FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MARCHMAN TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER

District Name: Pasco

Principal: Shelia Bryan

SAC Chair: Dr. Adam Dahmer

Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 9/11/2012



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	Shelia Bryan	B.A. Consumer Science M. Ed. Educational Leadership	7	17	8 years AP Marchman Technical Education Center 3 years AP Ridgewood High School
Assis Principal	Val Abram	B.S. Phys. Ed MPE and MS Guidance & Counseling	3	6	5 year Moore Mickens Education Center DJJ (NO AYP)
Assis Principal	Thomas Brochu	B. S. Physical Education M.A. Educational Foundations Policy and Administrtion Ed. S. Education Administration	3	16	2 years James Irving Educational Center 11 years Gulf High School
Assis Principal	Kim Dunn	B. A. Political Science M. Ed. Educational Leadership	5	5	NA

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)
Science	Sharon Zajd	Registered Nurse B.S. College of Nursing Biology 6-12 Chemistry 6-12 Health K-12 Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum 5-9 Social Science 5-	5	4	N/A
New Media Technology Vocational	Jeanne Tollerton	B.A. Business Education	12	4	N/A
Media Specialist	Jacqueline Walsh	M.A. Library and Information Science B.A. Elementary Education	8	4	N/A
Tech Specialist	Rob Braun	B.S. Vocational - Technical Education Florida North Carolina and New York Teaching License in Electronics Comp TIA A+ Certified Novell Can-3 IntranetWare NA-5 ICNE CNE-	7	4	N/A
Reading Instructor	Ruth Brugge	B.S. Speech Language Reading ESOL Family and Consumer Science, Middle Grades English (5-9) Speech/Language Impaired K-12	7	4	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	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Staff will attend district wide professional development sessions	Administration	May 2013	
2	Weekly Professional Development Meetings	Instructional Coaching Team/Administration	May 2013	
3		Instructional Coaching Team /Administration	May 2013	
4	Mentoring	Mentors/Administration	May 2013	

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	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

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		% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
5	0.0%(0)	20.0%(1)	40.0%(2)	40.0%(2)	40.0%(2)	100.0%(5)	20.0%(1)	0.0%(0)	20.0%(1)

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
Wanda DeLugi	Sharon Zajd	Wanda is nurse and teaching the Adult CNA Course. Sharon Zajd is a nurse teaching teaching the CNA Course to HS students.	Lesson sharing, common planning.

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.

Title I, Part A		
Title I, Part C- Migrant		
Title I, Part D		
Title II		

Title X- Homeless	
upplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)	
Tiolence Prevention Programs	
lutrition Programs	
Housing Programs	
Head Start	
Adult Education	
Career and Technical Education	
lob 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.	
School Administrator for HS Curriculum: Val Abram Cyesis Instructors: Michele Moore, Victor Naar, Philip Vance, Ruth Brugge, Lynn Hartley ESE Specialist: Jeri Dellutro Cyesis Nurse: Zeola Gilbert	
K-12 Literacy Coach: TBA	
Cyesis Guidance Counselor: Lucy Cooper Social Worker: Roseann Agnello-Sellers	
Social Worker: Roseann Agnello-Sellers	oes it work

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

Members of the RtI Leadership Team met this summer to review student data achievement and trends. The team determined deficiencies and developed goals to improve deficiencies. The team identifies students who need remediation in order to

plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

meet graduation requirements. The team will continue to meet bi - monthly to review student data, goal implementation and make adjustments in goals as necessary to improve student achievement.

-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.

FCAT Scores, attendance records, discipline records, lexile scores retrieved from TERMS

Fair Data as reported on Pasco Star.

Core K-12 base line data and mid year data assessment exams.

School generated assessments, pre and post portfolios, formative assessments, anecdotal records.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The K-12 Literacy Coach will continue to train staff on RtI at the bi-weekly meetings and through individual coaching. Online RtI classes offered to instructors.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

Team Administrator, Val Abram K-12 Literacy Coach, TBA Media Specialist, Jacqueline Walsh

Language Arts Instructor, Michele Moore

Reading Instructors, Ruth Brugge

Technical Instructor, Jeanne Tollerton

Technology Specialist, Rob Braun

Allied Health Instructor, Sharon Zajd

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The LLT meets monthly to develop school wide reading initiatives and to provide professional development for instructors.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

Professional Development Meetings, independent reading initiatives for students, Literacy Team Action Plan. This year the team is focused on improving the FCAT reading strands, reference and research and main idea.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

No Attachment

*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(b) F.S.

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

Learning Focused Strategies has a strong emphasis on reading and writing and uses best practices to ensure every teacher is teaching reading and writing strategies. All teachers have been or will be LFS trained. Professional development meetings will provide research based best practices on main idea and reference and research. Teachers will implement strategies working with Instructional Coaching Team. All instructors will focus on reading in the content area.

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(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?

For the technical programs, curriculum emphasizes relationship of course work and future employment. Students in these programs will receive shop/lab experience, internships and some job placement. These programs also teach employability skills.

