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## 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 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# of Years as } \\ \text { an } \\ \text { Administrator } \end{gathered}$ | 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT Performance Measures, and AYP information along with the associated school year) <br> School Grades: <br> 11-12: <br> 10-11: B <br> 09-10: B <br> 08-09: B <br> 07-08: A <br> 06-07: A <br> 05-06: A <br> 04-05: A <br> 03-04: A <br> Reading <br> \% Proficient \& Above: <br> 2012: 60 <br> 2011: 64 <br> 2010: 64 <br> 2009: 71 <br> 2008: 67 <br> 2007: 64 <br> 2006: 63 <br> 2005: 56 |

|2004: 5
Reading
\% Lrng Gains:
2012: 62
2011: 61
2010: 61
2009: 62
2008: 68
2007: 63
2006: 66
2005: 58
2004: 56
Reading
\% of Lowest 25 \%
Mkg Gains:
2012: 62
2011: 65
2010: 61
2009: 48
2008: 58
2006: 67
2005: 57
2004: 54
Math
\% Proficient \& Above:
2012: 70
2011: 66
2010: 63
2009: 94
2008: 91
2007: 90
2006: 88
2005: 86
2004: 86
\% Lrng Gains:
2012: 75
2011: 64
2010: 65
2009: 83
2008: 81
2007: 80
2006: 80
2005: 77
2004: 77
\% of Lowest 25 \%
Mkg Gains:
2012: 71
2011: 58
2010: 62
2009: 83
2008: 82
2007: 75
Writing
\% 3.5 and above:
2012: 90
2011: 92
2010: 86
2009: 94
2008: 92
2007: 94
2006: 89
2004: 95
Science
\% Proficient \& Above:
2012: N/A
2011: 39
2010: 42
2009: 52
2008: 48
2007: 51
AYP \% Reading Total:
11-12: 47
10-11: 59
09-10: 59
08-09: 69
07-08: 64
06-07: 61
05-06: 59
AYP \% Reading White:
11-12: 82
10-11: 70
09-10: 73
08-09: 77
07-08: 70
06-07: 65
05-06: 65
AYP \% Reading Black:
11-12: 49
10-11: 49
09-10: 53
08-09: NA
07-08: 59
06-07: 51

05-06: 53
AYP \% Reading Hispanic:
11-12: 66
10-11: 58
09-10: 55
08-09: 62
07-08: 57
06-07: 55
05-06: 54
AYP \% Reading Asian:
11-12: 74
10-11: NA
09-10: NA
08-09: NA
07-08: 73
06-07: NA
05-06: 59
AYP \% Reading FRL:
11-12: 51
10-11: 54
08-09: 55
07-08: 46
06-07: 35
05-06: 43
AYP \% Reading ELL:
11-12: 2
10-11: 30
09-10: 30
08-09: 39
07-08: 37
06-07: 33
$05-06: 39$
AYP \% Reading SWD:
11-12: 30
10-11: 25
08-09: NA
07-08: 34
06-07: 21
AYP \% Math Total:
11-12: 36
10-11: 60
09-10: 58
08-09: 92
07-08: 89
06-07: 87
05-06: 86
AYP \% Math White:
11-12: 86
10-11: 75
09-10: 74
08-09: NA
07-08: 91
06-07: 90
05-06: 88
AYP \% Math Black:
11-12: 62
10-11: 52
09-10: 45
08-09: NA
07-08: 81
06-07: 81
05-06: 78
AYP \% Math Hispanic:
11-12: 85
10-11: 59
09-10: 58
08-09: 91
07-08: 87
06-07: 85
05-06: 84
AYP \% Math Asian:
11-12: 86
10-11: NA
09-10: NA
08-09: NA
07-08: 94
06-07: NA
05-06: 94
AYP\% Math FRL:
11-12: 66
10-11: 56
09-10: 54
08-09: 88
07-08: 82
06-07: 75
05-06: 80
AYP \% Math ELL:
11-12: 27
10-11: 32
09-10: 36
08-09: 86
07-08: 80



05-06: 34
AYP \% Math Hispanic:
11-12: 85
10-11: 59
09-10: 58
08-09: NA
07-08: NA
06-07: NA
05-06: NA
AYP \% Math Asian:
11-12: 86
10-11: NA
09-10: NA
08-09: NA
07-08: NA
06-07: NA
05-06: NA
AYP\% Math FRL:
11-12: 66
10-11: 56
09-10: 54
08-09: 48
07-08: 47
06-07: 47
05-06: 35
AYP \% Math ELL
11-12: 27
10-11: 32
09-10: 36
07-08: 30
06-07: 31
AYP \% Math SWD:
11-12: 41
10-11: 29
09-10: 35
08-09: 35
06-07: 18
School Grades
11-12:
10-11: B
09-10: B
08-09: C
07-08: B
06-07: C
04-05: D
03-04: C
Reading
\% Proficient \& Above:
2012: 60
2011: 55
2010: 52
2009: 49
2008: 50
2007: 44
2006: 39
2005: 35
2004: 31
Reading
\% Lrng Gains:
2012: 62
2011: 56
2010: 51
2009: 51
2008: 55
2007: 51
2005: 45
2004: 43
Reading
\% of Lowest 25 \%
Mkg Gains:
2012: 62
2011: 53
2010: 43
2009: 50
2008: 43
2007: 53
2006: 56
2004: 43
Math
\% Proficient \& Above:
2012: 70
2011: 84
2010: 80
2009: 79
2008: 77
2007: 74
2006: 76



2011:
2010: 81
2008: 65
2007: 64
2006: 66
2005: 60
\% Lrng Gains:
2011: 71
2010: 78
2009: 64
2008: 68
2007: 68
2005: 64
\% of Lowest 25 \%
Mkg Gains:
2011:41
2010: 46
2009: 65
2008: 66
2007:67
2006: 74
2005: 47
Writing
\% 3.5 and above:
2011: 85
2010: 88
2008: 97
2007:94
2006: 93
Science
\% Proficient \& Above
2011: 48
2010: 46
2009: 41
2007: 31
AYP \% Reading Total:
10-11: 51
09-10: 53
08-09: 46
07-08: 43
06-07: 48
05-06: 38
AYP \% Reading White:
10-11: 73
09-10: 69
08-09: 72
07-08: 70
06-07: 73
05-06: 72
AYP \% Reading Black:
10-11: 43
09-10: 41
08-09: 36
07-08: 40
06-07: 38
05-06: 45
AYP \% Reading Hispanic:
10-11: 48
09-10: 44
08-09: N/A
07-08: N/A
06-07: 38
05-06: 51
AYP \% Reading FRL:
10-11: 42
09-10: 45
08-09: 33
07-08: 37
06-07: 36
05-06: 27
AYP \% Reading ELL:
10-11: N/A
09-10: N/A
08-09: 27
07-08: 31
06-07: 13
05-06: 20
AYP \% Reading SWD:
10-11: N/A
09-10: N/A
08-09: 13
07-08: 20
06-07: 16
05-06: 31
AYP \% Math Total:
10-11: 80
09-10: 78
08-09: 73
07-08: 68
06-07: 71
05-06: 66


|  |  |  |  |  | 10-11: N/A <br> AYP \% Reading SWD: <br> 11-12: 30 <br> 10-11: N/A <br> AYP \% Math Total: <br> 11-12: 36 <br> 10-11: 82 <br> AYP \% Math White: <br> 11-12: 86 <br> 10-11: 90 <br> AYP \% Math Black: <br> 11-12: 62 <br> 10-11: 75 <br> AYP \% Math Hispanic: <br> 11-12: 85 <br> 10-11: N/A <br> AYP\% Math FRL: <br> 11-12: 66 <br> 10-11: 78 <br> AYP \% Math ELL: <br> 11-12: 27 <br> 10-11: N/A <br> AYP \% Math SWD: <br> 11-12: 41 <br> 10-11: N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

| Subject Area | Name | ```Degree(s)/ Certification(s)``` | \# of Years at Current School | \# of Years as an I nstructional 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | Nadine Anchell | Master of Arts, Elementary Education Bachelor of Arts, English | 4 | 4 | School Grades: <br> 11-12: TBA <br> 10-11: B <br> 09-10: B <br> 08-09: C <br> FCAT Reading Proficiency: <br> 11-12: 60 <br> 10-11: 55 <br> 09-10: 52 <br> 08-09: 49 <br> FCAT Reading Learning Gains: <br> 11-12: 62 <br> 10-11: 56 <br> 09-10: 51 <br> 08-09: 51 <br> FCAT Reading LG of Lowest 25\%: <br> 11-12: 62 <br> 10-11: 53 <br> 09-10: 43 <br> 08-09: 50 <br> FCAT Writing <br> 11-12: 90 <br> 10-11: 86 <br> 09-10: 94 <br> 08-09: 92 <br> AYP Reading Total: <br> 11-12: 47 <br> 10-11: 53 <br> 09-10: 51 <br> 08-09: 46 <br> AYP Reading White: <br> 11-12: 82 <br> 10-11: 71 <br> 09-10: 71 <br> 08-09: 67 <br> AYP Reading Black: <br> 11-12: 49 <br> 10-11: 41 <br> 09-10: 37 $\text { 08-09: } 36$ <br> AYP Reading Hispanic: <br> 11-12: 66 <br> 10-11: N/A <br> 09-10: 71 <br> 08-09: N/A <br> AYP Reading FRL: <br> 11-12: 51 <br> 10-11: 45 <br> 09-10: 42 <br> 08-09: 37 |


|  |  |  |  |  | $\|$AYP Reading ELL: <br> $11-12: 2$ <br> $10-11:$ N/A <br> $09-10:$ N/A <br> $08-09:$ N/A <br> AYP Reading SWD: <br> $11-12: 30$ <br> $10-11:$ N/A <br> $09-10:$ N/A <br> $08-09:$ N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

|  | Description of Strategy | Person <br> Responsible | Projected <br> Completion <br> Date | Not Applicable (If not, please <br> explain why) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1. Teacher of the Month program | Sara Larosa | August 2013 |  |
| 2 | 2. Staff Development Opportunities | Valerie Ruwe | August 2013 |  |
| 3 | 3. New staff induction program | Sara Larosa | August 2013 |  |
| 4 | 4.Rising Leaders Program | Frank Gaines | August 2013 |  |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

| Number of <br> staff and <br> paraprofessional <br> that are <br> teaching out- <br> of-field/ and <br> who are not <br> highly <br> effective. | Provide the strategies <br> that are being <br> implemented to <br> support the staff in <br> becoming highly <br> effective |
| :--- | :--- |
| N/A | N/A |

## 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 <br> of <br> Instructional <br> Staff | \% of <br> First-Year <br> Teachers | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with 1-5 <br> Years of <br> Experience | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with 6-14 <br> Years of <br> Experience | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with 15+ <br> Years of <br> Experience | \% of <br> Teachers <br> with <br> Advanced <br> Degrees | \% Highly <br> Effective <br> Teachers | \% Reading <br> Endorsed <br> Teachers | National <br> Board <br> Certified <br> Teachers |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 84 | $6.0 \%(5)$ | $36.9 \%(31)$ | $39.3 \%(33)$ | $36.9 \%(31)$ | $59.5 \%(50)$ | $119.0 \%$ <br> Endorsed <br> Teachers |  |  |

## Teacher Mentoring Program/ Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Priscilla Ribeiro | John Hudson Sean Curran Marie Hautigan Dan Katz | Aspiring Leaders will work with the Principal in order to have the opportunities to explore administrative duties the | Aspiring Leaders will meet with the Principal on the six Professional Study Days to discuss, plan and evaluate the various experiences of leadership/organizational experiences with operations: Aspiring Leaders will be paired with Asst. Principals and |


|  |  | Principal open to them. | Principal to oversee the specific campus operations. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Val Ruwe | J ordanna Hass | National <br> Board Certified Teacher AYA Biology Mentor \& Clinical Educator | Weekly Mentoring, Marzano iobservations, Monthly Group Meeting |
| Marie Hautigan | Kathryn Lotocky | Mentor is completing Principal Rapid Orientation and Preparation in Educational Leadership Program (PROPEL) | Weekly Mentoring, Marzano iobservations, Monthly Group Meeting |
| J an March | Marina Batist | Mentor is a Clinical educator with experience as a Math Instructional Coach | Weekly Mentoring, Marzano iobservations, Monthly Group Meeting |
| Casey Portnoy | Israel Gonzales | Mentor is a Clinical Educator with a Maters degree \& also has <br> Experience in Vocational Education | Weekly Mentoring, Marzano iobservations, Monthly Group Meeting |
| Dan Katz | Ihsin Chang | National Board Certified Teacher \& Certified Lawyer experienced in teaching International Relations and a Clinical educator. | Weekly Mentoring, Marzano iobservations, Monthly Group Meeting |

## 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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

## N/A

Title II
N/A

Title III

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
N/A
Violence Prevention Programs

```
N/A
```


## Nutrition Programs

N/A
Housing Programs
N/A
Head Start
N/A

## Adult Education

N/A

## Career and Technical Education

## N/A

J ob Training

## N/A

Other
N/A

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

$\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { School- based MTSS/ RtI Team } \\ \text { Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. } \\ \begin{array}{|l|}\text { Principal } \\ \text { Grade Level Administrators } \\ \text { ESE/ESOL Specialist } \\ \text { Guidance Director } \\ \text { School Social Worker } \\ \text { School Psychologist } \\ \text { Reading Coach }\end{array} \\ \hline\end{array}\right.$

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?

Teachers are assigned at-risk students in August and then again in January. Teachers monitor student progress, communicate with student's other teachers, and implement interventions. If the student is not making progress, a referral is made to the Rtl Leadership team. The Rtl leadership team meets bi-weekly on Tuesday's to evaluate Tier 2/3 interventions, or more often if needed. Grade level teams meet quarterly to develop interventions.

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

The RtI team communicates with the School Advisory Council (SAC), principal, department chair-persons, instructional coaches, and administrators to ensure the academic goals set forth in the School Improvement Plan are achieved and aligned with district initiatives. The Rtl Leadership team develops and implements the action steps to accomplish school goals as determined by gaps in data.

## [MTSS I mplementation

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 Rtl chair designates selected Rtl members to collect and analysis tiered data. Depending on the evidence-based intervention, appropriate data will be collected using selected criteria specific to the evidence-based intervention being implemented. Review of the data occurs regularly and the need for a higher tier evidence-based intervention is evaluated. A variety of data management systems are used including, but not limited to Data Warehouse reports, Pinnacle reports, and classroom observations using a variety of collection methods, counselor and agency reports.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
Staff will be introduced to the Rtl concept on the first day back to school (August 15). A more comprehensive procedural type in-service will be given on August 16. The grade level teams will meet and grade level teachers will receive their student assignments on August 19. The Rtl Leadership team will meet on August 18.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.
Administration, guidance and faculty will work together to identify and work with students in need of RtI. It will be a collective effort to then provide appropriate interventions to assist students on an individual basis.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

## [School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
The Fort Lauderdale Literacy Leadership Team consists of the principal, assistant principals, Reading Coach, department heads, and guidance staff. This team also functions as the school based leadership team to identify school needs.

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
This leadership team will meet monthly to evaluate school-wide reading data, analyze data trends and adjust literacy initiatives accordingly. The leadership team members then report to their respective departments to share and discuss recommendations from the LLT so that teachers can then adjust their instructional focus.

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

## Goals: Level 4-5 Sustain

Level 3 Sustain-Improve 65\%
Level 1-2 Improve 65\%
This leadership team will focus on improving the achievement of the lowest $25 \%$ percentile of students in Reading.

## School Wide Literacy Practices:

- Sustained Silent Reading and Writing (SSRW)

1. Teachers will continue to follow the Departmentalized Monday, Wednesday, and Friday schedule hanging in their classrooms, dedicating 30 minutes to sustained silent reading one day per week. Math/Social Studies scheduled on Monday, English/Fine Arts/CTACE scheduled on Wednesday, and Science/World Languages scheduled on Friday. Teachers are expected to include this time in their IFC's and will be held accountable through classroom walkthroughs and observation 2. Teachers should be modeling effective silent reading during this time. An example of this is the teacher sitting visibly in front of the class reading text silently.
2. Writing activities should be meaningful, relevant, and accountable. Discussion activities are encouraged to promote motivation and authenticity. (How will you ensure or account for those teachers that are not equipped to come up with "relevant, meaningful writing activities."

- Word of the Day and Theme of the Week Programs

1. Words will continue to be read-aloud during morning announcements with a review day at the end of the week. Teachers are encouraged to post the words on a daily basis and review the word with students after it is read on announcements.
2. This year there will be a theme of the week (content driven) with an emphasis on common roots, prefixes, and suffixes.
3. Smoothie Incentive Program will continue with two students being awarded free smoothies in the cafeteria for knowing the word of the day.
4. Entire faculty is urged to use the daily word as much as possible throughout the day to maximize the fidelity of this practice. Examples are having the students use the word in written assignments and class discussions.

- Mastery Check Mini-Assessment Program

1. Homogenous 9th and 10th grade classrooms will continue to participate in six Mastery Check's throughout the school year in preparation of 2011 FCAT.
2. Homogeneous 11th and 12th grade students will continue to participate in six SAT Prep Assessments.
3. This year the benchmarks tested will include Math and Reading, but exclude Science. Reading benchmarks will follow the FCAT 2 content.
4. Dissemination and scoring of the assessments will remain the same with N.Anchell delivering bubble sheets and assessments in teachers' mailboxes prior to the scheduled date. Completed bubble sheets will then be turned in to N.Anchell who will place data in Virtual Counselor.
5. Teachers are encouraged to check data as soon as reports are available and share information with the students via data chats or class review.

School Wide Literacy Instructional Focus Calendar

1. The Literacy IFC will be provided to teachers once per marking period and will outline the school wide assessment schedule (including practice writing prompts and district mandated testing such as BAT and FCAT testing).
2. Benchmarks tested on the Mastery Check will be taught utilizing literacy strategies suggested in IFC. They will be broken down into two to three week increments.
3. All suggested strategies could be found in the CAB Learning Strategies Conference. N. Anchell will schedule periodic modeling of popular strategies during future planning periods (dates TBA).

- Enrichment Program (formerly known as Pull-Out)

1. This year an enrichment program will be provided to eleventh grade retake students prior to October FCAT retakes.

Schedule and guidelines will be provided to teachers prior to sessions.
2. After school tutoring sessions will be provided the week before October Retakes.
3. Enrichment will be provided to 9th and 10th grade students prior to April FCAT. Schedule and guidelines will be given to teachers prior to sessions. This year there needs to be a renewed vigor in ensuring students attend enrichment.
Administration will support this renewed attendance accountability
4. FCAT after school tutoring sessions will be provided and dates will be announced as they are scheduled.

- CAR-PD Student Support

1. This year's students designated as CAR-PD, will receive additional support through a push-in model in the classroom, conducted by N.Anchell. Schedules and details will be forthcoming to affected teachers.
2. CAR-PD teachers will continue to receive a list of designated students, their relevant data, and suggestions on improving performance.

- Word Walls / Class Libraries/ Print Rich Environment

1. Word Walls will vary from class to class and can be displayed through creative venues (multi-media, artwork, etc) They should continuously change throughout the year as needed by student progress and be interactive (not just displayed, but used within class activities).
2. All classrooms should have a designated class library, preferably labeled as such, with students gaining access to library as needed.
3. A Print Rich environment includes displayed student work (changing as content changes), charts, graphic organizers, teacher notes, and anything printed or displayed (multi-media acceptable) that is authentic and relevant to student learning. It is an environment that encourages students to read and write because they are surrounded with examples of literacy. It is the first thing an observer notices when they step into a classroom.

## 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.
$\square$

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

Teachers will receive training as needed on early release days, pre planning, and planning days, which includes, but is not limited to Reading in the Content Area, CAR-PD strategies, CRISS strategies, Vocabulary development, differentiated instruction, and other applicable programs to enhance classroom instruction as needed. Trainings are provided by reading coach and district personnel. Reading coach will provide ongoing training on the interpretation of Reading data gathered from 2012 FCAT and district BAT. Reading Coach will provide training on instructional strategies to support reading in the content areas. All teachers will be offered bi-weekly learning communities in reading addressing each benchmark to infuse reading strategies and reading across the content areas. The school has implemented a school wide reading and writing across curriculum process that ensures the all department participate in the schools reading and writing initiatives. The program incorporates the word of the day vocabulary strategy, trip (SSR), and elaboration through writing.

## *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?

FLHS offers Vocational courses where students can earn certifications that can be used in the following career fields: Fashion, Tech Studies, and Web Design. Success in these courses in addition to overall academic success, can be applied towards the Gold Seal Vocational Scholarship through Bright Futures. Each applied and integrated course includes real life lessons and hands on activities that would be carried out in their actual field of study. These hands on activities offer students invaluable first-hand experience with regard to field of education.

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?

Course choice is based on student goals, interests, and talents. There are a variety of elective classes offered that allow students to either continue in an area of interest or explore new areas. Programs provide varying levels of academic core courses ranging from basic college prep to Advanced Placement. Students are also able to enroll in additional "core electives" which may include upper level Science and Math classes, or additional Foreign Languages. Course selections are advertised through: elective fairs, grade level assemblies, curriculum guide, classroom visits by guidance and course instructors, and school website. Counselors make classroom visitations to instruct students on completing interest inventories and career planning tools. Each student plans out his/her high school coursework and selects a Major Area of Interest to help relate daily coursework to the students' interest and goals. Each year, during the course selections process, students are able to sit one-on-one with a counselor to discuss career and educational interest so that course selections may be catered to the individual.

We also hold an Elective Fair during this time each year, in which students are able to speak with members of clubs and organizations, as well as current students in elective courses, to get a better understanding of what the elective entails. It is during this registration process that students will select academic core and elective courses for the following year. They are instructed through grade level assemblies, involving a Power Point presentation and handouts, how to access Virtual Counselor and select their courses via an online system. A couple of weeks later, each student sits with a counselor to discuss and finalize these course selections.

## Postsecondary Transition

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

Objective 1: The number of College Ready students, as defined by FLDOE SB1908, will increase by $10 \%$ as compared to the 11-12 school year.
Measurement: The leadership team will identify high performing 9 th $\& 10$ th graders and provide practice and opportunities to engage in the ACT, SAT and PERT tests prior to traditional test taking time lines for college admissions.

Objective 2: The number of students participating in Advanced Placement or AICE courses will increase by $10 \%$ as compared to the number of students that participated in the 2011-2012 school year.
Measurement: The leadership team will conduct an analysis of students' PSAT, SAT, ACT and FCAT scores (as applicable) along with course grades/GPA and identify students who have not registered for AP/AICE courses and encourage their registration prior to September 2012.

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

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

| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#1a: |  |  | The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level 3 on the FCAT Reading assessment will increase by 3 percentage points from $28.3 \%$ to $31 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 28.3\% (265) |  |  | 31.3\% (290) |  |  |
| 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 | According to 2012 <br> Reading FCAT 2.0 score report, 9th Grade students demonstrated student deficiencies in vocabulary and 10th Grade students demonstrated deficiencies in Literary Analysis. | School wide Word of the Day program using common SAT and FCAT 2.0 affixes will be implemented daily. Students in grades nine through twelve will participate in daily "DO Now" warm up activities aligned to specific benchmarks that pertain to vocabulary development. Students in grades $9-10$ will be utilizing Spring Board strategies in all English classrooms to aid in increasing Literary Analysis achievement. | Literacy Coach (Ms. Anchell) and Administrative Team as well as LLT. | Monitor and analyze Word of the Day Test data and tailor instructional plans accordingly. <br> Monitor classroom lesson planning and assessments to ensure teacher accountability | Word of the Day <br> Test <br> Classroom <br> Walkthrough tool Classroom <br> Assessments |
| 2 | Limited direct reading instruction for fringe level 3 students | These targeted students will participate in Enrichment Programs facilitated by Literacy Coach. | Literacy Coach | Strategic Plan and administrative support | Mastery Check Data and Bat 2 Data |
| 3 | Inconsistency of effective content area literacy strategies | A Reading Plan will be implemented across the curriculum. The plan will include a Literacy Instructional Focus Calendar and Staff development opportunities. Each department will support the instructional focus benchmarks that will be covered by using content-based reading selections from their curriculum. A revamped Sustained Silent Reading and Writing Program (SSRW) will also be implemented to address | Literacy Coach | Monitor classroom lesson planning and design SSRW specifically tailored to meet content area teachers' needs. | Classroom <br> Walkthrough tool Classroom <br> Assessments as well as Mastery Check Data |

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: <br> Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#1b: |  |  | The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level 4,5 , or 6 on the FAA reading will increase by 3 percentage points from $33 \%$ to $36 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 33\% (3) |  |  | 36\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students lack of analytical skills necessary for comprehension | Use of who, what, where, when, and how. Use of graphic organizers. | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |
| 2 | Students lack the skills to utilize context clues | Predicting outcomes and paraphrasing | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |
| 3 | Students lack the appropriate skills to identify the main characters, setting, and simple plot of the story | Sequencing using prompting (first then last). To make real world connections to text. | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |

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 reading. <br> Reading Goal \#2a: |  |  | The percentage of students scoring a level 4 or above on the FCAT Reading assessment will increase by 3 percentage points from $31 \%$ to $34 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 31\% (291) |  |  | 34\% (318) |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Addressing reading needs of higher level learners | Revamped SSRW Program utilizes high lexile text to ensure students are reading and are exposed to complex text on a weekly basis. | Literacy Coach and Administrative Team as well as LLT | Classroom Teachers are trained to monitor and facilitate this process. | Rhetorical Triangle Writing activity that accompanies complex text provided to classroom teachers. |
| 2 | Lack of systematic, Tier2 direct instruction in vocabulary by content area teachers | School wide word of the day initiative as well as SSRW | Literacy Coach and Administrative Teams | Classroom Teachers are trained to monitor and facilitate this process. | Mastery Check Data |


| 3 | Enrichment Opportunities | Monthly Gifted Seminars <br> to address needs of <br> higher level learners | Literacy Coach | Student Survey and <br> Input |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#2b: |  |  | The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level 7 on the FAA reading will increase by 3 percentage points from $44 \%$ to $47 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 44\% (4) |  |  | 47\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students do not read text with accuracy | . Graphic organizers including KWL and word webs | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |
| 2 | Students have difficulty decoding words above level 3 | Front loading text and using resource material | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |
| 3 | Students have difficulty comprehending words they decode | Use of dictionary and technological resources | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#3a: |  |  | The percentage of students making Learning Gains on the FCAT Reading assessment will increase by 3 percentage points from $62 \%$ to $65 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 62\% (564) |  |  | 65\% (590) |  |  |
| 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 |
|  | Demonstrated student deficiencies in comprehension and fluency | The school will implement an afternoon FCAT <br> tutoring program from January through April. Students will receive both individual and group instruction from FLHS staff members. Topics to | Literacy Coach and Administrative Team | Pre and Post Tutoring data | USA Test Prep Online Software |

include but will not be
limited to reading in the
content area, general
reading skills, FCAT
skills, study skills, test
taking skills, and FCAT
questioning techniques.
The program is open to
all 9th and 10th
students as well as
11th and 12th grade
students that have not
successfully passed the
FCAT reading
|

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#3b: |  |  | The percentage of students making learning gains on the FAA reading will increase by 3 percentage points from $22 \%$ to $25 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 22\% (2) |  |  | 25\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | . Students lack of analytical skills necessary for comprehension | Use of who, what, where, when, and how. Use of graphic organizers. | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |
| 2 | Students are not likely to predict outcomes | Modeling with graphic organizer and small group instruction | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |
| 3 | Students have difficulty inferring meaning of text | Peer teaching, teacher modeling, cooperative learning | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest $25 \%$ making learning gains in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#4: |  | The percentage of students in lowest quartile making learning gains in reading on the FCAT Reading assessment will increase by 3 percentage points from $62 \%$ to $65 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 62.9\% (147) |  | 65\% (152) |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for | Process Used to Determine <br> Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool |


|  |  |  | Monitoring | Strategy |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Remediation of lowest <br> quartile based on <br> individual data | Utilizing FAIR Progress <br> Monitoring to meet <br> individual learner needs | Literacy Coach | Progress Monitoring of AP <br> l and AP 2 Data to <br> ensure adequate <br> progress and growth is <br> being made with all Level <br> 1 and 2 students |  |



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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal \#5B:
The percentage of white students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT will be reduced 2 percentage points from $17 \%$ to $15 \%$.

The percentage of black students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT will be reduced 2 percentage points from $51 \%$ to $49 \%$.

The percentage of Hispanic students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT will be reduced 2 percentage points from $33 \%$ to $31 \%$.

The percentage of Asian students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT will be reduced 2 percentage points from $26 \%$ to $24 \%$.

2012 Current Level of Performance:
2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 17\% (37)
White: 15\% (31)
Black:51\% (297)
Hispanic: 33\% (38)
Black:49\% (277)
Asian: 26\% (6)
Hispanic: 31\% (35)
Asian: 24\%(5)
American Indian: 0
American Indian: 0
Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | White: According to 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0 score report, students demonstrated deficiencies in Literary Analysis and Vocabulary. Black: : According to 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0 score report, students demonstrated deficiencies in Literary Analysis and Vocabulary. Hispanic: : According to 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0 score report, students demonstrated deficiencies in Literary Analysis and Vocabulary. Asian: : According to | Our student subgroups will utilize all the Literacy strategies and interventions that are used school wide including Word of Day, SSRW, Push-In and PullOut Models, Enrichment, Progress Monitoring through FAIR, BAT 2, Mastery Checks, Data Chats and after school tutoring. | Literacy Coach | All data gathered through these programs will be monitored for each subgroup individual data. | Mastery Check BAT 2, SSRW, FAI |


|  | 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0 <br> score report, students <br> demonstrated <br> deficiencies in Literary <br> Analysis and Vocabulary. <br> American Indian: : <br> According to 2012 <br> Reading FCAT 2.0 score <br> report, students <br> demonstrated <br> deficiencies in Literary <br> Analysis and Vocabulary. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Some students in these <br> subgroups are unable to <br> stay after school for <br> tutoring. | A Push-In model will be <br> utilized to ensure equal <br> access to tutoring. | Literacy Coach and <br> ESE /ELL Support <br> Person | All data gathered through <br> these programs will be <br> monitored for each <br> subgroup individual data. | Mastery Check <br> BAT 2, SSRW, FAIR |
| 3 | Struggling Readers in <br> these subgroups need <br> additional individualized <br> instruction. | Access to READ- ON <br> software will be utilized in <br> Reading Classrooms. | Classroom <br> Teachers and <br> Literacy Coach | READ- ON Data will be <br> evaluated | READ- ON |


| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5C: |  |  | The percentage of English Language Learners (ELL) students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT will be reduced 2 percentage points from $98 \%$ to $96 \%$. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 98\% (51) |  |  | 96\% (49) |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students need more chances to interact verbally with peers in English Language. | All teachers will be given strategies and tips for involving ELL's in class communication. | ESOL Contact | Anecdotal Records | Observation/Notes |
| 2 | Curriculum is not differentiated to meet ELL student needs. | All teachers will be given strategies and tips for differentiating curriculum to meet ELL student needs. | ESOL Contact | Mastery Check Data / BAT 2 | Monitor Mastery Check and BAT 2 Data |
| 3 | Decoding, fluency, and comprehension skills need to be reinforced. | REWARDS Program | Reading Teachers, Literacy Coach, and ESOL Contact | Pre/Post Test within Rewards | Rewards Pre/Post scale |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making <br> satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5D: | The percentage of Students With Disabilities (SWD) students <br> not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 <br> FCAT will be reduced 2 percentage points from 70\% to 68\%. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Level of Performance: |
| $70 \%(41)$ | $68 \%(39)$ |


|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | SWD need additional <br> support inside of the <br> classroom environment. | Push-In model with <br> support facilitator. | ESE Support <br> Facilitator | Msstery Check/ BAT 2 | Monitor Mastery <br> Check and BAT 2 <br> Data |
| 2 | Curriculum is not <br> differentiated to meet <br> SWD student needs. | All teachers will be given <br> strategies and tips for <br> differentiating curriculum <br> to meet SWD student <br> needs. | ESE Support <br> Facilitator | Mastery Check Data / <br> BAT 2 | Monitor Mastery <br> Check and BAT 2 <br> Data |
| 3 | Decoding, fluency, and <br> comprehension skills need <br> to be reinforced. | REWARDS Program | Reading Teachers, <br> Literacy Coach, <br> Rad ESE Support <br> Facilitator | Pre/Post Test within <br> Rewards | Rewards Pre/Post <br> scale |


| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5E: |  |  | The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be reduced 3 percentage points from $49 \%$ to $46 \%$. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 49\% (313) |  |  | 46\% (290) |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | These students may not have access to materials at home as other students. | Utilize USA Test Prep Resources, FCAT Pro, FCAT Explorer and Florida Achieves to narrow the gap | Literacy Coach and Classroom Teachers | Data garnered from these tools will be monitored and evaluated | USA Test Prep, FCAT Pro, FCAT Explorer and Florida Achieves website data |
| 2 | Lack of Attendance may be a factor | Utilize motivational programs to encourage attendance | Administrative Team | Student Feedback and Attendance Levels will be monitored | Attendance Records |
| 3 | Lack of Motivation is possible barrier | Data Chats and Motivational Programs | Literacy Coach and Administrative Team | Mastery Check and BAT 2 Data will be monitored and evaluated | Mastery Check and BAT 2 |

## 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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NGCARPD | $9-12$ | District <br> Trainings | Subject | October Trainings | Practicum/Portfolio | Literacy Coach |


| School Wide <br> Literacy <br> IFC/Trainings | $9-12$ | Literacy <br> Coach | School Wide | Every Marking <br> Period | School Wide and <br> District Data |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Spring Board | $9-10$ and 12 | District <br> Trainings | English | Fall Trainings | School Wide Data, <br> CWK |

## Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Saturday School(FCAT/EOC/SAT/ACT Prep | Instructional Staff for Saturday School | Accountability | \$1,868.75 |
| FLHS STAR Tutoring Program | Instructional Staff for STAR Tutoring Program | Advanced Placement Funds | \$6,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$7,868.75 |  |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total: \$7,868.75 |  |  |  |

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non- ELL students.

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/ speaking.

CELLA Goal \#1:
The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level 739-835 on the CELLA Writing will increase by 3 percentage points from $59 \%$ to $62 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/ speaking:

59\% (13)

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Limited exposure to the <br> English language | Bilingual dictionaries, <br> bilingual support, use of | ESOL <br> teacher/ESOL | Teacher observation, <br> assessments, and | Comprehensive <br> English Language |


| 1 |  | illustrations and <br> diagrams. | contact | tailored instructional <br> plans | Learning <br> Assessment <br> (CELLA) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Limited vocabulary | Bilingual dictionaries, <br> bilingual support, <br> Vocabulary <br> Improvement Strategy <br> (VIS), and word banks | ESOL <br> teacher/ESOL <br> contact | Teacher observation, <br> assessments, and <br> tailored instructional <br> plans | Comprehensive <br> English Language <br> Learning <br> Assessment <br> (CELLA) |
| 3 | Limited prior knowledge <br> of English language | Bilingual dictionaries, <br> bilingual support, <br> demonstrations, graphic <br> organizers, cooperative <br> learning groups, <br> alternative assessment <br> instruments | ESOL <br> teacher/ESOL | Teacher observation, <br> assessments, and <br> tailored instructional <br> plans | Comprehensive <br> English Language <br> Learning <br> Assessment <br> (CELLA) |


| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non- ELL students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal \#2: |  |  | The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level 778-820 on the CELLA Reading will increase by 3 percentage points from $27 \%$ to $30 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27\% (6) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited vocabulary | Bilingual dictionaries, bilingual support, Vocabulary Improvement Strategy (VIS), and word banks | ESOL teacher/ESOL contact | Teacher observation, assessments, and tailored instructional plans | Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) |
| 2 | Limited exposure to the English language | Bilingual dictionaries, and bilingual support | ESOL teacher/ESOL contact | Teacher observation, assessments, and tailored instructional plans | Comprehensive <br> English Language <br> Learning <br> Assessment <br> (CELLA) |
| 3 | Limited prior knowledge of English language | Bilingual dictionaries, and bilingual support | ESOL teacher/ESOL contact | Teacher observation, assessments, and tailored instructional plans | Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) |


| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non- ELL students. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. <br> CELLA Goal \#3: | The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level 746-850 on the CELLA Writing will increase by 3 percentage points from $32 \%$ to $35 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: |  |
| 32\% (7) |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |
|  | Person or $\quad$ Process Used to |


|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Limited exposure to the <br> English language | Bilingual dictionaries <br> and bilingual support | ESOL <br> teacher/ESOL <br> contact | Teacher observation, <br> assessments, and <br> tailored instructional <br> plans | Comprehensive <br> English Language <br> Learning <br> Assessment <br> (CELLA) |
| 2 | Limited prior knowledge <br> of English language | Bilingual dictionaries <br> and bilingual support | ESOL <br> teacher/ESOL <br> contact | Teacher observation, <br> assessments, and <br> tailored instructional <br> plans | Comprehensive <br> English Language <br> Learning <br> Assessment <br> (CELLA) |
| 3 | Limited vocabulary | Bilingual dictionaries <br> and bilingual support | ESOL <br> teacher/ESOL <br> contact | Teacher observation, <br> assessments, and <br> tailored instructional <br> plans | Comprehensive <br> English Language <br> Learning <br> Assessment <br> (CELLA) |

## CELLA Budget:



## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#1: |  |  | The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level 4,5 , or 6 on the FAA math will increase by 3 percentage points from $44 \%$ to $47 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 44\% (4) |  |  | 47\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students lack retention of previous skills acquired in preceding math courses. | Math teachers will spira previous skills in to their assignments. | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |
| 2 | Students lack of analytical skills necessary for comprehension | Math teachers will use manipulatives, hands on material and real world experience. | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |

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

| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#2: |  |  | The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level 7 on the FAA reading will increase by 3 percentage points from $22 \%$ to $25 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 22\% (2) |  |  | 25\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students not having the intellectual ability to interpret graphs and charts | One- on- one instruction, use of hands on manipulatives, and real world application problems. | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom Walktrough Tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |
| 2 | Students lack the skills needed to solve equations | One- on- one instruction and use of manipulatives. | ESE teacher | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom Walktrough Tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |

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

| 3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#3: |  |  | The percentage of students making learning gains on the FAA math will increase by 3 percentage points from $33 \%$ to $36 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 33\% (3) |  |  | 36\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student's intellectual ability | One- on- one instruction, individualized Educational Plan, use of manipulatives, and differentiated instruction. | ESE Specialist | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom walkthrough Tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessments (FAA) |
| 2 | Students lack prerequisite skills needed for mastery | One- on- one instruction, use of manipulatives, reteaching and differentiated instruction. | ESE Specialist | Teacher observations, graded work samples, Classroom Walkthrough Tool, and assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |

## Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#1: |  |  | The percentage of students achieving proficiency in math (range 3) will increase 4 percentage points from $45 \%$ to $49 \%$ as measured by the 2013 End of Course (EOC)examination for Algebra I. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 45 \% (222) |  |  | 49\% (241) |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students lack retention of previous skills acquired in preceding math courses | Math teachers will spiral previous skills in to their assignments. | Department pre and post tests, IFCs and classroom walkthrough tool | End of course examination- Algebra I 2013 Benchmark Assessment | End of course examinationAlgebra I 2013 Benchmark Assessment |
|  | Lack of direct instructional focus for fringe level 3. | All 9th , 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students, including but not limited to those who have demonstrated proficiency in Math will have the opportunity to | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Analysis of skills assessments administered during tutoring sessions. | End of Course examination- <br> Algebra I <br> 2013 <br> Benchmark |


|  |  | participate in an after <br> school tutoring program <br> to accommodate their <br> needs in math concepts <br> and skills. Students, <br> including FLHS members <br> will be used as tutors and <br> mentors. Teachers will <br> supervise these <br> students and the <br> tutoring program. <br> Assessment |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | All 9th and 10th grade <br> students will participate <br> in the Small Learning <br> Community program. <br> This program focuses <br> on increasing <br> personalization of the <br> education process. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. <br> Sterling | Administrative team will <br> monitor smaller learning <br> communities database for <br> accountability. | End of Course <br> examination- <br> Algebra I <br> 2013 <br> Bonchmark |
| Assessment |  |  |  |  |

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 <br> and $\mathbf{5}$ in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#2: | The number of students scoring above proficiency will <br> increase by 10\% based on the Algebra I EOC examination. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Level of Performance: |
| $24.7 \%(121)$ | $25.7 \%(126)$ |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Lack of direct instructional focus for level 4 and 5 students as it refers to the Algebra I EOC | All 9th, 10th 11th and 12th grade students, including but not limited to those who have demonstrated above proficiency in Math will have the opportunity to participate in an after school tutoring program to accommodate their needs in math concepts and skills. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Analysis of skills assessments administered during tutoring sessions | End of Course examinationAlgebra I 2013 <br> Benchmark Assessment |
| 2 | Students' lack of motivation | All 9th and 10th grade students will participate in the Small Learning Community program. This program focuses on increasing personalization of the education process | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Administrative team will monitor smaller learning communities database for accountability. | End of Course examinationAlgebra I 2013 <br> Benchmark Assessment |


| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by $50 \%$. | Algebra Goal \#In six years FLHS will reduce the achievement gap by $50 \%$ <br> from 39\% to $20 \%$$3 A:$ |


| Baseline data <br> 2010-2011 | $2011-2012$ | $2012-2013$ | $2013-2014$ | $2014-2015$ | $2015-2016$ | $2016-2017$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $30 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $\square$ |

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:

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making
satisfactory progress in Algebra.

The number of students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra I will decrease in each category by $5 \%$.
Algebra Goal \#3B:

2012 Current Level of Performance:
White: 14.5 \%
Black: 38.2 \%
Hispanic: 15.4\%
Asian: 14.3\%
American Indian: 0 \%

2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 10\%
Black:33\%
Hispanic: 10\%
Asian: 9\%
American Indian: 0\%

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 | Familiarity with relevant formulas and content vocabulary( all groups | Teachers will employ EOC activities that focus on using relevant formulas. <br> Content specific vocabulary will be taught using direct instruction. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Monthly mini assessments | 2013 End of course Examination Algebra I EOC |
| 2 | Lack of retention of prior knowledge and skills. | The school will implement an EOC Camp program. The students will receive both individual and group instruction from FLHS staff members. The program is open to all 9th and 10th students as well as 11th and 12th grade students who have not successfully made learning gains in Algebra as measured by the Algebra I EOC. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs, Sterling | Skills assessments administered during EOC Tutoring | Skills assessments administered during EOC Camp |

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.

The number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra I will decrease by $5 \%$.

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

68\%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  |  | Strategy |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Familiarity with relevant <br> formulas and content <br> vocabulary. | Teachers will employ EOC <br> activities that focus on <br> using relevant formulas. <br> Content specific <br> vocabulary will be taught <br> using direct instruction. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. <br> Sterling | Monthly mini assessments | 2013 End of course <br> Examination <br> Algebra I EOC |
| 2 | Lack of retention of prior <br> knowledge and skills | The school will implement <br> an EOC Camp program. <br> The students will receive <br> both individual and group <br> instruction from FLHS <br> staff members. The <br> program is open to all 9th <br> and 10th students as <br> well as llth and 12th <br> grade students that have <br> not successfully made | Mr. Mrs. <br> learning gains in Algebra <br> as measured by the <br> Algebra I EOC. | Skills assessments <br> administered during EOC <br> Tutoring | Skills assessments <br> administered during <br> EOC Camp. |

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#3D: |  |  | The number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra I will decrease by $5 \%$. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 59.5 \% (22) |  |  | 54\% |  |  |
| 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 | Familiarity with relevant formulas and content vocabulary. | Teachers will employ EOC activities that focus on using relevant formulas. Content specific vocabulary will be taught using direct instruction. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Monthly mini assessments | 2013 End of course <br> Examination <br> Algebra I EOC |
| 2 | Lack of retention of prior knowledge and skills. | The school will implement an EOC Camp program. The students will receive both individual and group instruction from FLHS staff members. The program is open to all 9th and 10th students as well as 11th and 12th grade students that have not successfully made learning gains in Algebra as measured by the Algebra I EOC. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Skills assessments administered during EOC Tutoring | Skills assessments administered during EOC Camp |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.

Algebra Goal \#3E:

The number of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra I will decrease by 5\%.

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34.8\% (123) |  |  | 29 \% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Familiarity with relevant formulas and content vocabulary. | Teachers will employ EOC activities that focus on using relevant formulas. Content specific vocabulary will be taught using direct instruction. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Monthly mini assessments | End of course Examination Algebra I EOC |
| 2 | Lack of retention of prior knowledge and skills. | The school will implement an EOC Camp program. <br> The students will receive both individual and group instruction from FLHS staff members. The program is open to all 9th and 10th students as well as 11th and 12th grade students that have not successfully made learning gains in Algebra as measured by the Algebra I EOC | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Skills assessments administered during EOC Tutoring. | Skills assessments administered during EOC Camp. |

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in <br> Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#1: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | The percentage of students achieving proficiency in math <br> (range 3) will increase 5 percentage points from 45\% <br> to50\% as measured by the 2013 End of Course (EOC) <br> examination for Geometry. |
| 45\% (158) |  |
| 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |


| 2 |  | who have demonstrated proficiency in Math will have the opportunity to <br> participate in an after school tutoring program <br> to accommodate their needs in math concepts <br> and skills. Students, including FLHS members <br> Will be used as tutors and mentors. Teachers will supervise these students and the tutoring program. Assessment |  |  | Benchmark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | Students' lack of motivation. | All 9th and 10th grade students will participate in the Small Learning Community program. This program focuses on increasing personalization of the education process. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Administrative team will monitor smaller learning communities database for accountability. | End of Course examinationGeometry 2013 Benchmark |

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#2: |  |  | The percentage of students achieving proficiency in math will increase 5 percentage points from $26 \%$ to $31 \%$ as measured by the 2013 End of Course (EOC) examination for Geometry |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 26\% (91) |  |  | 31\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students lack retention of previous skills acquired in preceding math courses. | Math teachers will spiral previous skills in to their assignments. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Department pre and post tests, IFCs and classroom walkthrough tool | End of course examination- <br> Geometry 2013 <br> Benchmark <br> Assessment |
| 2 | Lack of direct instructional focus. | All 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students, including but not limited to those who have demonstrated <br> proficiency in Math will have the opportunity to <br> participate in an after school tutoring program <br> to accommodate their needs in math concepts <br> and skills. Students, including FLHS members | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Analysis of skills assessments administered during tutoring sessions. | End of course examination- <br> Geometry 2013 <br> Benchmark <br> Assessment |


|  |  | Will be used as tutors <br> and <br> mentors. Teachers will <br> supervise these <br> students and the <br> tutoring program. <br> Assessment |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | Students' lack of <br> motivation | All 9th and 10th grade <br> students will participate <br> in the Small Learning <br> Community program. <br> This program focuses <br> on increasing <br> personalization of the <br> education process. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. <br> Sterling | End of course <br> examination- <br> Geometry 2013 <br> Benchmark <br> Assessment |


| 3A. Ambitious but Annual Measurab (AMOs). In six ye reduce their achi $50 \%$. | Achievable Objectives school will ement gap by | In six years FLHS will reduce the achievement gap by 50\% from $26 \%$ to $15 \%$. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |  |
|  | 26\% | 22\% | 18\% | 15\% |  |  |

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:
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

The number of students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry will decrease in each category by 5\%.
Geometry Goal \#3B:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White: 18.5\% <br> Black: 34.6\% <br> Hispanic: 15.8\% <br> Asian:0\% <br> American Indian: NA |  |  | White: 13.5\% <br> Black: 29.6\% <br> Hispanic: 10.8\% <br> Asian: 0\% <br> American Indian: NA |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Familiarity with relevant formulas and content vocabulary( all groups) | Teachers will employ EOC activities that focus on using relevant formulas. Content specific vocabulary will be taught using direct instruction. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Monthly mini assessments | End of course Examination Geometry EOC |
| 2 | Lack of retention of prior knowledge and skills. | The school will implement an EOC Camp program. The students will receive both individual and group instruction from FLHS staff members. The program is open to all 9th and 10th students as well as 11th and | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Analysis of skills assessments administered during tutoring sessions. | End of course Examination Geometry EOC |


|  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\|l\| l\|l\|$ |
| lith grade students |
| that have not |
| successfully made |
| learning gains in Algebra |
| as measured by the |
| Algebra I EOC |$|.$|  |
| :--- |


| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#3C: |  |  | The number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry will decrease in each category by $5 \%$. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 57.7 (15) |  |  | 52\% |  |  |
| 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 | Familiarity with relevant formulas and content vocabulary. | Teachers will employ EOC activities that focus on using relevant formulas. Content specific vocabulary will be taught using direct instruction. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Teachers will employ EOC activities that focus on using relevant formulas. Content specific vocabulary will be taught using direct instruction. | End of course Examination Geometry EOC |
| 2 | Lack of retention of prior knowledge and skills. | The school will implement an EOC Camp program. The students will receive both individual and group instruction from FLHS staff members. The program is open to all 9th and 10th students as well as 11th and 12th grade students that have not successfully made learning gains in Algebra as measured by the Geometry EOC. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Analysis of skills assessments administered during tutoring sessions. | End of course Examination Geometry EOC |

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#3D: | The number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra I will decrease by $5 \%$. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 59.5 \% (22) | 54\% |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |


|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Familiarity with relevant formulas and content vocabulary. | Teachers will employ EOC activities that focus on using relevant formulas. Content specific vocabulary will be taught using direct instruction. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Monthly mini assessments | . 2013 End of course <br> Examination <br> Algebra I EOC |
| 2 | Lack of retention of prior knowledge and skills. | The school will implement an EOC Camp program. The students will receive both individual and group instruction from FLHS staff members. The program is open to all 9th and 10th students as well as 11th and 12th grade students that have not successfully made learning gains in Algebra as measured by the Algebra I EOC. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Skills assessments administered during EOC Tutoring | Skills assessments administered during EOC Camp |

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

| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#3E: |  |  | The number of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry will decrease in each category by 5\%. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 31.8\% (74) |  |  | 26.8\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Familiarity with relevant formulas and content vocabulary | Teachers will employ EOC activities that focus on using relevant formulas. Content specific vocabulary will be taught using direct instruction. | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Teachers will employ EOC activities that focus on using relevant formulas. Content specific vocabulary will be taught using direct instruction. | 2013 End of course Examination Geometry EOC |
| 2 | Lack of retention of prior knowledge and skills. | The school will implement an EOC Camp program. The students will receive both individual and group instruction from FLHS staff members. The program is open to all 9th and 10th students as well as 11th and 12th grade students that have not successfully made learning gains in Algebra as measured by the Geometry EOC | Mr. Gaines, Mrs. Sterling | Analysis of skills assessments administered during tutoring sessions. | 2013 End of course Examination Geometry EOC |

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

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

|  | Grade Level/Subject | PD <br> Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or schoolwide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PLC Common Core \& End of Course Exams | 9-12 | Dan Katz | Reading, English, Math, Science, Social Studies | Implementation of Strategy <br> Student Work Brought <br> Back for Whole Group Discussion <br> Work Students In Small Group Instruction | Implementation of Strategy <br> Student Work <br> Brought Back for <br> Whole Group Discussion <br> Work Students In Small Group Instruction | Sara LaRosa |
| PLC Using Formative \& Summative Assessments to Drive Instruction | 9-12 | Cyd Sterling | Mathematics Teachers | Early Release, Professional Study Days, \& planning Days | Implementation of Strategy <br> Student Work <br> Brought Back for <br> Whole Group Discussion <br> Work Students In Small Group Instruction | Sara LaRosa |

## Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Saturday School <br> (FCAT/EOC/SAT/ACT Prep | Instructional Staff for Saturday <br> School | Accountability | $\$ 1,868.75$ |
| FLHS STAR Tutoring Program | Instructional Staff for STAR <br> Tutoring Program | Advanced Placement Funds | $\$ 6,000.00$ |
|  |  |  | Subtotal: $\$ 7,868.75$ |
| Technology | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Strategy | No Data | No Data | $\$ 0.00$ |
| No Data |  |  | Funding Source |

End of Mathematics Goals

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. <br> Science Goal \#1: |  |  | The percentage of students scoring a level 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA math will increase by 3 percentage points from $66 \%$ to $69 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 66\% (4) |  |  | 69\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students limited intellectual abilities. | Hands on manipulatives and one- on- one instruction | ESE teacher | Progress monitoring and teacher made assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |
| 2 | Students inability to recognize processes used in science | Differentiated instruction and hands on materials | ESE teacher | Progress monitoring and teacher made assessments | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |

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

| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. <br> Science Goal \#2: |  |  | The percentage of students scoring a level 7 on the FAA math will increase by 3 percentage points from $33 \%$ to $36 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 33\% |  |  | 36\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | The complexity of describing processes of science | Hands on material, one- on- one instruction, and cooperative learning groups | ESE teacher | Classroom walkthroughs, teacher made test, and progress monitoring | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |
| 2 | Student's intellectual ability | One- on- one instruction, differentiated instruction | ESE teacher | Classroom walkthroghs teacher made test, and progress monitoring | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |

## Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

[^0]Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. <br> Biology Goal \#1: |  |  | The goal for these students is to have them not just pass the EOC, but to increase their depth of knowledge and prepare them for advanced placement and AICE science courses. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 30\% (154) |  |  | 35\% |  |  |
| 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 | Science building and technology are antiquated and insufficient | Inquiry based approach, targeted on areas of EOC and depth of knowledge in order to prepare these students for advanced chemistry, advanced biology and advanced physics | Classroom teacher | Pretest/Post test | EOC scores and passing rates |
| 2 | Incorrect placement | Focus on Vocabulary | Department Chair | EOC passing rates | Term Exams |
| 3 | Student resistance because of lack interest | Focus on Critical Thinking | Supervisor of Department | Term Exams | Teacher observations |

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. <br> Biology Goal \#2: |  |  | Biology- Core <br> The goal for this course is to provide a strong foundation in science in order to build a strong base for all learning, as well as to prepare them for the Biology EOC. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 40\% (206) |  |  | 45\% |  |  |
| 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 | Science building and the technology are antiquated and insufficient. | Increase student engagement in short activities and small groups utilizing differentiated instruction methods. | Classroom teacher | Pretest/Post test | EOC scores and passing rates. |
| 2 | Student resistance because of reading skills | Teach to real life | Department chair | EOC passing rates | Term Exams |
| 3 | Student lack of motivation | Student presentations | AP Supervisor of Department | Term Exams | Teacher observations |

## 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 <br> Facilitator and/ or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or schoolwide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PLC Using Formative \& Summative Assessments to Drive Instruction | 9-12 | Casey Portnoy | Science Teachers | Early Release, Professional Study Days \& Planning Days | Implementation of Strategy Student Work Brought Back for Whole Group Discussion Work Students In Small Group Instruction | Sara LaRosa |
| PLC Common Core \& End of Course Exams | 9-12 | Dan Katz | Reading, English, Math, Science, Social Studies | 2nd \& 4th Tuesday of Each Month Afterschool | Implementation of Strategy Student Work Brought Back for Whole Group Discussion Work Students In Small Group Instruction | Sara LaRosa |

## Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  | Available <br> Amount |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source |

## Writing Goals

[^1]| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Leve 3.0 and higher in writing. <br> Writing Goal \#1a: |  |  | The percent of students scoring a 4.0 on the writing assessment will increase |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 86\% (304) |  |  | 89\% (315) |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students need additional help with conventions and spelling. | English teachers will devote time to daily activities to reinforce these skills such as peer review and warm ups. | Classroom Teachers, Ms. Larosa, Dr. Beaulieu | District Writing prompts and school wide prompts. | Student Conferences, Peer Editing |
| 2 | Students need reinforcement in writing process and models of sophisticated, complex text. | Spring Board curriculum addresses the need with Writing Workshops and both formal and informal writing activities. | Classroom Teachers, Ms. Larosa, Dr. Beaulieu | Analyze student writing | Conferences and Teacher Evaluation |
| 3 | Students need the writing process modeled for them to emulate top level 4 -quality writing. | Through the use of Think Aloud in Spring Board Writing Workshops and class evaluation of District Writing Prompts | Classroom Teachers, Ms. Larosa, Dr. Beaulieu | Analyze student writing | Conferences and Teacher Evaluation |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. <br> Writing Goal \#1b: |  |  | The percentage of students scoring a level 4 or higher on the FAA reading will increase by 3 percentage points from $75 \%$ to $78 \%$ for the 2013 administration of the test. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| 75\% (3) |  |  | 78\% |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students lack the ability to write expressive, informative, or in figurative forms. | One- on- one instruction and use of real world material. | ESE teacher | Teacher made assessments, Classroom Walkthrough Tools, and teacher observations | Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) |

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

| PD |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring |
| Spring Board <br> Training | $9-10,12$ | District | English Teachers | Fall Trainings | Evalusition <br> Monitoring <br> student writing |
| Writing <br> Workshop <br> Process | $9-10$ | Literacy <br> Coach | English Teachers | Second Marking <br> Period | Evaluation of <br> student writing |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Saturday School (FCAT/EOC/SAT/ACT Prep | Instructional Staff for Saturday School | Accountability | \$1,868.75 |
| FLHS STAR Tutoring Program | Instructional Staff for STAR Tutoring Program | Advanced Placement Funds | \$6,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$7,868.75 |  |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total: \$7,868.75 |  |  |  |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas <br> in need of improvement for the following group: |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level $\mathbf{3}$ in U.S. <br> History. <br> U.S. History Goal \#1:  <br> 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: <br>   |


| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible <br> for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.
U.S. History Goal \#2:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible <br> for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

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

| PD <br> Content / Topic and/ or PLC Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/ or PLC Leader | PD <br> 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 Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s)

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |


|  |  | Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Professional Development | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Strategy | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| No Data |  |  | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
|  | Description of Resources | Funding Source |  |
| Other | No Data | No Data | Available |
| Strategy |  |  | Amount |
| No Data |  |  | Srand Total: $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0}$ |
|  |  |  |  |

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

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


| 3 | Students' <br> tardiness | Parent Link call, staff <br> telephone call, letter to <br> parent or parent <br> conference with | Classroom <br> Teacher and <br> administrator <br> Hall Sweeps <br> administered between <br> Team <br> classes | Attendance <br> record review | Compared to <br> previous <br> school year: <br> Reduction in <br> number of days <br> tardy <br> and a reduction in <br> number of tardy <br> minutes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Inspiring <br> Leaders | $9-12$ | Sara LaRosa | School-Wide | Monthly | Using Research <br> based Strategies to <br> Create School Reform <br> that will be <br> implemented | Sara LaRosa |

## Attendance Budget:



End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

[^2]| 1. Suspension <br> Suspension Goal \#1: |  |  |  | FLHS will reduce the Out- of- School Suspension by 5\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions |  |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |  |  |
| 585 |  |  |  | 556 |  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School |  |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended InSchool |  |  |
| 311 |  |  |  | 296 |  |  |
| 2012 Number of Out- of- School Suspensions |  |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Out- of-School Suspensions |  |  |
| 103 |  |  |  | 98 |  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- ofSchool |  |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |  |  |
| 86 |  |  |  | 82 |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Pers Re | son or Position esponsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students' interests in other non-educational activities that prevent them from attending school. | Pair up students needing additional assistance with mentor or adviser. <br> All 9th and 10th grade students will be placed in a smaller learning community to enhance personalization of education. | Admi Perso | inistrator/Support onnel | Student focus group and/or survey | Student disciplinary referrals |
| 2 | Special needs students need more individualized attention | Guidance department will develop and implement a small group counseling program to address the various needs of students. | Admin Perso | inistrator/Support onnel | Student focus group and/or survey | Student disciplinary referrals |
| 3 | Newer teachers are still in the process of learning effective classroom management techniques | Provide assistance by means of mentoring, using during professional development. | Admi perso | inistrator/Support onnel | Classroom WalkThrough | Rubric or Time on Task Instrument |

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

| PD <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Inspiring <br> Leaders | $9-12$ | Sara LaRosa | School-Wide | Monthly | Using Research <br> based Strategies to <br> Create School Reform <br> that will be <br> implemented | Sara LaRosa |

## Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

| 1. Dropout Prevention |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Dropout Prevention Goal \#1: | Fort Lauderdale High School will decrease the dropout <br> rate by 3\%. <br> dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year. |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Dropout Rate: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Dropout Rate: |
| $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $15 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Graduation Rate: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Graduation Rate: |
| $82 \%$ | $85 \%$ |


| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students lack understanding of state requirements for graduation. | Guidance department will conduct data chats with students and inform them of graduation requirements. | Guidance <br> Personnel, <br> Administrative <br> Team, Teachers | Student focus group/survey | Analysis of graduation data. |
| 2 | Incoming 9th graders in the "at risk cohort" need more individualized attention to assist with their transition to high school. | All 9th grade students will be monitored to ensure the academic and social transition from middle to high school goes smoothly. | Guidance <br> Personnel, <br> Administrative <br> Team, Teachers | Analysis of student data. <br> Student focus group/survey | Analysis of "at risk" cohort graduation data. |

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent I nvolvement

Parent I nvolvement Goal \#1:
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who
participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.

| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Parent I nvolvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent I nvolvement: |
| :--- | :--- |
| 45\% of the parents of students were involved in a <br> school- <br> related activity | $50 \%$ of the parents of students will be involved in a <br> school-related activity. |


| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |
| 1 | Due to the size of the <br> school parents may feel <br> that communication <br> from school is <br> impersonal. | Improve our website to <br> allow parents to <br> communicate with <br> teachers and <br> administrators and <br> collect survey data of <br> ways to improve parent <br> involvement. | Administrative <br> Team, Classroom <br> Teachers and <br> website manager | Monotor website traffic <br> and collect data of <br> parent access to school <br> website | Parent survey |

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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules <br> (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Pesition <br> Responsible |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| for Monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |


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

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. STEM <br> STEM Goal \#1: |  |  | The goal for the development of STEM has been the focus of learning skills that create a seamless transition for students moving to their next level of education with relevance. We are cognizant of the entwinement of math with science. <br> In light of this position, we have created new classes that promote STEM, such as Applied Physics, Biotechnology, Experimental Science, which is Nutritional and Public Health Sciences, four different chemistry levels and focus, three different Environmental Sciences and four different Biology levels. |  |  |
| 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 | Matching correct math levels with sciences and pairing teachers | Communication: <br> Professional Study Days (PSD) | Department Chairs | Classroom test scores | Pretest/Posttest |
| 2 | Initial teacher resistance | Sharing IFCs information between partnered teachers | AP Supervisor of departments | Student's science projects | Quality of projects |
| 3 | Physical distance of classrooms and no common planning | Observe partnered classroom | Principal | Student engagement | Percentage of successful completion |

## (PLC) or PD Activity

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

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { PD } \\ \text { Content / Topic } \\ \text { and/ or PLC } \\ \text { Focus }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Grade } \\ \text { Level/ Subject }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { PD } \\ \text { Facilitator } \\ \text { and/ or PLC } \\ \text { Leader }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { PD Participants } \\ \text { (e.g., PLC, } \\ \text { subject, grade } \\ \text { level, or school- } \\ \text { wide) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Target Dates } \\ \text { (e.g., early } \\ \text { release) and } \\ \text { Schedules (e.g., } \\ \text { frequency of } \\ \text { meetings) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Strategy for } \\ \text { Follow- } \\ \text { up/ Monitoring }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Person or } \\ \text { Position }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Responsible for |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |$\}$

## STEM Budget:



## Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. CTE

CTE Goal \#1:

By May 2013 60\% of students/clients will have demonstrated an increase in learning gains in Reading as evidenced by FCAT or SAT/ACT scores.

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Absenteeism <br> ESE/ESOL status <br> Class size <br> Multiple Grouping | Phone Calls <br> Small Group Learning <br> Tutorials <br> Enjoyable Reading and <br> Digital Print <br> Use of CARPD skills | Teacher, Reading <br> Coach, Student, <br> Parent/s, Peer <br> Coaches | Prior Efforts | FCAT/SAT/ACT <br> Scores, classroom <br> scores |

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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CTE PLC | Callie Melton | CTE, Performing <br> Arts Teachers | Early, Release, <br> Professional Study <br> Days, and Planning <br> Day | Reflect on Student <br> work and make <br> modifications | Sara LaRosa |  |

CTE Budget:

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

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

## Budget:

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

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Goal | Strategy |  |  |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
j \cap \text { Priority } & j \cap \text { Focus } & j \cap \text { Prevent } & j \cap \text { NA }
\end{array}
$$

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

## School Advisory Council

## School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
| :---: | :---: |
| Saturday School(FCAT/EOC/SAT/ACT Prep and detention | $\$ 7,475.00$ |

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

The SAC will work during the 2012-2013 school year to increase parent and community involvement as well as be a forum to relay the vision of the school to the community.

## AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-201
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010
SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
FORT LAUDERDALE HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade <br> Points <br> Earned |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 55\% | 84\% | 86\% | 37\% | 262 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the \% scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the \% scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| \% of Students Making Learning Gains | 56\% | 74\% |  |  | 130 | 3 ways to make gains: <br> - Improve FCAT Levels <br> - Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br> - Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25\% in the School? | 53\% (YES) | 61\% (YES) |  |  | 114 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest $25 \%$ of students in reading and math. Yes, if $50 \%$ or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned |  |  |  |  | 516 |  |
| Percent Tested $=99 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | B | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and \% of students tested |

## Broward School District

FORT LAUDERDALE HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade <br> Points <br> Earned |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 52\% | 80\% | 94\% | 37\% | 263 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the \% scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the \% scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| \% of Students Making Learning Gains | 51\% | 75\% |  |  | 126 | 3 ways to make gains: <br> - Improve FCAT Levels <br> - Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br> - Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25\% in the School? | 43\% (NO) | 57\% (YES) |  |  | 100 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest $25 \%$ of students in reading and math. Yes, if $50 \%$ or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned |  |  |  |  | 499 |  |
| Percent Tested $=98 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | B | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and \% of students tested |


[^0]:    * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)).

[^1]:    * 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:

[^2]:    * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)).

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

