FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: THE PHOENIX PROGRAM

District Name: Collier

Principal: Dr. Cynthia M. Janssen

SAC Chair: Eric Peltz

Superintendent: Dr. Kamela Patton

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 9/17/2012



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		PhD Educational Leadership	5	31	According to statute, the Superintendent has the authority to strategically place administrators within the school district.
	Kelley C. Costin	MA in Educational Leadership	4.5	12	According to statute, the Superintendent has the authority to strategically place administrators within the school district.

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	 # 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)
litoracy/	Jeanine Brakefield	MA Technology Reading Endorsement BA English Education 6-12	6	1	History of academic excellence and past work experience with students in alternative programs

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	Strategies are dictated by the district.	CCPS District Personnel		

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
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers		% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading		% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
7	14.3%(1)	42.9%(3)	28.6%(2)	14.3%(1)	57.1%(4)	100.0%(7)	28.6%(2)	0.0%(0)	57.1%(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	Rationale	Planned Mentoring
	Assigned	for Pairing	Activities
Tammy Shaw	Lindsey Simmons	Qualified veteran CCPS teachers	MeeTopics: CCPS District policies and procedures, Alternative Schools policies and procedures, Beacon High School policies and procedures, EdOptions and Angel as curriculum tools, literacy strategies to be used with level 1 & 2 readers, writing in support or the superintendant's initiative, assessments, data driven instruction, CTEM as teacher evaluation, and any other topics as needed. Scheduled meetings are weekly and documented for the district.t at least twice weekly.

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.

Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Intervention Support Specialist, Lead Teachers, Reading Coach

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?

Leadership Team oversees the PLC and utilizes the problem solving approach to ensure that instruction and interventions for students are based on student performance data. PLC meets twice a month to discuss student data and adjust instruction according to individual student needs. Students needing additional intervention receive immediate intensive intervention at the point of need.

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 Leadership Team utilizes the problem solving approach to develop the school improvement plan. Status of implementation is reviewed by the PLC and the Alternative Schools SAC.

-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 PLC examines common core standards to be taught, shares best practices, implements the pre-assessments in the core areas, aligns the common core standards to the curricular and students' needs, engages in building common formative assessments and reviews data. As a result, teachers have strengthened their core teaching and have established that 80% of students will make gain. Re-teaching occurs as needed for Tier 1 students. The district Data Warehouse provides a means to record the minutes from PLC meetings as well as to follow the progress of groups and individual students. As students fail to meet with success in Tier 1, students are provided with Tier 2 strategies and PMPs are developed. The Data Warehouse data management system continues to follow the students' progress as monitored by the PMP. Online assessments and other data are tracked in Data Warehouse.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The RtI Leadership Team received initial training two years ago during a 4-day workshop led by district staff and receives annual updated training throughout the school year. The Intervention Support Specialist is the school's MTSS Coordinator to oversee the problem solving process, ensure the integrity and consistency of implementation of the process, and facilitate the PLC team meetings. All teachers have been provided training from the MTSS Coordinator and have completed the district mandated three courses using the Direct Steps online training tool.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Mini workshops from district staff on MTSS-related topics such as differentiating instruction, data analysis, and specific intervention training are provided throughout the year during early release time. All staff are encouraged to utilize the variety of online resources, video clips, research links, intervention tools, and training materials available in ANGEL.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Alternative Schools literacy team consists of the Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, and a Reading Teacher from each of our programs throughout the district.

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

Due to the nature of the Alternative Schools, and the distance between school sites, meetings are conducted electronically

via email and ANGEL on a monthly basis, at a minimum. In addition, the Reading Coach visits each school weekly, supporting, updating and soliciting information/knowledge from individual team members.

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

Major initiatives this year will be: Close reading in the content area using research based strategies; pre, during, and after reading strategies, to include writing across the content areas; writing journals, formative assessment; TAKE 10 lessons taught in content areas (district initiative); and Improving differentiated instruction in all classrooms.

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.

Authentic and content specific literacy is the responsibility of all teachers. Although not every teacher is a reading teacher per se, all teachers are indeed comprehension teachers who convey information to their students via the written word. In the effort to support literacy across disciplines, all secondary teachers in Collier County Public Schools utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies that guide students in pre-reading, comprehension monitoring, and summative question generating when encountering text. In addition, CCPS offers CAR-PD courses in order to build teachers' capacity to provide reading interventions to striving readers. An emphasis this year will be differentiation in the classrooms, and can be obtained by using accommodations in process, content, or product. Modeling and observation by the reading coach will continue throughout the year.

*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?

Students also have the opportunity to earn the Florida Ready to Work Credential which is designed to demonstrate to future employers the reading and mathematics skills of the students. The purpose of this credential is to integrate real world skills and abilities to the instructional objectives for both career and academic courses.

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?

Counselors encourage all students to complete or update the FACTS.org planning document each school year. Career guidance academic counseling provides access for students (and parents, as appropriate) to information regarding career awareness and planning with respect to an individual's occupational and academic future. This counseling also provides information with respect to career options, financial aid, and postsecondary options including college, technical, and post secondary educational opportunities. All seniors are encouraged to earn a Florida Ready to Work certificate at the highest level possible. Students are also encouraged to take the appropriate pre-assessments in applied reading, applied math, and locating information tests, which are a component of the Florida Ready to Work program.

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u>

Alternative schools support students and parents by placing an emphasis on the following:

- Improving and maintaining reading and mathematics achievement scores;
- Counseling to take college placement exams such as PERT, SAT, and/or ACT;
- Counseling to enroll seniors in college level remedial English and mathematics courses;
- Using FACTS.org as planning tool for college and technical school enrollment;
- Increasing utilization of technical school dual-enrollment as a stepping stone to other postsecondary programs;
- Encouraging students to earn Florida Ready to Work certificates and utilize career and college planning on-line assistance.

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:

Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		data, and refere	nce to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need
1a. FCAT2.0: Students sreading.	scoring at Achieven	nent Level 3 in			
Reading Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of P	Performance:	2	2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforn	nance:
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to In	crease S	itudent Achievement	
for				Drocass lisad to	
		No Data Si	ubmitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the formula. The Florida Alternate As Students scoring at Lev Reading Goal #1b:	ssessment:		nce to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need
2012 Current Level of P	Performance:	2	2013 Εχρ	pected Level of Perforn	nance:
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to In	crease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	nticipated Barrier Strategy		n or on nsible oring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data Si	ubmitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		data, and refere	nce to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students Level 4 in reading.	scoring at or above	e Achievement			
Reading Goal #2a:					

	Pi	roblem-Solving Prod	cess to I	ncrease Stud	dent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	for		ion onsible	Process Used to Determine Iffectiveness of Strategy	ermine ctiveness of		
			No Data S	Submitted		·	
Based on the analysis of improvement for the fo			and refer	ence to "Guic	ling Questions", identif	fy and o	define areas in nee
2b. Florida Alternate A Students scoring at or eading. Reading Goal #2b:			7 in				
012 Current Level of F	Perfori	mance:		2013 Expec	ted Level of Perform	iance:	
	Pi	roblem-Solving Prod	cess to I	ncrease Stud	dent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Stra	tegy	for	Drocass lisad to			uation Tool
			No Data S	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the formal of	ollowin	g group:		ence to "Guic	ling Questions", identif	fy and o	define areas in neo
2012 Current Level of F	Perfori	mance:		2013 Expec	ted Level of Perform	iance:	
	Pı	roblem-Solving Prod	cess to I	ncrease Stud	dent Achievement		
Anticipated Ba	rrier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible fo Monitoring	Process Used Determine or Effectiveness Strategy	:	Evaluation Toc
Most students ent program below gra level in reading		Implement FAIR assessments to mon student progress		ncipal ading Coach	Review FAIR data	reports	FAIR Assessment

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2	benchmarks in lesson plans and instructional delivery of all content areas	Lea	nd Teacher			Walkthroughs data
3	Implement pre, during, and post reading strategies in all conten areas	Lea	ading Coach ad Teacher	Classroom walkthro	ughs	Classroom walkthroughs
4	Engage and monitor all students			n Reading Coach		Student reading logs
Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	tudent achievement data, and lowing group:	d refer	ence to "Gu	ilding Questions", identify	y and d	define areas in need
3b. Florida Alternate As Percentage of students reading.	sessment: making Learning Gains in					
Reading Goal #3b:						
2012 Current Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Ехре	ected Level of Performa	ance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to L	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		n Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		uation Tool
	No	Data S	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of s	tudent achievement data, and	d refer	ence to "Gu	iiding Questions", identify	y and d	define areas in need
of improvement for the fol	lowing group:					
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage making learning gains in	of students in Lowest 25% reading.					
Reading Goal #4:						
2012 Current Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
for				Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Eval	uation Tool
	No	Data S	Submitted			

Explicitly infuse reading Reading Coach,

Classroom Walkthroughs Classroom

				Reading Goal	#						
	mbitious but Achiev Irable Objectives (A										<u>~</u>
school by 50°	I will reduce their a	achieve	ment gap								
<i></i>	70.			5A :		1					<u></u>
1	ine data 0-2011 2011-20	12 2	2012-2013	2013-201	14	2014	-2015		2015-201	6	2016-2017
	on the analysis of provement for the fo			ent data, and i	refere	ence to "Gu	iiding Q	uestion	ıs", identify	y and o	define areas in need
5B. St	tudent subgroups inic, Asian, Ameri actory progress i	by eth	nnicity (Wh								
Readi	ng Goal #5B:										
2012	Current Level of I	Perforr	mance:			2013 Expe	ected L	evel of	Performa	ance:	
		Pr	roblem-Sol	ving Process	to I r	ncrease St	udent A	Achiev	ement		
Antic	ipated Barrier	Strat	tegy	F F	or	Process Used to					
		-				Submitted					
				ent data, and i	refere	ence to "Gu	iiding Q	uestion	ns", identify	y and o	define areas in need
	provement for the for			A constitution of							
1	nglish Language L actory progress i			t making							
	ng Goal #5C:		J								
2012	Current Level of I	Perforr	mance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
		Pr	roblem-Sol	ving Process	toIr	ncrease St	udent A	Achiev	ement		
					Т	Person or	-	Proc	ess Used	to	
	Anticipated Ba	ırrier	Stı	rategy		Position esponsible Monitoring	for	D Effe	etermine ctiveness Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students ente program without E language proficien	nglish		d assess all ts on CELLA	ELL	. Contact d Teacher	Re re	eview n	nonthly TE Peview CEL		Home Language Survey; CELLA
2			appropriate and strated listening/sp writing, and	beaking,		d Teacher	CI	assroor	n Walkthro	oughs	Classroom Walkthrough data

of improvement for the fol	student achievement data, ar Iowing subgroup:	nd refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need			
5D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress in	ilities (SWD) not making reading.							
Reading Goal #5D:								
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
	N	o Data	Submitted					
December 11 and 12 and 12 and 12				dalla a Occabionali dalla alle				
of improvement for the fol	student achievement data, ar lowing subgroup:	na reter	ence to "Gl	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need			
5E. Economically Disadv satisfactory progress in	vantaged students not mak reading.	king						
Reading Goal #5E:								
2012 Current Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ince:			
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
	N	o 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 Grad and/or PLC Level/Su Focus	and/or PI (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
---	-------------	--	--	--	--

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages,	include the number of studer	nts the percentage	represents next to the perc	centage (e.g., 70% (35)).
Students speak in Englis	h and understand spoken E	nglish at grade le	vel in a manner similar to	o non-ELL students.
1. Students scoring pr	oficient in listening/spea	king.		
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient in	listening/speak	ing:	
	Problem-Solving Proce	ss to Increase S	itudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	N	o Data Submitted		

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

2. Students scoring p	roficient in reading				
CELLA Goal #2:					
2012 Current Percent	t of Students Profici	ent in readin	g:		
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person Positio Strategy Respor for Monito		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Students write in Englis	sh at grade level in a	manner simila	ır to non-El	LL students.	
3. Students scoring p	roficient in writing.				
CELLA Goal #3:					
2012 Current Percent	t of Students Profici	ent in writing	g:		
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t

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

No Data Submitted

CELLA Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Гесhnology			
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
		N- D-t-	
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00 Subtotal: \$0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Strategy Responsible Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Anticipated Barrier Strategy Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the a of improvemen			ent data, and refe	rence to "Gi	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and c	define areas in need
3b. Florida Al	ternate As	sessment:						
Percentage of	fstudents	making Learning	g Gains in					
mathematics								
Mathematics	Goal #3b:							
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Ехр	ected Leve	el of Performaı	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process to	Increase St	tudent Ach	nievement		
				son or	Process l	Jsed to		
Anticipated B	Barrier	Strategy		tion oonsible	Determin		Eval	uation Tool
			for		Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation 1001	
			Mon	itoring	on aragy			
			No Data	Submitted				
Based on the a			ent data, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and c	define areas in need
4. FCAT 2.0: F	Percentage	of students in L	owest 25%					
making learni	ing gains ir	n mathematics.						
Mathematics	Goal #4:							
Matrierriatics	σσαι π 4 .							
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performar	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process to	I ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		
			Pers	son or	Danasasi	1000 40		
				tion	Process l Determin			
Anticipated B	sarrier	Strategy	for	oonsible	Effective		Evai	uation Tool
			Mon	itoring	Strategy			
			No Data	Submitted				
Based on Ambi	itious but A	chievable Annual	Measurable Objec	tives (AMOs	s), AMO-2,	Reading and Ma	ith Pe	erformance Target
			Elementary Scho	ol Mathemat	ics Goal #			
5A. Ambitious Measurable Ob		ble Annual MOs). In six year						_
		hievement gap						
by 50%.			5A :			T		✓
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	2 2012-2013	2013-2014	2014	4-2015	2015-2016	5	2016-2017
	r	ľ	1	,		,		,

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	student achievement data, lowing subgroup:	and refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #5E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Pro	cess to Ir	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monit	ion onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #4:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving	g Process to	I ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsition			Process l Determin Effective Strategy	ie	Evaluatio	on Tool
		No Data	Submitted				
Based on Ambitious but A	Achievable Annual Mea	asurable Objec	tives (AMOs	s), AMO-2,	Reading and Ma	ath Perforn	nance Target
5A. Ambitious but Achiev Measurable Objectives (A school will reduce their a by 50%.	able Annual MOs). In six year	ddle School Ma	thematics G	Goal #			A
Baseline data 2010-2011 2011-20	12 2012-2013	2013-2014	2014	4-2015	2015-201	6	2016-2017
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the for		data, and refe	rence to "Gi	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and define	areas in need
5B. Student subgroups Hispanic, Asian, Americ satisfactory progress i	can Indian) not maki						
Mathematics Goal #5B	:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solving	g Process to	I ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp for			son or ition ponsible itoring	ion Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		on Tool	
		No Data	Submitted				
Based on the analysis of		data, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and define	e areas in need
of improvement for the for 5C. English Language L satisfactory progress i	earners (ELL) not m	aking					
Mathematics Goal #50							

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expecte	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		
1	Most students enter program below grade level in math	Utilize the benchmark assessments to target student specific needs for intervention	Principal Lead Teacher	Review student grouping charts	Progress of all students on assessments		
2		Increase the use of Agile Mind, Manga High, and hands-on activities to reinforce math concepts	Lead Teacher	Observe activities	Classroom Walkthrough Data		

