

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: OASIS CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Kim Lunger

SAC Chair: Amanda Sanford

Superintendent: Dr. Lee Bush

Date of School Board Approval: pending

Last Modified on: 11/4/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Kim Lunger	MS – Ed Leadership, Nova Southeastern, Certified School Principal K-12, History 6-12		13	2010-2011: A 2009-2010: B 2008-2009: A 2007-2008: A 2006-2007: C 2005-2006: B 2004-2005: D 2003-2004: C 2002-2003: C 2001-2002: C 2000-2001: C 1999-2000: C 2010-2011: Reading mastery = 59%, Math mastery = 87%, Writing mastery = 89%, Science mastery = 46%, did not meet AYP 2009-2010: Reading mastery = 62%, Math mastery = 84%, Writing mastery = 92%, Science mastery = 43%, did not meet AYP 2008-2009: Reading mastery = 58%, Math mastery= 81%, Writing mastery= 91%, and Science mastery= 35%, did not meet AYP 2007-2008: Reading mastery= 50%, Math mastery= 80%, Writing mastery= 89%,

				Science mastery= 32%, did not meet AYP 2006-2007: Reading mastery= 46%, Math mastery= 73%, Writing mastery= 87%, Science mastery= 33%, did not meet AYP 2005-2006: Reading mastery= 43%, Math mastery= 75%, Writing mastery= 87%, did not meet AYP 2004-2005: Reading mastery= 37%, Math mastery: 71%, Writing mastery= 91%, did not meet AYP 2003-2004: Reading mastery: 39%, Math mastery: 67%, Writing mastery: 90% 2002-2003: Reading mastery= 41%, Math mastery= 65%, Writing mastery= 90% 2001-2002: Reading mastery= 35%, Math mastery= 60%, Writing mastery= 91%
--	--	--	--	---

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.

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)
No data submitted				

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	1. We recruit from educational colleges, job fairs, and by using professional organization listings.	Principal	Ongoing	
2	2. Use of staff inductions processes, staff development meetings, and monthly literacy meetings.	Principal	Ongoing	
3	3. Implementing APPLES, a new teacher orientation program as required per the Department of Education.	Principal	Ongoing	
4	4. Partnering new teachers or teachers with less than 3 years' experience with veteran staff.	Principal	Ongoing	
5	5. Follow up with all new or out of field staff to ensure attendance/participation in all required professional development.	Principal	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Out of field 2% [6] Non-Effective 0% [0] Still need ESOL Endorsement 14% [5]	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
36	13.9%(5)	27.8%(10)	25.0%(9)	16.7%(6)	16.7%(6)	75.0%(27)	2.8%(1)	2.8%(1)	8.3%(3)

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
Kim Lunger	New Teachers	APPLES Administrator	New Teacher Support Activities; Summative Observations
Amanda Sanford	New Teachers	APPLES Peer Mentor	New Teacher Support Activities; Formative Observations
Dana Christopher	New Teacher	Veteran teacher within department	Informal weekly meetings to discuss development and offer guidance. Assist with content development. Report areas of professional need to the Peer Mentor for further review.
Shannon George	New Teacher	Veteran teacher within department	Informal weekly meetings to discuss development and offer guidance. Assist with content development. Report areas of professional need to the Peer Mentor for further review.
Ashley Marchese	New Teacher	Veteran teacher within department	Informal weekly meetings to discuss development and offer guidance. Assist with content development. Report areas of professional need to the Peer Mentor for further review.
Steve Jamieson	New Teacher	Veteran teacher within department	Informal weekly meetings to discuss development and offer guidance. Assist with content development. Report areas of professional need to the Peer Mentor for further review.
Allison Thebeau	New Teacher	Veteran teacher within department	Informal weekly meetings to discuss development and offer guidance. Assist with content development. Report areas of professional need to the Peer Mentor for further review.
Elizabeth Cannon	New Teacher	Veteran teacher within department	Informal weekly meetings to discuss development and offer guidance. Assist with content development. Report areas of professional need to the Peer Mentor for further review.
Keely Banbrey-Zedd	New Teacher	Veteran teacher within department	Informal weekly meetings to discuss development and offer guidance. Assist with content development. Report areas of professional need to the Peer Mentor for further review.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based MTSS team consists of the school psychologist, guidance counselor, principal, classroom teachers, and an ESE teacher.

