FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SOUTH FLORIDA AUTISM CHARTER SCHOOL INC

District Name: Dade

Principal: Glenn Pierce

SAC Chair: Gena Rosenzweig

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012



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	Tamara Moodie, Ph.D.	B.S. Psych. M.S. Special Ed. Ph.D. Philosophy in Education Completed coursework for Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA)	4	13	2004-2009: Educational Director at The Victory School for Autism: 8 out of 22 students successfully mainstreamed into a LRE. 2006-2012: 100% of students maintained or improved on skills/goals that were part of their individual programs, which included fine/gross motor, expressive/receptive language, augmentative communication, life & self-help skills, and when appropriate, academic skills

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)
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	 Use of local media outlets, periodic Job Fairs, and job postings that are publicized on the school's website, dadeschools.net and www.teachers-teachers.com. 	Tamara Moodie, Ph.D.	June 7, 2013	
2	2. All employees are offered the opportunity to participate in continuous professional development through workshops, seminars and weekly trainings. Workshops and seminars are offered periodically by outside consultants in ABA and related topics. Weekly training sessions are conducted by Dr. Tamara Moodie, which cover continuing education in a variety of topics related to our school's mission and curriculum.	Tamara	June 7, 2013	
3	3.Use of local colleges and universities to post job openings for graduate and post graduate candidates, as well as interns working towards a degree in education and/or therapeutic fields	Tamara Moodie, Ph.D.	June 7, 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 that are teaching out- of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
13	Staff who are in need of becoming highly effective instructional staff are being given opportunities to go to professional development seminars in order to obtain endorsements and being provided with assistance in certification testing on an individual basis

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	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
17	23.5%(4)	64.7%(11)	11.8%(2)	0.0%(0)	58.8%(10)	23.5%(4)	5.9%(1)	0.0%(0)	23.5%(4)

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 Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Marion Smink	Danielle Murphy John Souza	First year teacher	Marion Smink will meet monthly with any teacher in need of mentoring. In addition, she will perform lesson modeling and classroom observation feedback if necessary. The mentor will discuss evidence-based teaching strategies correlated to the Sunshine State Standards Access points and use of assistive technology.
Adlai Taylor	Marla Subero	First year teacher	Adlai Taylor will meet monthly with any teacher in need of mentoring. In addition, he will perform lesson modeling and classroom observation feedback if necessary. The mentor will discuss evidence-based teaching strategies correlated to the Sunshine State Standards Access points and use of assistive technology. The mentor will also discuss evidence- based teaching strategies correlated to Applied Behavior Analysis, Verbal Behavior and use of assistive technology.
Kristen Falepaini		First year Teacher	Kristen Falepaini will meet monthly with any teacher in need of mentoring. In addition, she will perform lesson modeling and classroom observation feedback if necessary. The mentor will discuss evidence-based teaching strategies correlated to the Sunshine State Standards Access points and use of assistive technology. The mentor will also discuss evidence- based teaching strategies correlated to Applied Behavior Analysis, Verbal Behavior and use of assistive technology.
Maria Zambrano	Claudia Moris	First year Teacher	Maria Zambrasno will meet monthly with any teacher in need of mentoring. In addition, she will perform lesson modeling and classroom observation feedback if necessary. The mentor will discuss evidence- based teaching strategies correlated to the Sunshine State Standards Access points and use of assistive technology. The mentor will also discuss evidence-based teaching strategies correlated to Applied Behavior Analysis, Verbal Behavior and use of assistive technology.
Estefania Lopez	Khiana Allen	First year teacher	Estefania Lopez will meet monthly with any teacher in need of mentoring. In addition, she will perform lesson modeling and classroom observation feedback if necessary. The mentor will discuss evidence-based teaching strategies correlated to the Sunshine State Standards Access points and use of assistive technology. The mentor will also discuss evidence-

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.

le I, Part A
/A
le I, Part C- Migrant
/A
le I, Part D
/A
le II
/A
le III
/A
le X- Homeless
/A
pplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
/A
lence Prevention Programs
/A
trition Programs
/A
using Programs
/A
ad Start
/A
ult Education
/A
reer and Technical Education
/A
o Training
/A
ner

N/A

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (Rtl)

-School-based MTSS/Rtl Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative for students who have not been placed in an ESE program. Due to the very nature of our school model and programs, 100% of SFACS students are identified as students with disabilities.