The Cyesis team emphasizes education as an important component in their future ability to sustain a family. They will tour local community colleges and learn about technical programs on campus. Field trips will include learning opportunities at museums and science centers.

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?

Students are provided opportunities to learn technical skills that will make students employable in the future. All technical course curriculum has employability skills training and assessment. Students may participate in Ready to Work testing. MTEC also has a career center that is open for adult and high school students. Students utilize Choices, PLAN test and ASVAB testing. The guidance counselor meets with students frequently to ensure coursework is meaningful and appropriate.

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>

Students meet regularly with counselor to ensure academic course work is adequate for post-secondary goals. Technical students are provided opportunities to return and complete program in post-secondary setting. Articulation agreements are in place with PHCC, as well as, post-secondary opportunities at MTEC with the awarding of Pell Grants to qualified students.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

	on the analysis of student provement for the following		eference to "Guiding	Questions", identify and o	define areas in need		
readi	CAT2.0: Students scoringing. ng Goal #1a:	g at Achievement Level 3	Cyesis will incre	Cyesis will increase the percentage of proficient students from 25% to 30% in 2012-13.			
2012	Current Level of Perforn	nance:	2013 Expected	Level of Performance:			
25% ((2/8)		30%				
	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	Attendance is the critical barrier 100% of the Cyesis population had 10 or more absences.	1. Students not in attendance by 3rd period will be called to determine reason/excuse and absences will be tracked.	worker and school		Attendance is the top predictor of success in school. An increase in student attendance will lead to student learning gains, and an increase in student proficiency will determine our success as measured by Fair, CoreK12, and FCAT.		
2	2. Students have difficulty with comprehension and low vocabulary (lexile) levels.	Reciprocal teaching and explicit Instruction in word parts.	Literacy Coach, Administration	Meet with students to review Student Data Chat, compare FAIR Data, PMS, FCAT scores	Observations, Walkthroughs		
Dacad	on the analysis of student	t achievement data and re	oforonco to "Cuidina	Ouestions" identify and	lafina aroas in noos		

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 Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.

Reading Goal #1b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible	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

The percentage of students achieving above proficiency

(FCAT Levels 4 and 5) will increase from 0% to 5% in 2012-

of improvement for the following group:

of improvement for the following group:

gains in reading.

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning

Level 4 in reading.

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement

Reading Goal #2a:				13.				
2012	Current Level of Perfor	mance:		2013 Expe	cted	Level of Performar	nce:	
0%				5%				
	F	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease Stu	udent	t Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible f Monitoring	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1	Need for differentiated instruction to meet individual students needs.	Incorporate reading strategies into core curriculum to address individual student needs	Adr	RtI Team Administration		Improvement of Read 2.0 FCAT scores, comparison of FAIR scores.	ding	FAIR results FCAT results District Reading Plan for 2012-13.
	on the analysis of stude provement for the following	nt achievement data, and ag group:	refer	ence to "Gui	ding	Questions", identify a	and d	lefine areas in need
	O	ment: e Achievement Level 7 ir	٦					
Readi	ng Goal #2b:							
2012	Current Level of Perfor	mance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	F	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease Stu	udent	t Achievement		
Antic	nticipated Barrier Strategy Posi Resp for		Posit Resp for	onsible	Dete	ess Used to rmine tiveness of egy	Evalı	uation Tool
	No Data Submitted							

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

The percentage of students making learning gains will

2012 Current Level of Perform	nance:	2013 Exp	ected	Level of Performand	ee:	
61.3% (9)		65%	65%			
Pro	oblem-Solving Process	to Increase S	tuden	it Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person o Position Responsible Monitorin	n e for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
l I	Differentiated instruction and Tier II response to intervention strategies.	Instructional Coaching Tea Administration		Walkthrough classroon Fair test results.	ns Pre and post tests. Fair Data	
Students are most deficient in reference and main idea.						
Prior academic history from base school. Lack of teacher collaboration with base school.	Incorporate best practices learned at weekly professional development meetings. Individualized teacher plans developed from specific student data.	Instructional Coaching Team, Administration, Instructor		Walk throughs, review lesson plans, peer evaluation/feedback Fair test results	of Pre and post tests Fair Data	
Based on the analysis of student of improvement for the following 3b. Florida Alternate Assessm Percentage of students makin reading. Reading Goal #3b: 2012 Current Level of Perform	group: nent: g Learning Gains in	2013 Exp	pected	I Level of Performanc		
Anticipated Barrier Strate	egy F	Person or Position Responsible or Monitoring	Dete	cess Used to ermine ctiveness of tegy	valuation Tool	
	No C	ata Submitted				
Based on the analysis of student of improvement for the following 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of stumaking learning gains in read Reading Goal #4:	group: udents in Lowest 25%	The perce	ntage	Questions", identify an of the lowest quartile ill increase from 66.6%	of students making	
2012 Current Level of Perform	nance:	2013 Exp	ected	I Level of Performand	ee:	

Reading Goal #3a:

increase from 61.3% to 65% in 2012-13.