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?

The team meets frequently to discuss the needs of our students, write interventions, and help classroom teacher's implement and monitor interventions.

The roles of each member are as follows:

Principal

- Facilitate implementation of MTSS in the building
- Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
- Assign paraprofessionals to support RTI implementation when possible
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process
- Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity

Classroom Teacher

- Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes
- Attend MTSS meetings to collaborate on and monitor students who are struggling
- Implement interventions designed by the MTSS team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports
- Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity

Guidance Counselor

- Attend MTSS Team meetings
- Maintain log of all students involved in the RTI process
- Assist with parental invites and meeting planning
- Complete necessary MTSS forms

ESE Teacher

- Consult with MTSS Team regarding Tier 3 interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when making eligibility decisions

School Psychologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings on some students receiving supplemental supports and on all students receiving intensive supports
- Monitor data collection process for fidelity
- Review and interpret progress monitoring data
- Collaborate with MTSS Team on effective instruction and specific interventions

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?

The data analysis of the team informs the school improvement process to help build on areas of strength and provide intervention and additional support for areas of need.

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.

The MTSS team uses a variety of data sources including but not limited to FCAT data, common formative assessments, teacher input, student record data (behavior, attendance, grades, etc.) to inform the decision making process.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The general staff will be repeatedly introduced to MTSS through staff meetings and professional development sessions to slowly cultivate their awareness and understanding of the complex processes involved in the RtI structure.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

ESE Department head monitors all processes required.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

Kimberly Lunger – Principal

Dana Christopher – Language Arts Teacher

David Christopher – Social Studies Teacher

Shannon George – Reading Teacher

Ashley Marchese – Science Teacher

Amanda Sanford – Mathematics Teacher

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

The literacy team meets periodically to discuss strategies and resources to support student reading at all levels. In addition, the LLT discusses and plans staff professional development and discusses pressing issues/areas of school-wide concerns. The team also works with our library staff to expand our library resources to support both struggling readers and higher-level readers.

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

The major initiative this year is to increase the use of comprehension structuring and vocabulary activities across the curriculum.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Every teacher is required to notate their use of reading and writing strategies in their lesson plans. Teachers work with the language arts department to create research, quality reading components in their lessons as well as implement effective writing componenets.

*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?

Oasis High School is committed to providing a curriculum that emphasizes real-world hands-on learning activities and labs through a variety of courses across content areas. The majority of teachers on staff have been trained through Cambridge courses, which emphasize critical thinking and a problem-solving approach to coursework. A Freshmen and Senior Success course is also implemented to help students transition successfully into high school from middle school as well as into a college or work environment.

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?

The guidance counselors and teaching staff are committed to advising each and every student on their career path and assisting them with planning for their future by offering a diverse curriculum. Each student is provided with opportunities to review their personal academic history each year, which is then explained and discussed in preparation to set goals for academic courses, Bright Futures, and career development to ensure success. Seminars are implemented for topics such as college admission requirements, financial aide, major selection, and required assessments.

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 [High School Feedback Report](#)

Oasis High is committed to motivating students to take AICE and DE classes by encouraging more teacher discussion on these courses and having each student speak with a guidance counselor regarding their postsecondary plans. Seniors are also enrolled in Career Research and Decision Making (Senior Success), which help students prepare for postsecondary success with resumes, applications, and scholarship funds. Seminars are implemented for topics such as college admission requirements, financial aide, major selection, and required assessments. Student success is tracked to ensure graduation, Florida Bright Futures, and college entrance requirements are met to best support the students individually.

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 need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In 2011-2012, 31% of our 9th graders scored at a level 3 in FCAT Reading. In 2012-2013, we will improve 4% to 35% as measured by the FCAT Reading Assessment. In 2011-2012, 32% of our 10th graders scored at level 3 in FCAT reading. In 2012-2013, we will improve 4% to 36% as measured by the FCAT Reading Assessment
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9th 31% [65] 10th 32% [49]	9th 35% [75] 10th 36% [77]

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	The accuracy and validity of the FCAT scoring process.	The school will implement the FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.	Administration	Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	FAIR assessments