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

Although SFACS does not have an MTSS/RtI team, administration, therapists and teachers meet twice on a monthly basis to discuss student progress, assessment procedures, lesson planning, etc. the meetings will maintain a continuous problem solving system to help improve all aspects of a conducive learning environment.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

SFACS RtI team will monitor the academic, social and behavioral progress of the students' IEP goals via a structured format for problem-solving using various methods of assessment to monitor student progress.

-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.

SFACS will use MTSS/RtI as an intervention to meet IEP goals adopting evidence-based intervention strategies and applied behavior analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

SFACS administrative team will train staff on MTSSRtI using frequent-progress monitoring data and/or anecdotal records to track a child's work completion, attention to task, compliance with teacher directions, and other behaviors that influence learning that are relevant to the IEP, aligning resources to deliver effective interventions that produce improved child outcomes and learning gains.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Teachers will meet with administration to review data source and assessments to maintain student improvement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

-School-Based Literacy Leadership Team—

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

Kristen Rodriguez-7th grade teacher; Colleen McMurray- curriculum specialist; Dr. Tamara Moodie-Principal

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

The LLT will meet bi-monthly to review strategies and any issues that may arise. There will be two main representatives for the lower and middle grades within the LLT. The LLT will discuss ways to incorporate a variety of centers located in the classroom into lesson plans to facilitate learning for the students. The principal will set aside time once a month for the LLT to meet school-wide to discuss any issues teachers may be having or to review professional development. Throughout the year, the LLT will be available to meet with individual teachers should any questions arise that require hands on attention.

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

The major initiatives for the LLT this year will to increase student grades by 75% from last year by helping teachers incorporate reading/listening centers into daily lessons.

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.

N/A

*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.

Through professional development, each teacher will be required to attend at least one reading workshop a year in order to ensure reading strategies are being used throughout the school. Monitoring will be done on a bi-monthly basis, between the principal and teachers to review strategies and student progress.

*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?

Academic courses will be offered alongside life skills lessons. These courses will be taught to all high school students via a functional curriculum which will incorporate life skills and functional academics.

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?

There will be no course selection due to the ESE curriculum and our student body. The teacher, along with the principal will meet to determine the best course schedule for the students, which will include a functional curriculum in which life skills and real life problems are the basis of delivery. Each student will have individualized components based on individual needs.

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</u> <u>Feedback Report</u>

Students will receive life skills training along with vocational training in order to prepare them for postsecondary transitioning. Teachers, along with the principal and parents will meet to determine which vocational course would be best suited for each individual student.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading 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 nee of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. N/A Reading Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: N/A N/A Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Responsible Strategy 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 reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 17% of the students will perform at levels 4-6 in reading.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
12% (8)	17%(12)			

	Pr	roblem-Solving Process 1	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD), and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may require training in self- help skills. Students who have Reading/Preacademic goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessment. Based upon	Leadership team will apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	Leadership Team	The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains.	reports of student IEP goals.

the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an IEP meeting by committee. Not all students have Reading/Preacademic goals on their IEP due to		
Individual need.		

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: Student Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Achievement	r N/A			
2012 Current Level of		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A			N/A		
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
for			Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data S	Submitted	•	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and refer of improvement for the following group:	rence to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 9% of the students will perform at level 7-9
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6%(4)	9%(6)

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	
All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD), and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may require training in self- help skills. Students who have Reading/Preacademic goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper	Leadership team will apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	Leadership team	The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains.	reports of student IEP goals.	