66.6%	ó (4/6)					70%			
			Problem-So	lving Process	toIn	icrease Studen	t Ach	ievement	
			Re	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		rocess Used to Determine ffectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	from other state or base and Tier II response to Coa		Coac	oaching		hroughs - rooms. Gains shown udent's data sheet.	Pre and post test - FAIR. District Reading Plan for 2012-2013.		
)	sessions	rkshops and will focus on structure and	Vocabulary checks.	and fluency			when	mine comfort level in testing sessions gh informal survey.	FCAT results in strands.
								Reading and Math Pe	
Measu	ırable Ob I will redü	out Achievable jectives (AMOs uce their achiev). In six year	Reading Goal :	#				l l
	ine data 0-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-201	4	2014-2015	5	2015-2016	2016-2017
		nalysis of stud t for the follow			efere	ence to "Guiding	Quest	tions", identify and c	lefine areas in nee
5B. S Hispa satisf	tudent sı ınic, Asia	ubgroups by e in, American I rogress in rea	ethnicity (What ndian) not n	nite, Black,	I	Not applicable			
2012 Current Level of Performance:				:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
Not applicable				I	Not applicable				
			Problem-So	Iving Process	toIn	ncrease Studen	t Ach	ievement	
	Antici	pated Barrier	St	rategy	Do	Person or Position		rocess Used to Determine	Evaluation Too

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 reading.

Reading Goal #5C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Not applicable

Not applicable

Monitoring

Not applicable

Strategy

Not applicable

Not applicable

Not ap	pplicable		Not applicable	Not applicable				
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
1	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable			
	on the analysis of studen provement for the following		eference to "Guidinç	g Questions", identify and	define areas in need			
satisf	tudents with Disabilities actory progress in readi ng Goal #5D:		Not Applicable					
2012	Current Level of Perforn	nance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:				
Not A _l	pplicable - less than 10.		Not Applicable	Not Applicable				
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
1	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable			
of imp 5E. Ed satisf	on the analysis of studen provement for the following conomically Disadvantag actory progress in readi ng Goal #5E:	ı subgroup: ged students not makinç	_	g Questions", identify and	define areas in need			
2012	Current Level of Perforr	nance:	2013 Expected	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
Not Ap	pplicable		Not Applicable	Not Applicable				
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable			

+

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			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
Reciprocal Teaching	9-12	Teacher / Literacy Coach	Open to all staff	Ongoing		Literacy Coach and Admin.

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Prograi	m(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 Developme	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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the p	percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)).			
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:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listenir	ng/speaking:			

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								
Students read in English	Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.									
2. Students scoring pr	oficient in reading.									
CELLA Goal #2:										
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient in re	eading:								
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to Increase S	tudent Achievement							
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool						
	No	Data Submitted								
Students write in English	n at grade level in a manner	similar to non-El	LL students.							
3. Students scoring pr	oficient in writing.									
CELLA Goal #3:										
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:										
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to Increase S	tudent Achievement							
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool						
	No Data Submitted									

CELLA 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 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 CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics 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: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Strategy Responsible Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for 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: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Anticipated Barrier Strategy 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: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	Problem-Solving Proces	ss 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 soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, an llowing group:	d refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas in need
2b. Florida Alternate As Students scoring at or a mathematics.	ssessment: above Achievement Level 7	in			
Mathematics Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Ехр	ected Level of Performa	ance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No		Submitted		
Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, an llowing group:	d refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas in need
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentaç gains in mathematics.	ge of students making learn	ing			
Mathematics Goal #3a:					
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Ехр	ected Level of Performa	ance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	o Data S	Submitted		

Based on the a of improvemen			ent data, and refe	rence to "Gi	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and c	define areas in need
3b. Florida Al	ternate As	sessment:						
Percentage of	fstudents	making Learning	g Gains in					
mathematics								
Mathematics	Goal #3b:							
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Ехр	ected Leve	el of Performaı	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process to	Increase St	tudent Ach	nievement		
				son or	Process l	Jsed to		
Anticipated B	Barrier	Strategy		tion oonsible	Determin		Eval	uation Tool
			for		Effective Strategy			
			Mon	itoring	on aragy			
			No Data	Submitted				
Based on the a			ent data, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and c	define areas in need
4. FCAT 2.0: F	Percentage	of students in L	owest 25%					
making learni	ing gains ir	n mathematics.						
Mathematics	Goal #4:							
Matrierriatics	σσαι π 4 .							
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performar	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process to	I ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		
			Pers	son or	Danasasi	1000 40		
				tion	Process l Determin			
Anticipated B	sarrier	Strategy	for	oonsible	Effective		Evai	uation Tool
			Mon	itoring	Strategy			
			No Data	Submitted				
Based on Ambi	itious but A	chievable Annual	Measurable Objec	tives (AMOs	s), AMO-2,	Reading and Ma	ith Pe	erformance Target
			Elementary Scho	ol Mathemat	ics Goal #			
5A. Ambitious Measurable Ob		ble Annual MOs). In six year						_
		hievement gap						
by 50%.			5A :			T		$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	2 2012-2013	2013-2014	2014	4-2015	2015-2016	5	2016-2017
	r	<u>'</u>	1	,		,		,

