Commention of ECAT Whiting	ECAT Writing Assessment	
Achievement Level	Difficulty in maintaining	Utilize strong grammar,	K12 instructors	Comparison of FCAT Writing Assessment Results.	FCAT Writing Assessment	
	high standards	capitalization,		rissessment results.		
		punctuation,				
	criteria.	and spelling				
		in all writing				
		responses in				
		virtual course subject areas.				
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current	subject areas.				
Winning Obai #1A.	Level of					
	Performance:*					
90% of all students						
will meet mastery level		2013 Expected				
performance on the FCAT		Level of				
Writing Assessment.		Performance:*				
	90%	90%				

		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
Alternate			1B.1. K12 instructors		1B.1. Curriculum data		
Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	maintaining high standards based on new	complete					
Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		90%					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please not 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
All PD provided by K12 Organization				Ongoing		K12 organization

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Writing Goals

<u>Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals (required in year 2014-2015)</u></u>

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

Civics EOC Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Civics_Goal #1:</u> Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier	Strategy	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation 1001		
data and reference to	Durrier		responsible for womening	Effectiveness of Strategy			
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in Civics.							
Civics Goal #2:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
		Level of					
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	Performance:*					
goal in this box.							
S · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical	l	1			
	data for	data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
		performance in					
	this box.	this box.				2.2	
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
L					ļ		

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
	Description of Resources	Description of Resources Funding Source

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals (required in year 2013-2014)

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

	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
U.S. History Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	data for current level of performance in	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above	1	1					
Achievement Levels	1	1					
4 and 5 in U.S.	1	1					
History.	2012 Current	2013 Expected		l			
U.S. History Goal #2:		Level of					
		Performance:*					
goal in this box.							
		Enter numerical					
		data for expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		1					
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
	1	'					
	L'	Ĺ′					I

<u>0.5. Ilistor y 1 101</u>		eropinene				
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

U.S. History Professional Development

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Goal(s)	Problem- solving Process to Increase Attendan ce					
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	log in to the account, but not actively work on lessons for the entire time.	times on submitted material to ensure that the	1.1. K12 Teachers		1.1. Classroom data	
	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*				

<u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u>	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	'	1!	1!	I!	1'	[]
Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

~	1		
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem- solving Process to Decrease			represents next to the p		(<i>33)</i>).	
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and	Suspension Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool		
reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	1.1	1.1	1.1	Strategy	1.1		
 Suspension Suspension Goal #1: 	1.1. 2012 Total Number	1.1. 2013 Expected	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	of In –School Suspensions	Number of In- School Suspensions					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	Number of Out-of- School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	of Students Suspended	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					

1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

Suspension 1 roles						
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	Grade Level/	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g. , Early		Person or Position Responsible for
and/or PLC Focus	Subject	and/or	(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or	Release) and Schedules (e.g.,	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Monitoring
		PLC Leader	school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		-
N/A						
·						

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s) Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem- solving Process to Dropout Prevention						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Dropout Prevention		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Goal #1: K12 is set up for ultimate	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
student success. Work is done at the student's own time and discretion as long as he maintains the expected pace. Work is also allowed to be resubmitted to experience mastery.							
		N/A					
	Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	No Comparison Data	No Comparison Data		1.2	1.2	1.2	
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please not 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/A						

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section. Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

				represents next to the p			
Parent Involvement	Problem-						
Goal(s)	solving						
	Process						
	to Parent						
	Involveme						
	nt						
	п						
Based on the analysis of parent	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
and define areas in need of				Strategy			
improvement:							
1. Parent Involvement	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
		Ensure all	K12 Instructors, SJVS	Conversations with	Data Analysis		
	involvement	parents have			sheets.		
		the necessary skills and tools	-		Sheets.		
		to access student		parents.			
		information					
		via the student website with					
		K12.					
Parent Involvement Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
#1:		Level of Parent					
	Involvement:*	Involvement:*					
Parents are fully expected to participate in their child's							
education. Parents may access							
child's work, percent complete,							
and current grade.							
	No Data	No Data					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
				I		L	L]

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please not ethat 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/A						

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
As a partner with K12. SJVS is on the cutting edge of Technology in Saint Johns County. Our goal is to simply increase the current population of students utilizing the latest technology the STEM areas to	Brick and Mortar School and the traditional educational delivery.		K12 Instructors		1.1. Student performance in first attempt at a virtual course.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional			
Development			
(PD) aligned with			
Strategies through			
Professional			
Learning			

Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1
N/A					
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional			
Development			
(PD) aligned with			
Strategies through			
Professional			
Learning			
Community (PLC)			
or PD Activity			
Please note that each			

Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

	1			
Include only school-based funded				
activities/materials and exclude district				
funded activities /materials.				
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
N/A				
Subtotal:				
Technology				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
N/A				
Subtotal:				
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
N/A				
Subtotal:				
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
N/A				
Subtotal:				
Total:				

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt			represents next to the p		
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Additional Goal	parent to see significance in community service	1.1. Educate student and parent on the value of community service and setting goals and standards early in life. 2013 Expected		1.1. Validation of student service hours	1.1. Student service logs.	
<u>Additional Goal #1:</u> Increase student community service involvement.	Level :*	Level :*				
	No Data	No data				

	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please not ethat 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/A						

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:
Science Budget	
	Total:
Writing Budget	
	Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:

Grand Total:

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
□Priority	□Focus	□Prevent

Are you reward school? □Yes □No

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

 \Box Yes \Box No

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

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

Looking to build the base of the SAC Team this year. In the past, it has not been a successful committee. The goal is to build a successful team of students, parents, and school staff that are willing to come together as a unit once a month, via online cohort meeting or face-to-face meeting, to discuss what steps can be taken to improve the virtual educational system in Saint Johns County.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
N/A	