assessment. Based upon the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an IEP meeting by committee. Not all students have Reading/Preacademic goals on their IEP due to Individual need.All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD), and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may require training in self- help skills. Students who have Reading/Preacademic goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessment. Based upon the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an IEP meeting by committee. Not all students have Reading/Preacademic goals on their IEP due to Individual need.	e findings, objectives e agreed upon during IEP meeting by mmittee. Not all udents have ading/Preacademic als on their IEP due to dividual need.All udents at SFACS are agnosed with autism ectrum disorder (ASD) d some have mmunication deficits d/or behavioral allenges, and may quire training in self- lp skills. Students who ve ading/Preacademic als on their IEP are aluated by the proper sessment. Based upor e findings, objectives e agreed upon during IEP meeting by mmittee. Not all udents have ading/Preacademic als on their IEP due to ading/Preacademic als on their IEP due to	ings, objectives eed upon during meeting by tee. Not all s have /Preacademic n their IEP due to al need.All s at SFACS are ed with autism m disorder (ASD), ne have nication deficits behavioral ges, and may training in self- ils. Students who /Preacademic n their IEP are ed by the proper nent. Based upon ings, objectives seed upon during meeting by tee. Not all s have /Preacademic n their IEP due to					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:			N/A		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A			N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

No Data Submitted

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

 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

 Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.

 Reading Goal #3b:

 2012 Current 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		
1	All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD), and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may require training in self- help skills. Students who have Reading/Preacademic goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessment. Based upon the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an IEP meeting by committee. Not all students have Reading/Preacademic goals on their IEP due to Individual need.	Leadership team will apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	Leadership Team	The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains.	IEP goals.		

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A	N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual			Measurable Objectiv	es (AMOs), AMO-2,	Reading and Math Pe	erformance Target
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal #				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

dent achievement data, ar wing subgroup: ethnicity (White, Black, I Indian) not making eading.		N/A	uiding Questions", ident	tify and define areas in nee
Indian) not making eading.	,	N/A		
6- mm				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A				
Problem-Solving Proce	ess to l	ncrease S ⁻	tudent Achievement	
trategy	Posit Resp for	ion onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Ν	No Data S	Submitted		
t	rategy	Perso Posit rategy Resp for Moni	Person or Position Responsible	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following subgroup:			
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	N/A		
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A	N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in ne of improvement for the following subgroup:		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	Given the specific needs of the students we serve,% of the students with Preacademic/Reading goals on their IEP wi master the goal within one full academic year	
Reading Goal #5D:		
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
NA	NA	

	Anticipated Barrie	er	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible fo Monitoring	Process Used to Determine r Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Too
1	All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disor (ASD), and some have communication deficit and/or behavioral challenges, and may require training in self help skills. Students w have Reading/Preacademic goals on their IEP are evaluated by the prop assessment. Based up the findings, objective are agreed upon durin an IEP meeting by committee. Not all students have Reading/Preacademic goals on their IEP due individual needs.	appl rder Suns re Acce indiv stud goal f- who e per pon es ng	lership team will y appropriate shine State Standard ess Points per vidual needs of the ents based on IEP s.	Leadership team	The leadership team v conduct monthly revie of the progress report student IEP goals in o to assess learning gai Adjustments to indivic student academic plan will be made as neede order to achieve learn gains	ews reports of studer ts of IEP goals rder ns. dual ns ed in
	on the analysis of stu provement for the follow			eference to "Guidi	ng Questions", identify a	nd define areas in ne
	conomically Disadva	_	students not making	J		
	actory progress in re	eading.		N1 / A		
	ng Goal #5E:			N/A		
Read	ing Goal #5E: Current Level of Per	formanc	e:		ed Level of Performand	ce:
Read		formanc	e:		ed Level of Performand	ce:
Read 2012			e: m-Solving Process	2013 Expect		ce:
Read 2012 N/A	Current Level of Per		m-Solving Process	2013 Expect N/A to Increase Stud erson or osition esponsible r	ent Achievement	ce: Evaluation Tool

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus			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 fc Monitoring
1	1	I	I I		I	I

SRA/ED Mark	K-11	Gena Rosenzweig	School-wide	September 26, 2012	Observation within Classroom	Tamara Moodie
-------------	------	--------------------	-------------	--------------------	---------------------------------	---------------

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Mat	erial(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
Reading materials (flash cards, books, etc)	school purchased	EESAC	\$360.00
			Subtotal: \$360.00
			Grand Total: \$360.00

End of Reading Goa

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the 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.						
1. Students scoring pr	oficient in listening/speak	king.				
CELLA Goal #1:						
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient in li	stening/speaki	ing:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to Increase S	itudent 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 at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.							
2. Students scoring p	2. Students scoring proficient in reading.						
CELLA Goal #2:							
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficie	nt in reading	:				
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monite	ion onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
No Data Submitted							