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	s by ethnicity (White	Black					
Hispanic, Asian, Ameri satisfactory progress	can Indian) not makir						
Mathematics Goal #5E	3:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:		
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi: Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	'	No Data	Submitted				
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f		lata, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need		
5C. English Language I satisfactory progress		aking					
Mathematics Goal #50): :						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving	Process 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		
			Submitted		<u>'</u>		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f		lata, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need		
5D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress		king					
Mathematics Goal #5D):						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			

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, lowing subgroup:	and refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
5E. Economically Disadv satisfactory progress in					
Mathematics Goal #5E:					
2012 Current Level of Po		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Pro	cess to Ir	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 Submitted					

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)).	

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: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: 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

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 Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Anticipated Barrier Strategy Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Determine Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Determine Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy Anticipated Barrier Strategy Reposition Responsible Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy Anticipated Barrier Strategy Reposition Responsible Evaluation Tool Strategy Anticipated Barrier Strategy Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy Anticipated Barrier Strategy Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy Anticipated Barrier Strategy Process Used to Evaluation Tool Strategy Process Used to Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Process to Increase Stud	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 Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Bata Submitted No Bata Submitted No Bata Submitted Strategy No Bata Submitted Strategy No Bata Submitted Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Trategy No Bata Submitted Strategy No Bata Submitted Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Person or Position Position Responsible Informance: Problem-Solving 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 Submitted Person or Position Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy No Bata Submitted Person or Position Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy No Bata Submitted No Bata Submitted Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Bata Submitted Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Bata Submitted Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Bata Submitted Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Bata Submitted Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Bata Submitted Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Bata Submitted Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy No Bata Submitted Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool Strategy Strategy	Mathematics Goal #1b:					
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. No Data Submitted Process Used to Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy 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 Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted No Data Submitte	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 Determine Effectiveness of Strategy No Data Submitted Problem-Solving at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics. No Data Submitted Process Used to Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy 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 Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted No Data Submitte		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 Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Person or Position Process Used to Process Used to Person or Position Process Used to Process Used to Process Used to Person or Position Process Used to Process Used to	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 data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need f improvement for the following group: 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: 4. 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:						
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 Oussettes III II II	for and define the
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: 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: tudents scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in nathematics. Alathematics Goal #2b: 1. Submitted 2. Submitted 2. Submitted 2. Submitted 2. Submitted 2. Submitted 3. Submitted 4. Submitted 5. Submitted 5. Submitted 6. Submitted			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 Evaluation Tool Strategy No Data Submitted Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool					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: Students Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:	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: Percentag gains in mathematics.	e of students making learn	ing			
Mathematics Goal #3a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expe	ected Level of Performar	nce:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		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 Po	erformance:		2013 Ехр	ected Level of Performa	ance:
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I r	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monit	ion onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	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	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	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	4-2015	2015-201	6	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	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	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 Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Posit Resp for Monit		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	١		Submitted	1		
Based on the analysis of softimprovement for the fo	student achievement data, a	nd refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas in nee	
<u> </u>	vilities (SWD) not making n mathematics.					
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ance:	
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	1	No Data :	Submitted			
of improvement for the fo	vantaged students not ma		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 Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	ı	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 in need 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:		2	2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	ance:
	Problem-Solving Process	s to In	crease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier		Perso Position Responsi for Monito	on onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data Sı	ubmitted		

Algebra 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 student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. 25% (2/8) will achieve level 3 on the Algebra EOC. Algebra Goal #1: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 25% (2/8) will achieve level 3 on the 0% (0/4) Algebra EOC. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Entire Cyesis Team Attendence will be 1. Attendance is the 1. Students not in Attendance is the critical barrier -- 100% of attendance by 3rd period including the Social tracked and the top predictor of the Cyesis population had will be called to worker and school percentage of students success in school. determine reason/excuse with 10 or more absences An increase in 10 or more absences. psychologist and and absences will be administration. will decrease by 10%. student tracked. attendance will lead to student learning gains, and an increase in student proficiency will determine our success as measured by Fair, CoreK12, and FCAT. 2. Lack of prerequisite 2. Remediation and 2. Math teacher 2. Practice, student 2. Alg 1 EOC, Core knowledge and lack of accountability, and work K12. students will be Administration critical thinking skills. challenged to complete samples, walkthroughs. problem sets and to explain their answers (show their work steps)