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 of improvement for the fo		it data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in need
1. Students scoring at a	Achievement Leve	l 3 in Algebra.			
Algebra Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solvi	ng Process to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and refer of improvement for the following group:	rence to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

		Problem-So	Iving Proces	ss to In	ncrease St	tudent Ach	ievement			
Anticipated Barrier Strategy			Perso Position Respondent for Monito	on onsible	Process L Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eva	luation Tool		
			No	o Data S	ubmitted			·		
Based on Amb	itious but A	Achievable Annual	Measurable	Objectiv	ves (AMOs), AMO-2, I	Reading and M	∕lath Pe	erformance Target	
	jectives (A	able Annual MOs). In six year chievement gap	Algebra Goa	al #					Į.	
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	12 2012-2013	2013-2	2014	2014	4-2015	2015-20	16	2016-2017	
		student achievem bllowing subgroup:		d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identif	y and	define areas in nee	
Hispanic, Asia satisfactory p Algebra Goal 2012 Current	erogress ir #3B:		naking		2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Perform	ance:		
		Problem-So	lying Proces	ss to Im	acrosso St	tudont Ach	viovoment			
		Froblem-30	TVITIG FTOCE:	1		Tudent Aci	nevement			
Anticipated E	3arrier	Strategy		Perso Position Responsi for Monito	on onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Eva	Evaluation Tool	
			No	o Data S	ubmitted					
		student achievem ollowing subgroup:		d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identif	y and	define areas in nee	
3C. English La satisfactory p		earners (ELL) no n Algebra.	ot making							
Algebra Goal	#3C:									
2012 Current	Level of F	Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Perform	ance:		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	student achievement data, and llowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
3D. Students with Disab	ilities (SWD) not making				
satisfactory progress in	Algebra.				
Algebra Goal #3D:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to L	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data S	Submitted		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:					
3E. Economically Disad satisfactory progress in	o .	making			
Algebra Goal #3E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving P	rocess 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 Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

in need of improve	ment	for the foll	owing group:						
1. Students scorii Geometry.	ng at	Achieven	nent Level 3 in						
Geometry Goal #	1:								
2012 Current Lev	el of	Performaı	nce:		2013 Exp	ected	Level of Perform	nanc	ce:
		Problem	-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent	Achievement		
Anticipated Barri	er	Strategy		Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Deter	iveness of	Eva	aluation Tool
			No	Data	Submitted				
Based on the analy in need of improve	sis of	student a	chievement data, owing group:	and r	reference to	"Guid	ing Questions", id	lentif	fy and define areas
2. Students scori 4 and 5 in Geome	_	or above	Achievement Le	vels					
Geometry Goal #	2:								
2012 Current Lev	el of	Performaı	nce:		2013 Exp	ected	Level of Perform	nanc	ce:
		Problem	-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent	Achievement		
Anticipated Barri	er	Strategy		Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Deter	iveness of	Eva	aluation Tool
			No	Data	Submitted				
Based on Ambitiou Target	s but	Achievable	Annual Measurab	ole Ob	ojectives (A	MOs), i	AMO-2, Reading a	and N	Math Performance
3A. Ambitious but . Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six year reduce their achiev 50%.	Obje r scho	ctives ol will	Geometry Goal #						<u></u>
Baseline data 2011-2012	201	12-2013	2013-2014		2014-20	15	2015-2016		2016-2017

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

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:

,	is by ethnicity (white, Black ican Indian) not making in Geometry	CK,				
Geometry Goal #3B:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforn	nance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data	Submitted			
	f student achievement data, for the following subgroup:	and r	reference to	o "Guiding Questions", id	dentify and define areas	
3C. English Language satisfactory progress	Learners (ELL) not makin in Geometry.	g				
Geometry Goal #3C:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data	Submitted			
	f student achievement data, for the following subgroup:	and r	reference t	o "Guiding Questions", id	dentify and define areas	
3D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress	abilities (SWD) not making in Geometry.	9				
Geometry Goal #3D:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforn	nance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		