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.							
3. Students scoring pr	3. Students scoring proficient in writing.						
CELLA Goal #3:							
2012 Current Percent	of Students Profic	cient in writing	:				
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		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

			Available
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fo		data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in need	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.						
Mathematics Goal #1a:						
2012 Current Level of P		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solvin	ig Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
for			Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:					
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 14% will				
Mathematics Goal #1b:	perform at levels 4-6.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
9%(6)	14%(10)				

	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	All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self- help skills. Those students who have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP)	apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	Leadership Team	The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	reports of student goals			

meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP due to individual needs				
--	--	--	--	--

	ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee f 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-Solv	ing 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 student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:						
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 6% of students will perform at level 7-9					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
3%(2)	6%(4)					

	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	spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits	apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	Leadership team	The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	reports of student goals

an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP due to individual needs				
---	--	--	--	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #3a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solvi	ng Process to	Increase St	tudent Achievement	
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 nee of improvement for the following group:					
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 62% of students will make learning gains.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
52%(27)	62%(33)				

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	spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits	apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	Leadership Team	The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	reports of student goals		

the findings, objectives		
are agreed upon during		
an individualized		
education plan (IEP)		
meeting by committee.		
Not all students have		
preacademic/mathematics		
goals on their IEP due to		
individual needs		

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	student achievement data, and llowing group:	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #4:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to Ir	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No Data Submitted				

Based on Amb	itious but Achi	evable Annual	Measurable Objecti	ves (AMOs), AMO-2,	Reading and Math Pe	erformance Target
	but Achievable ojectives (AMO luce their achie	s). In six year		Mathematics Goal #		A
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	analysis of stud nt for the follov			ence to "Guiding Ques	stions", identify and	define areas in nee
	subgroups by an, American progress in m	Indian) not n				
Mathematics	Goal #5B:					
2012 Current	t Level of Perf	formance:		2013 Expected Leve	el of Performance:	
		Problem-Sol	lving Process to L	acrease Student Act	nievement	

Antic	cipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:					
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #5C:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ince:
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in neer of improvement for the following subgroup:					
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Given the specific needs of the students we serve,% of the students with preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP will master the goal within one full academic year.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
NA	NA				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

	Pr	oblem-Solving Process 1	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self- help skills. Those students who have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on	apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	Leadership Team	The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	reports of student goals

the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/mathematics		
preacademic/mathematics		
goals on their IEP due to individual needs		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in ne of improvement for the following subgroup:					
5E. Economically Disad satisfactory progress ir	vantaged students not mak n mathematics.	king			
Mathematics Goal #5E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proce	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goa

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		nt data, and refere	nce to "Gu	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in need
1a. FCAT2.0: Students mathematics.	ement Level 3 in				
Mathematics Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of F	2	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solv	ing Process to In	crease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Persor Positio Respo for Monito	on nsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:							
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in ma Mathematics Goal #1b:	athematics.			Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 14% of students will perform at levels 4-6.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expe	cted Level of	f Performance:			
9%(6)		14%(10)					
Problem-Solving	g Process to	Increase Stu	ident Achiev	ement			
Anticipated Barrier Strate	egy F	Person or Position Responsible Monitoring	for Effe	cess Used to etermine ctiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Too		
All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self- help skills. Those students who have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP due to individual needs		adership Tear	conduct of the pr student I to assess Adjustme student a will be m order to gains	ership team will monthly reviews ogress reports of IEP goals in orde s learning gains. ents to individua academic plans ade as needed i achieve learning	of goals r n y		
Based on the analysis of student achievement of improvement for the following group: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above			ding Questior	ns", identify and	define areas in nee		
Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
Problem-Solving	g Process to	Increase Stu	ident Achiev	ement			
Anticipated Barrier Strategy R fc		ponsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Iluation Tool		
		Submitted					