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

	In 2011-2012, 33% of 9th graders scored at or above a level
--	---

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	4 on the FCAT Reading. In 2012-2013, this percentage will be maintained for 9th graders scoring at or above a level 4 on the FCAT Reading. In 2011-2012, 34% of 10th graders scored at or above a level 4 on the FCAT Reading. In 2012-2013, this percentage will be maintained for 10th graders scoring at or above a level 4 on the FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9th 33% [70] 10th 34% [52]	9th [70] 10th 34% [73]

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	The accuracy and validity of the FCAT scoring process.	The school will implement the FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.	Administration	Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	FAIR assessments

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on 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:	In 2011-2012, 65% of students made learning gains on the FCAT Reading. In 2012-2013, we will maintain this percentage of students making gains on the FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% [237]	65% [276]

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	The accuracy and validity of the FCAT scoring process.	The school will implement the FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.	Administration	Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	FAIR assessments

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In 2011-2012, 67% of students in the lowest 25% made proficient gains on FCAT Reading. In 2012-2013, we will maintain the percent of 67% proficiency as measured by the FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% [61]	67% [71]

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	Increase rigor on FCAT Reading	Staff training on level of Depth of knowledge and selecting higher-level text, questioning techniques, and close reading.	Administration; Literacy Team	Observation and on-going progress monitoring	FCAT 2.0

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # A 3% increase of proficient students annually for the next 5 years. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	65%	68%	71%	74%	77%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2011-2012, 62% of Hispanic students scored at or above grade level in reading. In 2012-2013, 65% of the Hispanic students will achieve proficiency as measured by FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% [39]	65% [51]

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	Increase rigor on FCAT Reading	Literacy Meetings	Administration	Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	FAIR assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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 need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on 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 reading. Reading Goal #5E:		In 2011-2012, 48% of students identified as economically disadvantaged demonstrated mastery on the FCAT reading. In 2012-2013, 50% will demonstrate mastery as measured by the FCAT reading.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
48% [73]		50%			
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	Lack of background knowledge	Teachers will build background knowledge prior to teaching	Administration; Teachers	On-going progress monitoring	FCAT Reading

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
Common Core Alignment Training	9-12	FLDOE	6 participants (Department leaders)	November 2012	Lesson Plans, School-wide Training	Administration
AICE Level AS/A Training	9-12	Conference	6 AICE Instructors	Fall/Spring 2012	Participants will share strategies and implement methods	Administration; AICE Leader

Literacy Training; Common Core; Text Complexity; Higher-Level Questioning; Student Engagement Vocabulary	9-12	Administration; Guest Literacy Coach; Literacy Leadership Team	School-wide	Monthly in-service / workshops	Observations; Lesson plans; Progress monitoring through classroom assessments	Administration; Literacy Team; Instructors
--	------	--	-------------	--------------------------------	---	--

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Achieve 3000 Reading Program	Reading Curriculum Addition	General school-based fund	\$10,000.00
			Subtotal: \$10,000.00
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
AICE Level AS/A teacher workshop	Conference	Title II	\$5,746.00
			Subtotal: \$5,746.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$15,746.00

End of Reading Goals

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 proficient in listening/speaking.				
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

No Data Submitted

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------

No Data Submitted

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

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

CELLA Budget:

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

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:

1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	
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				

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Mathematics Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:				
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				

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	In 2011-2012, 37% of our students scored at a Level 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC. In 2012- 2013, we will improve to 40% as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% [60]	40% [67]

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	Students not sufficiently prepared due to overlapping requirements in the curriculum.	Math department meeting to plan and strategize; Complete the academic plan with some modifications; Weekly problem solving and critical thinking through higher order word problems.	Administration; Math Department	Lesson Plans	EOC; Classroom Assessments

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	In 2011-2012, 8% of our students scored at or above a Level 4 on the Algebra 1 EOC. In 2012-2013, we will increase this percentage to 11% as measured by the Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% [11]	11% [18]

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	Students not sufficiently prepared due to overlapping requirements in the curriculum.	Complete academic plan with some modifications; Weekly problem solving and critical thinking through higher order word problems.	Administration; Math Department	Lesson Plans	EOC; Classroom Assessments

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	In 2011-2012, 26% of our students scored in the middle third for the Geometry EOC. In 2012-2013, we will increase the percentage of students scoring in the middle third on the scoring rubric of the Geometry EOC to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% [41]	30% [67]