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:

and 5 in Algel	bra.								
Algebra Goal	#2:								
2012 Current	Level of Per	formance:		2	2013 Expe	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process	s to Ind	crease St	udent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated E	3arrier S	trategy		Persor Positic Respor for Monite	on nsible	Process L Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eva	luation Tool
	·		No	Data Su	ubmitted				
Based on Amb	itious but Ach	ievable Annual	Measurable C	Objectiv	es (AMOs)), AMO-2, I	Reading and Ma	ath Pe	erformance Target
3A. Ambitious Measurable Ob school will red by 50%.	jectives (AMC	Os). In six year	Algebra Goal	#					A
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-20	014	2014	1-2015	2015-2016	5	2016-2017
		udent achieveme wing subgroup:	ent data, and	referer	nce to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and	define areas in need
	an, American progress in A	v ethnicity (Wh n Indian) not m lgebra.							
2012 Current	Level of Per	formance:		2	2013 Expe	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process	s to Ind	crease St	udent Ach	ilevement		
Anticipated E	3arrier S	trategy		Persor Positic Respon for Monite	on nsible	Process L Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eva	luation Tool
			No	Data Su	ubmitted				
		udent achieveme wing subgroup:	ent data, and	referer	nce to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and	define areas in need

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making

satisfactory progress in Algebra.

2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	ance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		ata, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identif	y and define areas in need
3D. Students with Disal satisfactory progress in	bilities (SWD) not mak	king			
Algebra Goal #3D:					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	ance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		<u> </u>	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		ata, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identif	y and define areas in need
3E. Economically Disac satisfactory progress i		ot making			
Algebra Goal #3E:					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	ance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
		Perso	on or	Process Used to	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for	ion onsible toring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

Algebra Goal #3C:

Geometry 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 student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. 10% of students taking the Geometry EOC will pass with a level 3. Geometry Goal #1: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 10% of students taking the Geometry EOC will pass with 0% a level 3 Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring 1. Attendance is the 1. Students not in Entire Cyesis Attendence will be Attendance is the critical barrier -- 100% attendance by 3rd Team including tracked and the top predictor of of the Cyesis population period will be called to the Social worker percentage of students success in with 10 or more had 10 or more determine and school school. An absences. reason/excuse and psychologist and absences will decrease increase in absences will be by 10%. student administration tracked. attendance will lead to student learning gains, and an increase in student proficiency will determine our success as measured by Fair, CoreK12, and FCAT. 2. Scheduling 2. Teacher will create 2. Math and 2. Quality of common 2. EOC, CoreK12 Science teachers, assessments and use common assessment to administration. determine students' progress.

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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

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		

Based on Ambition Target	ıs but Achievable	e Annual Measurab	le Ob	jectives (A	MOs), <i>i</i>	AMO-2, Reading a	nd Math Performance
3A. Ambitious but Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six yea reduce their achie 50%.	e Objectives er school will	Geometry Goal #					<u> </u>
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014		2014-20	15	2015-2016	2016-2017
Based on the analy			and r	eference to	"Guid	ing Questions", id	entify and define areas
3B. Student subg Hispanic, Asian, A satisfactory prog Geometry Goal #	American India gress in Geome	_	k,				
2012 Current Lev	el of Performa	nce:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem	n-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent	Achievement	
Anticipated Barr	pated Barrier Strategy Posi Resp		Posit Resp for	sponsible De Eff		ss Used to mine iveness of egy	Evaluation Tool
		No	Data S	Submitted			
Doord on the size!	usis of students	ahiayamant data	and -	oforonos to	. "	ing Ougstians" :-	ontifu and define
Based on the analy			and r	ererence to	Guid	ing Questions", id	entify and define areas

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to I	ncrease Student Achievement

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

	f student achievement data, for the following subgroup:	and r	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", ic	dentify and define areas
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.					
Geometry Goal #3D:					
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 reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:					
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.					
Geometry Goal #3E:					
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					

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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							

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	diri(s)/iviaterial(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 Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

When us	ing percenta	ges, include	the number	of students	s the percent	tage represents	s (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:						
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:	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						

	of student achievement data rement for the following gro		reference	to "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define
1b. Florida Alternate	Assessment:				
Students scoring at L	evels 4, 5, and 6 in science	ce.			
Science Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	mance:
	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data S	Submitted		_

Based on the analysis areas in need of improv			d reference	e to "Guiding Questio	ns", identify and define
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.					
Science Goal #2a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving	g Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achieveme	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Res for	son or tion ponsible itoring	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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.

Science Goal #2b:						
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp for		on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
			Submitted			
Florida Alternate						
* When using percentage (35)).	s, include the number o	of students th	e percentag	ge represents next to the	percentage (e.g., 70%	
Based on the analysis areas in need of improv			I reference	to "Guiding Questions	", identify and define	
1. Florida Alternate A at Levels 4, 5, and 6		its scoring				
Science Goal #1:	iii science.					
0010 0	f D f		0010 5	and the state of Davids		
2012 Current Level o	T Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving F	rocess to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	ion or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
<u> </u>						
Based on the analysis areas in need of improv			l reference	e to "Guiding Questions	", identify and define	
2. Florida Alternate A	Assessment: Studen					
at or above Level 7 in	n science.					
Science Goal #2:						
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		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						

urco (EOC) (В

Biolo	gy End-of-Course	(EOC) Goals			
* Whe	n using percentages, inclu	de the number of students	s the percentage rep	presents (e.g., 70% (35))).
	d on the analysis of studin need of improvement			Guiding Questions", ide	entify and define
Biolo	udents scoring at Achi gy. gy Goal #1:	evement Level 3 in	10% of the stu with a level 3.	udents taking the Biolo	gy EOC will pass
2012	Current Level of Perfo	ormance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performar	nce:
0%			10% of those pass with a lev	enrolled and taking the vel 3.	Biology EOC will
	Prob	lem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	ent Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Attendance is the critical barrier 100% of the Cyesis population had 10 or more absences.	1. Students not in attendance by 3rd period will be called to determine reason/excuse and absences will be tracked.	Entire Cyesis Team including the Social worker and school psychologist and administration.	Attendence will be tracked and the percentage of students with 10 or more absences will decrease by 10%.	Attendance is the top predictor of success in school. An increase in student attendance will lead to student learning gains, and an increase in student proficiency will determine our success as measured by Fair, CoreK12, and FCAT.
2	Insufficient background knowledge and vocabulary.	Remediation / vocabulary checks.	Science teacher, admin.	CoreK12 score increases, Biology practice test.	Walkthroughs, evaluation process.

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:				
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 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						

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Progra			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

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

vviie	ir using percentages, includ	ie the number of students t	пе регсептаде герге	sems (e.g., 70% (33)).			
	d on the analysis of studeed of improvement for the		nd reference to "Gu	iding Questions", identify	y and define areas		
3.0 a	CAT 2.0: Students scor nd higher in writing. ng Goal #1a:	ing at Achievement Le	60% of the stu	60% of the students in the Cyesis program will achieve a level 3.0 in writing.			
2012	Current Level of Perfo	rmance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performance	e:		
58.3%	6 (7/12)		60%				
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	ent Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	Need for differentiated instruction. Prior knowledge from base school.	Students Data Chat - developed at the beginning of the school year and reviewed with the student at least 2X per quarter.	Students' English teacher and Data Chat mentor, Administration	All instructors will utilize 6 traits of writing rubric in their content area.			
2	Students lack of writing experienc.	Reciprocal teaching	English teacher, literacy coach and administration.	Students writing samples	Walkthroughs, FCAT 2.0 Writing scores.		
3	Unfamiliarity w/writing rubrics	Peer evaluation using rubrics	English teacher	Observation and anecedotal evidence.	Rubrics		
	d on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the		nd reference to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas		
at 4 d	lorida Alternate Assess or higher in writing. ng Goal #1b:	sment: Students scorin	g				

in need of improvement			0.0.0.00	o caraning cassinonis	, radining and domine areas
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.					
Writing Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	ormance:
	Problem-Solvii	ng Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Pos for		son or tion ponsible itoring	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
Reciprocal teaching	19-17	English teacher / Literacy Coach	All teachers	Once a month		Literacy Coach and Admin.

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	arri(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
<u> </u>		<u> </u>	Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.	
Civics Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to I	l ncrease Student 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 in need of improvement	student achievement data, for the following group:	and re	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", id	lentify and define areas
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.					
Civics Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:	:	2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to In	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monit	on onsible	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	lo Data Submitted	d		

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Progr	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 Civics Goals

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

	d on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the		nd reference to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas
Histo	udents scoring at Achie ory. History Goal #1:	evement Level 3 in U.S		nts taking the US History	EOC will pass with
2012	Current Level of Perfo	rmance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performance	e:
0%			10% (1/10)		
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Attendance is the critical barrier 100% of the Cyesis population had 10 or more absences.	1. Students not in attendance by 3rd period will be called to determine reason/excuse and absences will be tracked.	Entire Cyesis Team including the Social worker and school psychologist and administration.	Attendence will be tracked and the percentage of students with 10 or more absences will decrease by 10%.	Attendance is the top predictor of success in school. An increase in student attendance will lead to student learning gains, and an increase in student proficiency will determine our success as measured by Fair, CoreK12, and FCAT.
2	2. Lack of basic history knowledge and weak vocabulary.	Use supplemental resources to scaffold lessons to higher level material. Use best practice methods (LFS)- Word wall made by US History students.	Administration.	Student responses in class, teacher observations, monitoring of Student Data Chat progress.	2 EOC practice exams, EOC exam results. FCAT 2.0 Writing, FAIR, CoreK12.