Based	d on the analysis of s	tuden	t achievement data, and	refer	ence to "Gi	uidinc	1 Questions" identify	and o	lefine areas in nee
	provement for the fol			reiei		nunng	g Questions , identify		
Stud math	2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:				Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 6% of the students will perform at level 7 or above.				
2012	Current Level of Pe	erforn	nance:		2013 Expe	ected	d Level of Performar	nce:	
3%(2)				6%(4)				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barr	rier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible Monitorin	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1				adership Tea	-	The leadership team conduct monthly rev of the progress repo student IEP goals in to assess learning ga Adjustments to indiv student academic pla will be made as need order to achieve lear gains	iews rts of order ains. idual ans led in	-	
	d on the analysis of s provement for the fol		t achievement data, and group:	refer	ence to "Gu	uiding	g Questions", identify	and c	define areas in nee
	CAT 2.0: Percentag s in mathematics.	e of s	tudents making learnir	ng					
Math	ematics Goal #3a:								
2012 Current Level of Performance:					2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit for			on or tion ponsible Effectiveness of Strategy				uation Tool		

No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group:					
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 62% will make learning gains.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
52%(27)	62%(33)				

	Pr	oblem-Solving Process t	o Increase Studer	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	and some have	apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	Leadership Team	The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	reports of student goals

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 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

Based on Amb	itious but A	chievable Annual	Measurable	Object	ives (AMOs), AMO-2, F	Reading and Ma	ath Pe	rformance Target
			Middle Scho	_			<u> </u>		
	jectives (Al	able Annual MOs). In six year chievement gap	5A :		nematics G	041 #			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	2 2012-2013	2013-2	014	2014	-2015	2015-201	16 2016-201	
		student achieveme	ent data, and	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and c	define areas in nee
Hispanic, Asia	an, Americ progress in	by ethnicity (Wh an Indian) not m n mathematics.							
2012 Current	Level of P	erformance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated E	Barrier	Strategy		Perso Posit Resp for Moni	ion onsible Strategy		ne Eva		uation Tool
			No		Submitted	1			
<u></u>									
Based on the a of improvemer	analysis of s at for the fol	student achieveme llowing subgroup:	ent data, and	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and c	define areas in nee
-		earners (ELL) no 1 mathematics.	t making						
Mathematics	Goal #5C:								
2012 Current Level of Performance:					2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated E	3arrier	Strategy		Perso Posit Resp for Monit		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Eval	uation Tool

No Data Submitted

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Given the specific needs of the students we serve,% with preacademic. Mathematics goals on their IEP will maste the goal within one full academic year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
ΝΑ	NA

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
1	All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self- help skills. Those students who have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP due to individual needs	apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	Leadership Team	The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	goals			

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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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:						
 Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1: 			Given the speci	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 14% will perform at levels 4-6.		
2012	2 Current Level of Perfor	mance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance		
9%(6)			14%(10)			
	Probl	em-Solving Process to	o Increase Stude	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self- help skills. Those students who have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP due to individual needs	apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	Leadership Team	The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	review of progress reports of student goals	

ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas a need of improvement for the following group:					
 Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2: 	t Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 6% the students will perform at level 7 or above.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
3%(2)	6%(4)				
Problem-Solving Process to I	ncrease Student Achievement				
	Person or Process Used to				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self- help skills. Those students who have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP due to individual needs	IEP goals.		2.1. The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	2.1. review of progress reports of student goals

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

 Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3: 	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 62% of students will make learning gains.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
52%(27)	62%(33)		

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	3.1. All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self- help skills. Those students who have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/mathematics goals on their IEP due to individual needs	IEP goals.	Leadership team	3.1. The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	3.1. review of progress reports of student goals		

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

Г

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

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fo		ta, and refer	ence to "Gi	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need		
1. Students scoring at A	Achievement Level 3 ir	n Algebra.					
Algebra Goal #1:	Algebra Goal #1:						
2012 Current Level of P		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforr	mance:			
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement			
for			Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy				
		No Data S	Submitted				
Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fo		ta, and refer	ence to "Gi	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in nee		
2. Students scoring at c and 5 in Algebra.	or above Achievement	Levels 4					
Algebra Goal #2:							
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforr	nance:		
	Problem-Solving P	Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
		No Data S	Submitted				

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target							
3A. Ambitious Measurable Ok school will red by 50%.	ojectives (AMO	s). In six year	Algebra Goal #				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
		1					

	ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee f improvement for the following subgroup:						
3B. Student subgroups Hispanic, Asian, Americ satisfactory progress ir Algebra Goal #3B:	an Indian) not m						
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Sol	ving Process to	Increase St	tudent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Pos Res for	son or ition ponsible nitoring	Process U Determine Effectiver Strategy	e	Eval	uation Tool
	No Data Submitted						

	ised on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in neer improvement for the following subgroup:				
3C. English Language satisfactory progress	naking				
Algebra Goal #3C:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
for			Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data :	Submitted		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in ne of improvement for the following subgroup:					
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	icipated Barrier Strategy Person or 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 neer of improvement for the following subgroup:

3E. Economically Disa satisfactory progress	9	s not making			
Algebra Goal #3E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solv	ing Process to I	ncrease S ⁻	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data s	Submitted		

End of Algebra EOC Goa

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 o in need of improvement		ata, and re	eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
1. Students scoring at Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	t Achievement Level 3	in			
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	mance:
	Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement			reference t	to "Guiding Questions",	, identify and define areas
 Students scoring a and 5 in Geometry. 	t or above Achieve	ment Levels			
Geometry Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Ex	pected Level of Perfc	ormance:
	Problem-Solving	g Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
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 Ambitious but Target	t Achievable Annual N	Measurable Ob	ojectives (/	AMOs), AMO-2, Readin	g and Math Performance
3A. Ambitious but Achie	evable Geometry	y Goal #			

3A. Ambitious but Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six yea reduce their achie 50%.	e Objectives ar school will	3A :			×
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

	f student achievement data, for the following subgroup:	and r	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", io	dentify and define areas
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss 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 S	Submitted		

	f student achievement data for the following subgroup:		eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
3C. English Language	Learners (ELL) not maki	ng			
satisfactory progress	in Geometry.	0			
Geometry Goal #3C:	-				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	N	lo 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:					
3D. Students with Disa	3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making				
satisfactory progress	in Geometry.				
Geometry Goal #3D:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	١	lo Data :	Submitted		

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
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 Proce	ess to Increase S	Student 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

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
Touchmath	Functional mathematics for students with cognitive impairments	Lead ESE teacher	School-wide	September 26, 2012	Modeling of lessons, classroom visits	Principal, Lead ESE Teacher

Mathematics Budget:

\$0.0
: \$0.0
ailabl mour
\$0.0
: \$0.0
ailabl mour
\$0.0
: \$0.0
ailabl mour
360.0
360.0

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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 sc Level 3 in science.	oring at Achievement		Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 23% of students will perform at levels 4-6.		
Science Goal #1a:		2370 01 310001	its will perform at levels	τ-0.	
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
18%(3)		23%(4)			
Pro	blem-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 Too	
 1.1. All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficit and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training ir self-help skills. Those students who have preacademic/science goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee Not all students have preacademic/science goals on their IEP due to individual needs 	,	1.1. Leadership team	1.1. The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	1.1. review of progress reports of student goals	
Based on the analysis of stu areas in need of improveme			Guiding Questions", ider	ntify and define	
1b. Florida Alternate Ass Students scoring at Leve Science Goal #1b:		Given the spe	cific needs of the studer rm at levels 4-6.	nts we serve,	

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have	1B.1. Leadership team will apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students	team		1B.1. review of progress reports of student goals

1	and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self-help skills. Those students who have preacademic/science goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/science goals on their IEP due to individual needs	based on IEP goals.		learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	
2	2.1. All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self-help skills. Those students who have preacademic/science goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/science goals on their IEP due to individual needs	2.1. Leadership team will apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	2.1. Leadership team	2.1. The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	2.1. review of progress reports of student goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.					
Science Goal #2a:					
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					

	s in need of improvement Florida Alternate Asses	001	:			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.			Given the spe	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 3% of students will perform at level 7 or above.		
2012	2 Current Level of Perfo	ormance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performanc	ce:	
0%(())		3%(1)			
	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 Too	
1	2B.1. All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self-help skills. Those students who have preacademic/science goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/science goals on their IEP due to individual needs	2B.1. Leadership team will apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	2B.1.Leadership Team	2B.1. The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	2B.1. review of progress reports of student goals	
2	2B.1. All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self-help skills. Those students who have preacademic/science goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/science goals on their IEP due to individual needs	2B.1. Leadership team will apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	2B.1.Leadership Team	2B.1. The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	2B.1. review of progress reports of student goals	

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:			Given the spec	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 23% of students will perform at levels 4-6.		
2012	2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
18%(3)		23%(4)	23%(4)		
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	

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	1.1. All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self-help skills. Those students who have preacademic/science goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/science goals on their IEP due to individual needs	1.1. Leadership team will apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	1.1. Leadership team	1.1. The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	1.1. review of progress reports of student goals

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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2:	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, 3% will perform at level 7 or above.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
0%(0)	3%(1)		
Droblem Colving Dropped to Ingrance Student Aphievement			

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	2.1. All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self-help skills. Those students who have preacademic/science goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized education plan (IEP) meeting by committee. Not all students have preacademic/science goals on their IEP due to individual needs	2.1. Leadership team will apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	2.1. Leadership team	2.1. The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	2.1. review of progress reports of student goals

Biology 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 a Biology.	t Achievement Level 3 ir				
Biology Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for		on 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:

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

Biology Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Persor Positio Respo for Monito	on nsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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

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

Science 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 Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:			N/A		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:
N/A			N/A		
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	itudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for		on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group:	eference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring	
at 4 or higher in writing.	Given the specific needs of the students we serve 22%

Writing Goal #1b:	will perform at level 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17%(4).	22%(5)

	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	1B.1. All students at SFACS are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and some have communication deficits and/or behavioral challenges, and may also require training in self-help skills. Those students who have preacademic/writing goals on their IEP are evaluated by the proper assessments, based on the findings, objectives are agreed upon during an individualized	1B.1. Leadership team will apply appropriate Sunshine State Standard Access Points per individual needs of the students based on IEP goals.	1B.1.Leadership Team	1B.1. The leadership team will conduct monthly reviews of the progress reports of student IEP goals in order to assess learning gains. Adjustments to individual student academic plans will be made as needed in order to achieve learning gains	1B.1. review of progress reports of student 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
	-	Γ	lo Data Submitte	d		

Writing Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
			Grand Total: \$0.0

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of 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 Civics.

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving	g Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
for			Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

÷

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	f student achievement data, for the following group:	and re	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", ic	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 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to Ir	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data S	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
			Ν	lo Data Submitte	d		

÷

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available
			Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Professional Developme	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
			Grand Total: \$0.0

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Cource (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 n need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.					
U.S. History Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforn	nance:
	Problem-Solving Proce	ss 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 student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area in need of improvement for the following group:					
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels4 and 5 in U.S. History.U.S. History Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				

	Problem-Solving Pro	cess to Incre	ease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data Subr	nitted		

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	No Data Submittee	d	-	

U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Progr	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Professional Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
			Grand Total: \$0.0

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

	d on the analysis of atter provement:	ndance data, and referer	nce to "Guiding Que	estions", identify and def	ine areas in need		
	tendance Idance Goal #1:		the students to needs of our s	Given the needs of our students, we expect 94.68% of the students to attend school on a daily basisGiven the needs of our students, we expect 94.68% of the students to attend school on a daily basis			
2012	2012 Current Attendance Rate:			ed Attendance Rate:			
93.68	%(93)		94.68%(94)	94.68%(94)			
-	Current Number of Stunces (10 or more)	udents with Excessive	2013 Expecte Absences (10	ed Number of Students) or more)	with Excessive		
44			42	42			
-	Current Number of Stu es (10 or more)	udents with Excessive		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
44	44			42			
	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	Due to the nature of our students, many are susceptible to illness, which keeps them out of school for one day or more.	washing, proper use and disposal of tissues,	Leadership team	Administration will address needs as necessary	Attendance logs		

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						

Attendance Budget:

Available Amount	Funding Source	Description of Resources	Strategy
\$0.00	No Data	No Data	No Data
Subtotal: \$0.00			
			Fechnology
Available Amount	Funding Source	Description of Resources	Strategy
\$0.00	No Data	No Data	No Data
Subtotal: \$0.00			
		ht	Professional Developme
Available Amount	Funding Source	Description of Resources	Strategy
\$0.00	No Data	No Data	No Data
Subtotal: \$0.00			
			Dther
Available Amount	Funding Source	Description of Resources	Strategy
\$0.00	No Data	No Data	No Data
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Grand Total: \$0.00			