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

B 1 11 1 1	<u> </u>				1 115 1 1 5
3	f student achievement data, for the following subgroup:	, and r	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", i	dentify and define areas
3E. Economically Disa	dvantaged students not				
making satisfactory p	rogress in Geometry.				
Geometry Goal #3E:					
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 :	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			
	No Data Submitted								

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

areas in need of improv			l reference	to "Guiding Questions	", identify and define
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.					
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	rmance:
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	itudent 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 areas in need of improverse			l reference	to "Guiding Questions	", identify and define
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.					
Science 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						

	of student achievement data rement for the following gro		reference	to "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define
2a. FCAT 2.0: Student	ts scoring at or above				
Achievement Level 4	in science.				
Science Goal #2a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
		Pers	on or		
		Posi	tion	Process Used to Determine	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp	onsible	Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
		Monitoring		Strategy	
	No	Data :	Submitted		

	of student achievement diversely to the following of		reference	to "Guiding Question	ns", identify and define
2b. Florida Alternate Students scoring at c in science. Science Goal #2b:	Assessment: or above Achievement I	Level 7			
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proc	cess to L	ncrease S	Student Achievemer	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

 $^{^* \}textit{ When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., ~70\%) \\$

Based on the analysis areas in need of impro			d reference	e to "Guiding Question:	s", identify and define
1. Florida Alternate <i>A</i> at Levels 4, 5, and 6		its scoring			
Science Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	ormance:
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
		Pers	son or		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Res for	ition ponsible litoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis areas in need of impro			d reference	e to "Guiding Question:	s", identify and define
2. Florida Alternate <i>A</i> at or above Level 7 in		its scoring			
Science Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level o	of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
		Pers	son or	Process Used to	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res	ition ponsible litoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted	•	
iology End-of-Co	urse (EOC) Goal	ls			
When using percentage	es, include the number o	of students th	ne percentag	ge represents (e.g., 70%	(35)).
Based on the analysis areas in need of impro	of student achieveme vement for the followi	ent data, and ing group:	d reference	e to "Guiding Question:	s", identify and define
1. Students scoring a Biology.	at Achievement Leve	el 3 in			
Riology Goal #1:					

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

	of student achievement dar vement for the following gro		reference	to "Guiding Question	s", identify and define
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.					
Biology Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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	t		
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 n 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:					
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 Submitted				

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

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

* When using percer	ntages,	include th	ne number of stude	nts the p	percentage	represents (e.g.,	70% (35)).	
Based on the analin need of improve				a, and r	eference t	o "Guiding Ques	stions", id	lentify a	nd define areas
1. Students scor	ing at	Achieve	ment Level 3 in	Civics.					
Civics Goal #1:									
2012 Current Lev	vel of I	Perform	ance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of	Perform	nance:	
		Proble	m-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	Student Achiev	ement		
Anticipated Barr	ier	Strateg	У	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible toring	Process Used Determine Effectiveness Strategy		Evalua	tion Tool
			N	o Data	Submitted				
Based on the anal				a, and r	eference t	o "Guiding Ques	stions", id	entify a	nd define areas
 Students scor and 5 in Civics. 	_	or abov	e Achievement L	evels					
Civics Goal #2:									
2012 Current Lev	vel of l	Performa	ance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of	Perform	nance:	
		Proble	m-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	Student Achiev	ement		
				Doro	00.05			<u> </u>	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy F			Posit Resp for	tion ponsible Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy			Evalua	ition Tool	
			N		Submitted				
Professional Dev	-	nent (Pl	D) aligned with	Strate	egies thr	ough Professi	onal Lea	arning (Community
PLC) or PD Acti	J	ategy doe	es not require a pr	ofessio	nal develo	opment or PLC ac	ctivity.		
						Target Dates			
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus		ade Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	Partio (e PLC,s grade	eipants .g. , ubject, level, or I-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strate Follo up/Mon	DW-	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics 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 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 in need of improvement			eference to	o "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define areas
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	g Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible 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:

Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels and 5 in U.S. History.					
U.S. History Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

Enthless the sead Decem			
Evidence-based Progr Strategy	am(s)/Material(s) 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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Absences (10 or more) Absences (10 or more)							
Attendance Goal #1: 2012 Current Attendance Rate: 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		rence	to "Guidin	g Questions", identify a	and define areas in need		
2012 Current Attendance Rate: 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 2014 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	1. Attendance						
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	Attendance Goal #1:						
Absences (10 or more) Absences (10 or more) 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2012 Current Attendar	nce Rate:		2013 Exp	ected Attendance Ra	ate:	
Absences (10 or more) Absences (10 or more) 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)							
Tardies (10 or more) Tardies (10 or more)				2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
Tardies (10 or more) Tardies (10 or more)							
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
Problem-Solving Process to Encrease Student Achievement							
. Fobiem Solving Frocess to moreuse Student Aemevement		Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for		Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted	No Data S						

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 Progr			Available
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional 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
	<u> </u>		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 n of improvement:					
1. Suspension					
Suspension Goal #1:					
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In- School				
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				

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								

Suspension Budget:

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

End of 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 in need of improvement:	Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:				ntify and define areas
1. Dropout Prevention					
Dropout Prevention Go	oal #1:				
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.					
2012 Current Dropout Rate:			2013 Exp	ected Dropout Rate:	
2012 Current Graduati	on Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

m(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		Subtotal: \$0.00
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	No Data Description of Resources	Description of Resources Funding Source No Data Description of Resources Funding Source

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement:	f parent involvement data, a	and ref	ference to	"Guiding Questions", ide	ntify and define areas
1. Parent Involvement	t				
Parent I nvolvement Goal #1:					
*Please refer to the per participated in school ac unduplicated.	rcentage of parents who ctivities, duplicated or				
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Parent	Involvement:
	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data 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
No Data Submitted						

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Progr			A 11 1 1
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of 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, ident	ify and define areas in n	eed of improvement:	
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
	Problem-Solvin	g Process to Increase	Student Achievemen	t
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						

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

End of 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, ident	ify and define area	as in ne	eed of improvement:	
1. CTE					
CTE Goal #1:					
	Problem-Solvin	g Process to Inc	rease S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person Position Respon for Moniton	n Isible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data Suk	omitted		

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

GOAL (Priority): Improve staff awareness of exactly what the CCSS are, their importance, and why we need to implement them in all Alternative Schools programs. Goal: Goal:

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
Provide awareness training for APC, Dean, and Lead Teachers who will set the tone for implementation and provide training at each site/ various program staff.	All	Lead Teachers	All teachers	Early Release Days and Planning Days	Observations of PLC's, Feedback at Bi-monthly leadership team meetings. iObservation - Domain 4	Principal
Clearly identify how all processes are aligned (CCSS, PLCs, Rtl, PBS, Progress Monitoring, FCIM, CTEM) to use data to make decisions that lead to improved student outcomes; and that the focus is depth of instructional practice and comprehension rather than breadth of content.	AII	Lead Teachers	All Teachers	Early Release Days and Planning Days	Observations of PLC's, Feedback at Bi-monthly leadership team meetings iObservation - Domain 4	Principal

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

End of GOAL (Priority): Improve staff awareness of exactly what the CCSS are, their importance, and why we need to implement them in all Alternative Schools programs. Goal: Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

	5 () () ()			
Evidence-based	Program(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 Dev	velopment			
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
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$0.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance



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

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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The Alternative Schools SAC meets four times per year to review and discuss academic progress and strategies. Other issues pertaining to school improvement are addressed as needed.

	l

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