 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels and 5 in U.S. History. 					
U.S. History Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proc	ess to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi for		for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Su					

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	(e.g. , PLC,	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
District SS Dept	9-12	Textbook Publisher Rep	All SS teachers	()n aoina	Dept heads, Admin., District SS Supervisor

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

Attendance Goal(s)

* И	/hen using percentages, i	include the number of students the	percentage represen	ts (e.g., 70% (35)).			
	sed on the analysis of improvement:	attendance data, and reference	to "Guiding Questi	ons", identify and defin	ne areas in need		
1.	Attendance						
Attendance Goal #1:			75% of the studer excessive absence	nts in the Cyesis Progra es and tardies (10 or m	am will have nore).		
2012 Current Attendance Rate:			2013 Expected A	Attendance Rate:			
100% of the students in the Cyesis program had excessive absences (10 or more).			75% of the students in the Cyesis Drop Out Prevention Program will have excessive absences (10 or more).				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
100% of the students in the Cyesis program had excessive absences (10 or more).			75% of the students in the Cyesis program will have excessive absences (10 or more).				
	12 Current Number c rdies (10 or more)	f Students with Excessive	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
100% of the students in the Cyesis program had excessive tardies (10 or more).			75% of the students in the Cyesis program will have excessive tardies (10 or more).				
		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		
	Poor attendance due to: Maternity leave and pregnancy	Student/parent/teacher/counse attendance contracts. Make D		Review attendance records weekly.	Attendance records, number of students on		

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	to: Maternity leave and pregnancy issues, transportation, health issues of the students and students children.	Student/parent/teacher/counselor attendance contracts. Make Dr.'s appts. for after school. Prompt placement on Home bound if extended maternity leave. Home visits, calls and/or letters home when student is absent. Collaboration between Cyesis nurse and Doctors. Complete planner in each class each day as part of academic instruction. Increase implementation of Moodle in the classroom Counselor meets with seniors to review MAP/Graduation Plan Teachers assigned students to monitor attendance Quarterly celebrations with	Instructors, Cyesis Nurse, Guidance Counselor,	Review attendance records weekly.	Attendance records, number of students on home bound, log of maternity leave by Doctor and timely production of birth certificate and shot records.
		attendance awards given			

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:				
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	The number of students receiving in-school suspensions and out-of school suspensions will decrease by 10%.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			

	e were 14 in-school susper Prevention Program.	ensions in the Cyesis Dro	i P	The number of students receiving in-school suspensions in the Cyesis Drop Out Prevention Program will decrease by 10%.		
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School				2013 Expecte School	d Number of Students	Suspended In-
10 of the 46 students in the Cyesis Drop Out Prevention Program served an in-school suspension.				The number of students serving in-school suspensions will decrease by 10%.		
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				2013 Expecte Suspensions	d Number of Out-of-Sc	hool
There were 4 out-of-school suspensions in the Cyesis Drop Out Prevention Program.				The number of students serving out- of-school suspensions will decrease by 10%.		
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of- School				2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School		
	he 46 students in the Cy am served an out-of-sch			The number of students receiving an out-of-school suspension will decrease by 10%.		
	Pro	olem-Solving Process t	to In	ncrease Stude	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res	Person or Position sponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Implement lunch detention so students can receive classroom instruction while serving detentions at lunch and also not miss instructional time in class.	Cye Adm	Committee, esis Teachers, ninistration.	Decrease in in-school and out-of school suspensions by percentage as indicated above.	TERMS and the actual referrals.

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 Submitted	d		

Suspension Budget:

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

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 Suspension Goal(s)

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 (e.g., 70% (35)).

	d on the analysis of parened of improvement:	nt involvement data, and	d reference to "Gui	ding Questions", identify	and define areas	
1. Dr	opout Prevention					
*Plea	out Prevention Goal #1 use refer to the percentaged out during the 2011	ge of students who	85% of the ser graduate.	85% of the seniors enrolled in Cyesis Program will graduate.		
2012	Current Dropout Rate:		2013 Expecte	ed Dropout Rate:		
	(10/12) of the seniors en NOT graduate.	rolled in the Cyesis Progr	ram 15% of the sei graduate.	niors enrolled in the Cyes	sis Program will not	
2012	Current Graduation Ra	te:	2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
	(10/12) of the students i lated.	n Cyesis Program	85% of the stu	85% of the students in Cyesis Program will graduate.		
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	base/home school. Lack of parent involvement. Attendance. Data Chat form. We Psi ad		Cyesis nurse, Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, School Psychologist, administration, and teachers.	Attendance records. Parent attendance at events, as well as enrolled students. Continued review of student progress.	Attendance records, esembler, STAR.	

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						

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)

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent I nvolvement Goal #1:					
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.	Parental Involvement will increase to 65%				
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:				
Parental Involvement currently is at 20% (6/29)	Parental Involvement will be at 65%.				

	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	Employment, transportation, financial, think education is not important.	Parents must sign Student Data Chat plan. Parents given opportunity to add comments. Open House / Spaghetti Dinner Individual Parent conferences - as needed End of Year Celebration	Instructors/Administration, nurse, guidance counselor, social worker, school psychologist.	Sign in sheets at events.	Review sign in sheets.				