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	Lack of Algebra 1 knowledge and requirements to pass the EOC	Differentiated instruction and cooperative learning groups to allow students to assist each other in mastery of knowledge; Weekly enrichments designed to offer students higher level thinking experiences.	Administration; Math Department	Lesson plans; Classroom Walkthroughs	Classroom assessments; EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	In 2011-2012, 36% of our students scored in the top third on the Geometry EOC. In 2012-2013, we will increase the percentage of students scoring in the top third on the Geometry EOC to 39%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% [56]	39% [87]

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	Lack of Algebra 1 knowledge and requirements to pass the EOC	Differentiated instruction and cooperative learning groups to allow students to assist each other in mastery of knowledge; Weekly enrichments designed to offer students higher	Administration; Math Department	Lesson plans; Classroom Walkthroughs	Classroom assessments; EOC

level thinking experiences.

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
Common Core Alignment Training	9-12	FLDOE	6 participants (Department leaders)	November 2012	Lesson Plans, School-wide Training	Administration
Literacy Training; Common Core; Text Complexity; Higher-Level Questioning; Student Engagement Vocabulary	9-12	Administration; Guest Literacy Coach; Literacy Leadership Team	School-wide	Monthly in-service / workshops	Observations; Lesson plans; Progress monitoring through classroom assessments	Administration; Literacy Team; Instructors

Mathematics Budget:

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

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

Based on 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:				
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				

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 at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.	In 2011-2012, 41% of our students scored in the middle third on the Biology EOC. In 2012-2013, we will increase the percentage of students scoring in the middle third of the Biology EOC to 44%.
Biology Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

41% [95]			44% [40]		
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	No prior examples/exams, from the state to use as a reference; Presentation, language, and format of the test.	Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments and manipulatives; Identify "big ideas", key concepts, knowledge and skills that describe what the students will understand;	Administration; Science Department.	Lesson plans; Classroom Walkthroughs	Classroom Assessments; EOC

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:	In 2011-2012, 29% of our students scored in the top third of the Biology EOC. In 2012-2013, we will increase the percentage of students scoring in the top third of the Biology EOC to 32%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% [67]	32% [29]

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	No prior examples/exams, from the state to use as a reference; Presentation, language, and format of the test.	Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments and manipulatives; Identify "big ideas", key concepts, knowledge and skills that describe what the students will understand;	Administration; Science Department.	Lesson plans; Classroom Walkthroughs	Classroom Assessments; EOC

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
Literacy Training; Common					Observations;	

Core; Text Complexity; Higher-Level Questioning; Student Engagement; Vocabulary	9-12	Administration; Guest Literacy Coach; Literacy Leadership Team	School-wide	Monthly in-service / workshops	Lesson plans; Progress monitoring through classroom assessments	Administration; Literacy Team; Instructors
Biology EOC Training	9-12	Science County Coordinator	Science Department	August 2012	Lesson Plans	Administration; Science Department Head
Common Core Alignment Training	9-12	FLDOE	6 participants (Department leaders)	November 2012	Lesson Plans, School-wide Training	Administration

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.		In 2011-2012, 95% of students scored at level 3.0 or higher in FCAT Writing. In 2012-2013, we will maintain this overall proficiency of 95% as measured by FCAT Writing.			
Writing Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
95% [143]			95% [203]		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Increased rigor of FCAT writing	Establish a writing plan; Develop writing strategies to implement practice opportunities	Administration; Language Arts Department	In-class mirrored assessments	FCAT Writes

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Training; Common Core, Text Complexity; Higher-Level Questioning; Student Engagement; Vocabulary Development	9-12	Administration; Guest Literacy Coach; Literacy Leadership Team	School-wide	Monthly in-service / workshops	Observations; Lesson plans; Progress monitoring through classroom assessments	Administration; Literacy Team; Instructors
FCAT Writes Training	9-12	County Coordinator	School-wide	October 2012	Lesson Plans; Student Examples	Administration; Language Art Department

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

U.S. History 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 U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on 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 U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

of improvement:

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	In 2011-2012 our attendance rate was 94%. In 2012-2013 we will raise our attendance rate to 95%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94%	95%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
Not Calculated	Not Calculated
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
Not Calculated	Not Calculated

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	Earlier start time	Parent and student education on new start time; daily monitoring of absences and tardies; Phone calls made home to verify absences.	Administration	Daily attendance and tardy reports	Pinnacle

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:

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

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

End of 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		No goal set		
Suspension Goal # 1:				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions		
N/A		N/A		
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School		
N/A		N/A		
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		
N/A		N/A		
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		
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				

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						

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	In 2011-2012, 1 student was withdrawn as a dropout and the graduation rate was 99%. In 2012-2013, we will maintain a 99% graduation rate.