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

1. Suspension	Given the specific needs of the students we serve, suspensions are not implemented in our school, therefore
Suspension Goal #1:	we expect to maintain 100% of students to not be suspended during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-Sch	ool 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended I n- School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of School	- 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School
0	0
Problem-Solving Process	to Increase Student Achievement
	Person or Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	No Data Submittee	d		

Suspension Budget:

			Available
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amoun
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Fechnology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
			Grand Total: \$0.0

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)).

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

1. Dropout Prevention

*Plea	out Prevention Goal #1 use refer to the percenta ped out during the 2011	ge of students who	All students in with a special	has dropped out of school. The goal is to maintain this All students in the High School program will be graduating with a special diploma. Recovery courses are in place to maintain this expected graduation rate.		
2012	Current Dropout Rate:		2013 Expect	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:		
0			0	0		
2012 Current Graduation Rate:			2013 Expect	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
0			0	0		
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stuc	lent Achievement		
			Person or Position Responsible fo Monitoring	Process Used to Determine r Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	1.1. Due to the nature of our students. SFACS has not had a student drop out of school.	1.1. As issues with drop out occur, the leadership team and administration will deal with these on an individual basis	1.1. Administration	1.1. Maintaining a 0% drop out rate	1.1. School records	

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: \$0.0

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

1	I on the analysis of parer ed of improvement:	nt involvement data, and	reference to "Guid	ling Questions", identify	and define areas	
1. Pa	rent Involvement					
*Plea partic	nt Involvement Goal #^ se refer to the percentag sipated in school activitie plicated.	ge of parents who		Given the nature of the students, we expect to maintain 100% parent involvement during the 2012-2013 school year.		
2012	Current Level of Parer	it Involvement:	2013 Expected	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
100%			100%	100%		
	Prob	olem-Solving Process to	o Increase Stude	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation roof
1	1.1. SFACS parents are required to attend mandatory Parent Training sessions on a quarterly basis, however attendance was lacking due to conflicting schedules.	 1.1. Needs assessment will be conducted periodically throughout the year to pinpoint best days of the week and times for parents to hold school meetings. 1.2. The school will partner with the University of Miami and Nova University to conduct workshops requested by the parents 1.2. Dates and times are set in advance and announced throughout the school year 	Principal	Administration will address needs as necessary	Attendance logs

(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							

Parent Involvement Budget:

	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

STEM 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 STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

to the nature of the students, they are incapable of
pleting certification, however, the school does offer ational courses as part of the high school curriculum.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
			Grand Total: \$0.0

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Goal #1 Goal:

	ed on the analysis of stud eed of improvement for th		nd reference to "G	uiding Questions", identif	y and define areas	
			U U	Our goal for this year is for 75% of the students to meet success on 80% of IEP goals by IEP completion dates.		
2012	2 Current level:		2013 Expecte	2013 Expected level:		
75%	75%(68)			75%(74)		
	Pro	blem-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	Lack of fundamental academic skills	Assessment of Behavior and Language Learning Skills (ABLLS)		Data collection4 day mastery of ABLLS/IEP goal	ABLLS	

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
		Ν	No Data Submittee	d		

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

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

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Pro	ogram(s)/Material(s)			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Develo	opment			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading materials (flash cards, books, etc)	school purchased	EESAC	\$360.00
Mathematics	Touchmath items	Manipulatives	EESAC	\$360.00
				Subtotal: \$720.00
				Grand Total: \$720.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority jn	Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA	
----------------	-------	------------	-------	--

Are you a reward school: in Yes in No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/15/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SFACS will use SAC funds to support the instructional program	\$720.00

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) will monitor the implementation of the strategies designated in the School Improvement plan (SIP)

at their quarterly meetings. Mid-year and End of year reviews will be conducted to adhere to District and State guidelines. Informal data (teacher observations, daily progress reports, etc.) and formal data (Woodcock Johnson, Brigance, Florida Alternate Assessment, etc.) will be used to measure successful implementation of strategies and goals.

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