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						

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program	n(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 Developme	nt		
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

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	Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:						
1. STEM							
STEM Goal #1:							
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		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
		N	lo Data Submitted	d		

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/I	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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

* Whe	n using percentages, includ	le the number of students t	he percentage repre	sents (e.g., 70% (35)).			
Based	on the analysis of school	ol data, identify and defir	ne areas in need of	improvement:			
				orograms will meet or ma 0% completion, 70% pla			
			individual progi	student enrollment will incrams until maximum class 2012/2013 school year.			
1. CT	E			andards achieved by HS acrease by 10% from 201			
CTE G	Goal #1:		will be reported Determination 14th day of confine instructor, aduprincipal.	nt who is absent for 10 cd to the adult academic a of enrollment status will insecutive absence by a lit academic adviser and will provide current evice h COE course curriculum	adviser. be made by the committee of the PSAV assistant		
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1							
	incentives for students to update information with school, students do not test for certifications after program completion,	Instructors will work	Career Center staff. 1.2. Technical instructors,	1.1. Instructors will work with Career Center staff and data entry to accurately report student completions, placement and licensure. 1.2. Instructors will participate in recruitment efforts to encourage students to enroll. 1.3. Instructors will schedule students to take exams and track results on district database. 1.4 Instructors will complete attendance forms and submit to student services office on time.	1.1. COE Annual Report data. 1.2. Enrollment records. 1.3. District database. 1.4 Attendance Records. 1.5 COE data to include current curriculum and frameworks, industry certification, updated instructional resumes, narratives and other documents as required.		

	information school wide Scheduling all eligible students to test. Instructors tracking an recording results accurately on district database.	student contact information in files.	administration.	1.5 Instructors will prepare COE data and submit to administration periodically throughout year on designated due dates.	
	1.4 Accurate and timely reporting.	y 1.2. Instructors will be encouraged to			
2	1.5 Providing instructors time to prepare and provide evidence. Changes in instructional staff and program curriculum.	participate in a minimum of two recruitment efforts a year for all levels both HS and PSAV. 1.3. Instructors will prepare and test as many students as possible to take industry certification exams. Utilize practice tests. Industry Certifications achieved by students should be posted and announced for celebration. Similar certifications grouped for instruction and practice.			
		Develop Committee composed of CCTE Department and school staff to oversee industry certification process to review certification exams and school resources. 1.4 Instructors will be provided forms and a procedure to track student attendance.			
		1.5 Instructors will be provided crates with outline of documents to be provided.			

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
Review of student data, share on modules, course cards, recruitment,					Technical	

relationships,	Secondary and Post Secondary Technical students	Technical	Technical instructors.	Meetings Quarterly. Small Group Meetings	instructors and administration participation in meetings and review of preliminary and final data.	Technical instructors/administration	
Review current COE requirements.							

CTE Budget:

Stratogy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attendance Monitoring	Time Clock Plus technical support.	Internal	\$4,000.00
			Subtotal: \$4,000.0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
COE Update	Travel to COE Annual Meeting/Conference (5)	Internal/District	\$8,000.00
			Subtotal: \$8,000.0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
			Grand Total: \$12,000.0

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Increase student achievement as measured by LCPs by 10% for students classified as completers. Goal:

	d on the analysis of studed of improvement for the		nd reference to "G	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas
LCPs Goal Incr	crease student achieve by 10% for students o ease student achievem 0% for students classif	ent as measured by LC	1. Increase stu CPs by 10% for stu	udent achievement as m udents classified as com	
2012	? Current level:		2013 Expecte	ed level:	
Base	Line.		10% Increase	from 2012 base line.	
	Pro	blem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	and infrequent	1.1. Incorporate Marzano best practices into instruction 80% of the time by February.	1.1. MTEC Adult Education Team Leader and Administration.	1.1 Review student data each term.	1.1 LCP report from terms.

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
Marzano Learning Strategies.	ABE/GED/ESOL	Coaches	All Adult Education Instructors.	IBI_IVIONTNIV	Meeting Schedule.	Lead Teacher.

Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
	·		Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Increase student achievement as measured by LCPs by 10% for students classified as completers. Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Prograr	m(s)/Material(s)			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CTE	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Increase student achievement as measured by LCPs by 10% for students classified as completers.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CTE	Attendance Monitoring	Time Clock Plus technical support.	Internal	\$4,000.00
Increase student achievement as measured by LCPs by 10% for students classified as completers.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$4,000.00
Professional Developme	ent			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
СТЕ	COE Update	Travel to COE Annual Meeting/Conference (5)	Internal/District	\$8,000.00
Increase student achievement as measured by LCPs by 10% for students classified as completers.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$8,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CTE	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Increase student achievement as measured by LCPs by 10% for students classified as completers.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$12,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	j n NA

Are you a reward school: j γ Yes j γ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 8/25/2012)

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.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Meetings will be held monthly for a total of 8 meetings. We will discuss the School Improvement Plan and monitor the implementation. The committee will also review the activities of the technical programs. This year the committee will be involved with the activities and data collection for the re-affirmation of our Council on Occupational Education (COE) post-secondary accreditation.

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