2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:				
0.2% [1]	0.2%				
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:				
99% [542]	99%				
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	Increased credit requirements	Offer a credit recovery course	Administration; Guidance	Dropout and graduation rates	Mainframe reports

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						

Dropout Prevention Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement		Currently school policy requires parents to volunteer 30 or more hours to the school during the year. In 2011-2012, 31% of the required volunteer hours were completed. In 2012-2013, we will increase this involvement rate to 35% by increasing parent communication and involvement activities/opportunities.			
Parent Involvement Goal #1:					
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
31% [5000.78 hours]			35% [7171.5 hours]		
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	Parent schedules and obligations	Increase communication and variety of opportunities available for parents to participate;	Administration; Volunteer Coordinators	Records from Parent Involvement	Volunteer tracking data obtained from the schools logging system, Keep-n-Track.
2	Parent schedules and obligations	Implement an electronic communication tab on the school website.	Administration; Volunteer Coordinators	Records from Parent Involvement	Volunteer tracking data obtained from the schools logging system, Keep-n-Track.

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						

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of 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:			In 2012-2013, we will increase the number of advanced science and mathematics courses available to students.		
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	Student interest and ability to complete advanced science and math courses	Offer more advanced science and math courses	Administration; Guidance	Master Schedule	Master Schedule

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						

STEM Budget:

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

End of 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)).

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:		In 2012 – 2013, Oasis High will implement an industry certification program in Culinary Arts with a secured contract with a vendor providing certification exams at an educational price.			
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	Cost of program and exams	Research vendors; Start to prepare students for certification requirements	Administration; Culinary Specialist	Contract with vendor; Contract secured	Chosen Certification Exam

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
Photoshop World Conference	9-12	Conference Director	Graphic Design Instructor	September 2012	Participant will implement learned material in the teaching of the new AICE Graphic Design course	Administration; AICE Leader

CTE Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Photoshop for AICE Graphic Design	World Conference	Title II	\$2,200.00
			Subtotal: \$2,200.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,200.00

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Anti-Bullying Program Goal:

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. Anti-Bullying Program Goal Anti-Bullying Program Goal #1:			In 2012-2013, a baseline organization will be established to bring awareness of anti-bullying strategies and intervention for students and teachers		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
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
1	Securing a staff member to lead and organize the club and activities.	Implement a Anti-Bullying club on campus; Align training for staff in response to anti-bullying; Community outreach events	Administration;	Club involvement; established baseline intervention occurrences.	Existence of the Established Program, documented activities and meetings.

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
Operation Respect	9-12	District Workshop	3 Instructors	Fall 2012	Participants will discuss strategies to implement methods learned	Administration

Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Operation Respect	Workshop	Title II	\$375.00
			Subtotal: \$375.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$375.00

End of Anti-Bullying Program Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Achieve 3000 Reading Program	Reading Curriculum Addition	General school-based fund	\$10,000.00
				Subtotal: \$10,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	AICE Level AS/A teacher workshop	Conference	Title II	\$5,746.00
CTE	Photoshop for AICE Graphic Design	World Conference	Title II	\$2,200.00
Anti-Bullying Program	Operation Respect	Workshop	Title II	\$375.00
				Subtotal: \$8,321.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$18,321.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 11/4/2012)

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
School Improvement funds will be spent to directly support school improvement goals when/if the funds are allocated to schools.	\$0.00

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

The SAC will assist in the preparation and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan, will review current curriculum, course availabilities, AICE program updates, testing requirements, state standards, and school goals. The SAC members will have the opportunity multiple times a year to be involved with school activities and receive updates on status and progress of school improvement goals and profession development.

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

Lee School District OASIS CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	64%	82%	90%	67%	303	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	62%	78%			140	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	44% (NO)	77% (YES)			121	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					564	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District CITY OF CAPE CORAL CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	60%	82%	89%	54%	285	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	63%	84%			147	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	59% (YES)	66% (YES)			125	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					557	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested