FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: NEW BEGINNINGS EDUCATION COMPLEX

District Name: Osceola

Principal: Nina A. Wehmeyer

SAC Chair: Peggy Delgado

Superintendent: Melba Luciano

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/10/2012



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner Florida Department of Education 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor K-12 Public Schools Florida Department of Education 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Nina A. Wehmeyer	Elementary Education; Exceptional Student Education; Educational Leadership	9	9	2011-2012 Grade = No Grade; AYP = No 2010-2011 Grade = No Grade; AYP = No 2009-2010 Grade = No Grade; AYP = No 2008-2009 Grade = No Grade: AYP = No 2007-2008 Grade = No Grade; AYP = No 2006-2007 Grade = P; AYP = No 2005-2006 Grade = P; AYP = No 2004-2005 Grade = F; AYP = No
Assis Principal	Norma Evans- O'Connor	Educational Leadership; History; Psychology; Exceptional Student Education	3	9	2011-2012 Grade = No Grade; AYP = No 2010-2011 Grade = No Grade; AYP = No 2009-2010 Grade = B; AYP = No 2008-2009 Grade = D; AYP = No 2007-2006 Grade = C; AYP = No 2006-2007 Grade = C; AYP = No 2005-2006 Grade = C; AYP = No

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest

25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy Coach	Reagan Hall	MS/EDS Reading K-12; Educational Leadership K-12; ESE K-12; English 6-12; ESOL K-12	9	5.5	2011-2012 Grade= No Grade; AYP=No 2010-2011 Grade= No Grade; AYP = No 2009-2010 Grade = No Grade; AYP = No 2008-2009 Grade = No Grade; AYP = No 2007-2008 Grade = No Grade; AYP = No 2006-2007 Grade = P; AYP = No 2005-2006 Grade = P; AYP = No 2004-2005 Grade = F; AYP = No

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Mentorship Program	Leadership Team Reagan Hall	6/2013	
2	Partnering new teachers with appropriate veteran staff	Leadership Team	6/2013	
3	Department meetings that are data driven, best practices, collaboration, Marzano frameworks	Leadership Team Department Leaders	6/2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out- of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Instru	Number of octional caff	% of First-Year Teachers		% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
27		11.1%(3)	40.7%(11)	25.9%(7)	25.9%(7)	51.9%(14)	100.0%(27)	29.6%(8)	3.7%(1)	25.9%(7)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee	Rationale	Planned Mentoring
	Assigned	for Pairing	Activities
		Reading	

Reagan Hall	Kourtney Beall Trinia Gay	coach with Reading Teacher	model in the classroom; provide assistance and support when needed
Heidi Lizardi Richard Marshall	Willie Anderson Camden Dumas	Elective Dept. Head with P.E. Teacher and Music Teacher	model in the classroom; provide assistance and support when needed model in the classroom;
	David Ingley	Math Chair with Math Teacher	provide assistance and support when needed

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Note: For This I schools only
Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include oth Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutritic programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.
Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
The Osceola County School District provides resources (clothing, school supplies, bus passes, social services, etc.) for students identified as homeless to eliminate barriers to a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
SAI funds are used to support our After School Tutoring Program.
Violence Prevention Programs
New Beginnings incorporates the Stop Bullying Now Program.
Nutrition Programs
Free breakfast is provided to all New Beginnings students free of charge through a federally funded program. The school wellness coordinator will form a wellness team to meet and discuss educating our students and parents on the importance of balanced nutrition every day.
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education

Job Training	
The OJT Program is available for both regular education students and ESE students here at New Begin	nings.
Other	

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

-School-based MTSS/RtI Team-

Career and Technical Education

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Administrators - Nina Wehmeyer, Norma Evans-O'Connor

Rtl Coach - Keith Anakotta Reading Coach - Reagan Hall

School Psychologist - Carolyn Chalifoux

Teachers - Richard Marshall, Cheryl Anderson, Tiffany Procter

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?

Once the student has been identified as in need of RI:

- 1. The Informal Notice of Screening/Notification of Intervention Assistance Team Involvement is sent to parents and a copy to Student Services.
- 2. Vision and hearing screenings are conducted after notice is given to parent.
- 3. Teachers complete a page one of the Intervention Summary sheet.
- 4. All above is sent to parents, including the parent letter requesting the concurrent evaluation.
- 5. Consent for evaluation is provided.
- 6. The psychologist will have 60 days to complete the evaluation and report.

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 provides input regarding interventions, strategies and support needed for students.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

The district has a checklist for documentation of General Education Intervention Procedures as well as a form for this plan. The team meets regularly to discuss the progress of each student and makes recommendations to appropriate teachers and staff.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The RtI Coach, the Psychologist and/or Administration will do a presentation to discuss the RtI process so that teachers are aware of their part in the plan as well as participation in meetings to develop an effective and useful plan for the student. District will support additional training as needed for specific requirements of the plan.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	
School-Based Literacy Leadership Team	
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).	
The current Literacy Leadership Team consists of Reagan Hall, Kat Gordon, Nina Wehmeyer and Norma Evans-O'C	Connor.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).	
The Literacy Team will meet once a month highlighting one literacy activity a month.	
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?	
All teachers may not be reading teachers but all teachers are teachers of reading; therefore, all content area teachers per using reading strategies in their classrooms.	achers should
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 scho applicable.	ool programs a
*Grades 6-12 Only	
Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.	
For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of	every teacher
The Reading Plan has been presented and reviewed by the reading coach. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted Administration as well as the Reading/Literacy Coach and the Learning Resource Specialist to ensure that reading are not only presented but used in the classrooms.	•
*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 s relevance to their future?	subjects and
How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course select students' course of study is personally meaningful?	ctions, so tha
Postsecondary Transition	
Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.	

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level 1 in NBEC will increase I achieving mastery in achieving mastery in the state of the	in reading.				
· ·		ce.			
	eetina hiah standar	, , , ,			
7% of our students are scoring at or above grade level in reading. 15% of students me 2012 FCAT.	,	15% of students meeting high standards in reading on the 2012 FCAT.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Ad	chievement				
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
instruction differentiated instruction Norma Evans- obs	alkthroughs: I servations and assi lesson planning and velopment				
Reading/Language Arts trained on how to Norma Evans- Magic 14 into class incorporate the Magic 14 into class instruction.	alkthroughs Formal a formal; assist in less anning and velopment; PLC's llaboration	and Scale scores on walkthroughs, lesson plan designs, PLC notes			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Qu of improvement for the following group:	uestions", identify a	nd define areas in need			
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.					
Reading Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Le	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Ad	achievement				
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Determ	veness of	valuation Tool			
No Data Submitted					

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students Level 4 in reading.	scoring at or above Achieve	ement				
Reading Goal #2a:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ince:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	on Determine Evaluatio		
	No	o Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data, an ollowing group:	d refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
2b. Florida Alternate As Students scoring at or a reading.	ssessment: above Achievement Level 7	in				
Reading Goal #2b:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ince:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	_	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data, an Illowing group:	d refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:			NBEC will increase by 10% the percentage of students achieving mastery in reading.			
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performs	ance:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Data Unavailable			NBEC will go back to the 2009 scores or better in the number of students making learning gains in reading.			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		

of improvement for the following group:

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
11	motivation to read	PLCs will be used to generate ideas to increase student motivation.		<u> </u>	Oral Reading Fluency, AR usage

Based on the analysis of softimprovement for the fo		t data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in need		
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solvi	ng Process to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	No Data Submitted						

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Data not available Reading Goal #4: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Data unavailable Continue to nurture the lowest quartile to succeed Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Lack of motivation and Provide incentives for Monitor testing and track Leadership Team Benchmark attendance at school students to do well and assessments/progress assessments; attend school attendance

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap

Reading Goal #

Continue to work at raising each subgroup by 7%.

4

	ne data)-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	4	2014-201	2014-2015 2015-201		2016-2017
		No data availabl							
	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. St Hispa	5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. No group made AYP in reading								
Reading Goal #5B:									
2012	Current	Level of Perfo	ermance:			2013 Expected	d Leve	el of Performance:	
No da	ta availa	ble				Raise each of th	ne sub	groups by 7%.	
			Problem-Sol	ving Process t	toIr	ncrease Studer	nt Ach	nievement	
	Antic	ipated Barrier	Sti	rategy		Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of compreh	motivation and ension		he 14 anguage Arts in all subjects	Nori	Monitor lesson plans and attendance, professional development geared at reading, I Observations Observations			
of imp	rovemer	it for the follow	ng subgroup:		efere	ence to "Guiding	Ques	stions", identify and o	define areas in need
satisf	_	anguage Learr progress in rea #5C:		t making		No subgroup ma	ade A\	/P	
2012	Current	Level of Perfo	rmance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
no dat	ta					Raise all ELL students by 5 %			
			Problem-Sol	ving Process t	toIr	ncrease Studer	nt Ach	nievement	
	Antic	ipated Barrier	Sti	rategy	I	Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1 schoolwide Language No			Nori	ina Wehmeyer; Monitoring the strategies schoolwide by walkthroughs, lesson plans and assessments.				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:									
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.									
Readi	ng Goal				No subgroup made AYP				

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

by 50%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

1								
- 1	During 2011 91% of the students were below grade level in reading.@012 No data was available				Lower the number of ESE students that are reading and testing below grade level			
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process t	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement			
		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
		ESE students have low comprehension and poor attendance	Provide incentives and encouragement to try to get the students to work at their highest potential. Provide incentives for attendance		Monitor teacher lesson plans and testing. Monitor attendance	Benchmark assessments		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:							
			, and the second	Decrease the number of students reading below grade level by 5%			
2012	Current Level of Perforn	mance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:			
84% were below grade level in reading. In 2012 no data was available			To lower the nu	To lower the number of students reading below grade 50%.			
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	nt Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	Attendance	Provide incentives to get students to come to school	Leadership Team	Monitoring attendance in TERMS; track attendance during testing			

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus		PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Guided Reading PLC's specific	all	Reading Coach	School wide	on-going	CWT's	Leadership Team
to grade level needs based on student data.	all	Leadership Team		on-going	Monthly PLC meetings	Leadership Team and meeting records

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* Whe	n using percentages, includ	de the number of students t	the percentage repre	sents next to the percentag	ge (e.g., 70% (35)).					
Stude	Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.									
1. Stu	udents scoring proficie	nt in listening/speakin	g.							
CELL	A Goal #1:									
2012	Current Percent of Stu	udents Proficient in liste	ening/speaking:							
	Pro	blem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement						
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
1	Not every student will have one on one assistance	Set a schedule for the ESOI Para to work with the ELL students we have on campus.	ESOL Para and Leadership Team	Improvement on speaking English and the understanding of English	Cella Test Teacher assessments					

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner si	milar to non-ELL students.
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	
CELLA Goal #2:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:						
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
No Data Submitted						

Students write in Englis	Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.						
3. Students scoring p	roficient in writing.						
CELLA Goal #3:							
2012 Current Percent	of Students Profic	ient in writing:					
	Problem-Solvino	g Process to In	crease S	itudent Achievemer	nt		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monito	on onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
No Data Submitted							

CELLA Budget:

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

* Whe	en using percentages,	include	the number of students the	e perc	entage repres	sents	s (e.g., 70% (35)).		
	d on the analysis of provement for the fo		nt achievement data, and g group:	refer	rence to "Gu	iding	g Questions", identify a	and d	define areas in need
math	CAT2.0: Students nematics. nematics Goal #1a		ng at Achievement Leve	l 3 in	1				
2012	2 Current Level of F	Perfor	mance:		2013 Expe	ected	d Level of Performar	nce:	
		Р	roblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease Stu	uder	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Ba	rrier	Strategy	R	Person or Position Pesponsible Monitoring	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1	Understanding of r math series	new	Provide training and assistance for the new series.	Со	adership Tea unty Math ecialist	am:	CWTS		Use of resources; Formative Benchmark Assessments; FCAT results
Stud Math	nematics Goal #1b	vels 4	, 5, and 6 in mathemati	CS.					
2012	2 Current Level of F	Pertor	mance:		2013 Ехре	ected	d Level of Performar	nce:	
		Р	roblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease Stu	uder	nt Achievement		
Anti	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Res for		Posit Resp for	esponsible Det		cess Used to ermine ectiveness of ategy	Eval	uation Tool	
			No	Data	Submitted				
	d on the analysis of provement for the fo		nt achievement data, and g group:	refer	rence to "Gu	iding	g Questions", identify a	and o	define areas in need
	CAT 2.0: Students If 4 in mathematics		ng at or above Achiever	ment					
Math	nematics Goal #2a								
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expe	ected	d Level of Performar	ice:			

	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to Increase St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data Submitted		

Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fol	student achievement data, and llowing group:	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Performan	nce:
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data S	Submitted		

l	d on the analysis of studen provement for the following		eference to "Guiding	g Questions", identify and o	define areas in need		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:			NBEC will increa	ase by 5% the percentage ery in mathematics.	of students		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:			
No data available			25% of our stud	25% of our students will be at or above grade level.			
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	Low motivation	Increase attendance at school and to use technology to increase student participation.	Leadership Team	Student performance and student feedback	Benchmark assessments		

Based on the of improvement			ent data, and ref	erence to "(Guiding Que	stions", identify	and (define areas in need
3b. Florida A Percentage o mathematics	fstudents	ssessment: making Learnin	g Gains in					
Mathematics	Goal #3b:							
2012 Current	t Level of P	Performance:		2013 Ex	pected Lev	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process to	Increase	Student Acl	nievement		
Anticipated E	Barrier	Strategy	Pos Res for	son or ition ponsible nitoring	Process Determine Effective Strategy	ne eness of	Eval	luation Tool
			No Data	a Submitted			•	
Based on the a			ent data, and ref	erence to "(Guiding Que	stions", identify	and o	define areas in need
making learn	ning gains i	e of students in l in mathematics.	owest 25%					
Mathematics	Goal #4:							
2012 Current	t Level of P	erformance:		2013 Ex	pected Lev	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process to	Increase	Student Acl	nievement		
Anticipated E	Barrier	Strategy	Pos Res for	son or ition ponsible nitoring	Process Determin Effective Strategy	ne eness of	Eval	luation Tool
			No Data	a Submitted				
Based on Amb	oitious but A	Achievable Annual	Measurable Obje	ctives (AMC)s), AMO-2,	Reading and Ma	ath Pe	erformance Target
	ojectives (A	able Annual MOs). In six year chievement gap	Elementary Scho	ool Mathem	atics Goal #			_
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	12 2012-2013	2013-2014	20	14-2015	2015-2016	ó	2016-2017
			1			1		

of improvement for the fo	llowing subgroup:					
5B. Student subgroups Hispanic, Asian, Americ satisfactory progress in	_					
Mathematics Goal #5B:						
2012 Current Level of P	Performance:		2013 Expe	ected Level of Performa	ince:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data :	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data, and Illowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
5C. English Language L satisfactory progress ir	earners (ELL) not making n mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #5C:						
2012 Current Level of P	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data :	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data, an illowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
5D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress in	oilities (SWD) not making n mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #5D:						
2012 Current Level of P	Performance:		2013 Expe	ected Level of Performa	ance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		

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

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of improvement for the			efer	ence to "Guiding	Questions", identify and o	lefine areas in need		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:			NBEC will increase by 5% the percentage of students achieving mastery in mathematics.					
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
No data available				20% of our students will be at or above grade level in mathematics.				
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease Studer	t Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier Strategy R			R	Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Process Used to Determine Evaluation		Evaluation Tool		
Lack of motivation Utilization of manipulatives and technology to increase student participation.			adership Team	student performance and feedback	Benchmark assessments			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25%

making learning gains in mathematics.

The lowest quartile will increase by 15% the percentage of

Mathematics Goal #4:					students achieving mastery in mathematics.				
2012 Current Le	evel of Per	rformance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
No data available					15% of oui mathemati		will achieve lear	rning (gains in
		Problem-Solv	ving Proces	stolr	ncrease St	udent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp for				Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		uation Tool			
	·		No	Data S	Submitted				
Based on Ambitio			Middle Scho	ol Math	nematics G	oal #	Reading and Ma		
Measurable Object school will reduce by 50%.		ievement gap	subgro				gap 27 g		<u> </u>
Baseline data 2010-2011 2	011-2012	2012-2013	2013-20	014	2014	1-2015	15 2015-2016		2016-2017
Based on the ana of improvement for			ent data, and	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and d	efine areas in need
5B. Student sub Hispanic, Asian, satisfactory pro Mathematics Go	Americar	n Indian) not m							
2012 Current Le	evel of Per	rformance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
		Problem-Solv	ving Proces	s to Ir	ncrease St	udent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi for					ion Onsible Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool		uation Tool		
			No	Data S	Submitted				
Based on the ana	llysis of stu	udent achieveme	ent data, and	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and d	efine areas in need
of improvement for 5C. English Lang	or the follo	wing subgroup:							

satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
for		IProcess Head to		Evaluation Tool		
	No	Data :	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, an Ilowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
5D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress in	ilities (SWD) not making					
Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data :	Submitted			
of improvement for the fo	vantaged students not mak		ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No		Submitted			

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages	, include the number of stud	ents the p	percentage	represents next to the pe	rcentage (e.g., 70% (35)).
	f student achievement dat for the following group:	ta, and r	eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
1. Florida Alternate A	ssessment: Students sco	oring at			
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in r	nathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #1					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solving Proc	ess to L	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position		on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1	No Data S	Submitted		
in need of improvement	of student achievement data for the following group: ssessment: Students sco		eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
or above Level 7 in m		9			
Mathematics Goal #2	:				
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solving Proc	ess to L	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		
in need of improvement	of student achievement date for the following group:		eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
making learning gains		tauents			
Mathematics Goal #3	:				

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to I			ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Person Posit Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for Moni				Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data :	Submitted		

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. NBEC will increase 5% of the students on grade level or above on End of Course Exams. Algebra Goal #1: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: NBEC will increase 5% of the students on grade level or 70% students were below grade level. above on End of Course Exams. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Lack of motivation The students will focus EOC Exam Leadership Team student performance on th 27 strategies that are defined in Algebra 1

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

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

Based on Amb	itious but Ac	chievable Annual	Measurable (Objecti	ives (AMOs)), AMO-2, I	Reading and Ma	ath Pe	rformance Target
	ojectives (AM	ble Annual MOs). In six year nievement gap	Algebra Goa	l #					A
			3A :		<u> </u>			T	▽
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2 2012-2013	2013-2	014	2014	l-2015	2015-2016	5	2016-2017
		tudent achieveme lowing subgroup:	ent data, and	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and d	lefine areas in need
	an, America progress in	by ethnicity (Whan Indian) not m Algebra.							
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:			2013 Expe	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	s to L	ncrease St	udent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated I	3arrier	Strategy		for		Process U Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eval	uation Tool
	-		No		Submitted	-			
		tudent achievemo	ent data, and	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and d	lefine areas in need
3C. English L. satisfactory Algebra Goal	progress in	arners (ELL) no Algebra.	t making		Decrease of level by 5%		ent of students	scorii	ng below grade
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:			2013 Expe	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
No data availa	ble				70-&5% of	f the stude	nts will score be	elow g	grade level.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Person or Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.131		ESOL compliance		TERMS; Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reform of improvement for the following subgroup:			ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.					
Algebra Goal #3D:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ance:
	Problem-Solving P	Process to L	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		

	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and report of improvement for the following subgroup:			uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:		Increase the number of students passing the EOC Exams by 20%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	nce:
No data available			Decrease the number of students not passing the EOC Exams by 20%.		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position			on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data			Submitted		

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

in need of improver	ment	for the foll	owing group:					
1. Students scorir Geometry.	ng at	Achieven	nent Level 3 in					
Geometry Goal #7	1:							
2012 Current Lev	el of	Performaı	nce:		2013 Exp	ected	Level of Perform	nance:
		Problem	-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent	Achievement	
Anticipated Barri	er	Strategy		Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Deter	iveness of	Evaluation Tool
			No	Data	Submitted			
Based on the analy in need of improver				and r	eference to	"Guid	ng Questions", id	lentify and define are
2. Students scorii 4 and 5 in Geome		or above	Achievement Le	evels				
Geometry Goal #2	2:							
2012 Current Lev	el of	Performai	nce:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
		Problem	-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent	Achievement	
Anticipated Barri	er	Strategy		Posi Resp for	Determine Effectiveness of		mine iveness of	Evaluation Tool
			No		itoring Submitted			
Based on Ambitious Target	s but	Achievable	Annual Measural	ole Ob	jectives (A	MOs), <i>i</i>	AMO-2, Reading a	and Math Performanc
3A. Ambitious but A	Achiev	vable	Geometry Goal #					-
Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six year reduce their achiev 50%.	r scho	ol will	3A :					<u>l</u>
Baseline data 2011-2012	201	12-2013	2013-2014		2014-20	15	2015-2016	2016-2017
Based on the analy	rsis of	student a	chievement data	and r	eference to	o "Guid	ina Questions" io	dentify and define are

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:

	Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			All subgroups will improve testing scores by 20%			
Geometry Goal #3B:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
No data available				Each subgroup will increase their level of performance on the end of cousre exam by 20%.			
	Pro	blem-Solving Process	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	Lack of motivation and poor attendance	Use technology and incentives to increase student attendance and participation.	Leadership Team; Math department	student performance	EOC Exam and Benchmark assessments		
Raser	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas						

	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas n need of improvement for the following subgroup:				
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.					
Geometry Goal #3C:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position		on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas n need of improvement for the following subgroup:				
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:						
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:				Increase the number of students scoring below grade level on EOC exams by 5%		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
No data available			25% will score	25% will score above grade level on EOC Exam.		
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	Too many math-phobic students	To encourage students to succeed and that they "can do" math	· ·	Participating in math assignments and math assessments	benchmark assessments and textbook assessments.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:				NBEC will increase the number of students scoring a level 4, 5, 6 in science by 5%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			4	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performan	ce:
No data available			ı	Increase in levels 4,5,6, in science by 5%.		
	Prob	lem-Solving Process t	o I n	icrease Stude	ent Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res	Person or Position sponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of familiarily with the science common core curriculum	Apply the common core standards with the new textbook	and	dership Team District ence Coach	Pacing guides per county and county workshops	Benchmark assessments
2	Linking the science curriculum with common core standards.	With the use of the new pacing guides and workshops		dership Team	Student performance	Benchmark assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:				
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.				
Science Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

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

	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 Students scoring at c in science. Science Goal #2b:	Assessment: or above Achievement I	Level 7			
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perf	ormance:
	Problem-Solving Proc	cess to L	ncrease S	Student Achievemer	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No Data Submitted				

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:						
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:			NBEC will incre	NBEC will increase the number of students scoring a level 4, 5, 6 in science by 5%.			
2012	Current Level of Perfo	ormance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performance:			
No data available			Increase in lev	Increase in levels 4,5,6, in science by 5%.			
	Prob	lem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	ent Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	Linking the science curriculum with common core standards.	With the use of the new pacing guides and workshops	Leadership Team	Student performance	Benchmark assessments.		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define reas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2. Florida Alternate A at or above Level 7 in	ssessment: Students sco science.	ring			
Science Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitte					

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.

Students will increase by 20% on the EOC Exam Biology Goal #1:

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expect	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
No data available			Students will	Students will increase by 20% on the EOC Exam		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible fo Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	Poor attendance and lack of motivation	Using technology and incentives to increse student attendance and participation.	Leadership Team ; Science Department	TERMS, Student Performance	EOC assessments	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2. Students scoring a Levels 4 and 5 in Biol	t or above Achievement ogy.				
Biology Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Positi Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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

 ${\it Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.}$

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

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Increase 10% the number of students scoring level 3 or higher Writing Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 10th grade increased by 20% and the 8th grade 79% for the 8th grade and 89% for the 10th grade; bring decreased by 10% in the number of students scoring 3 or the 8th grade closer to the 10th grade score higher Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy New teachers untrained Get the teachers Leadership Team Practice, practice, Portfolios in PDA trained practice

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	Students will increase by 20% on the writing FCAT			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			

No da	ata available Prol	olem-Solving Process t	Students will increase by 20% on the writing FCAT Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	Lack of proper usage of grammar	Pretest for middle and high school students, as well as a middle and post test. Each grade level will write an essay each Wednesday with teachers supplying feedback as well as peer grading.		All students work on weekly writing assessments.	FCAT Writing Assessment	

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Г					1	
Based on the analysis o in need of improvement			eference to	o "Guiding Questions", io	dentify and define areas	
1. Students scoring at	t Achievement Leve	el 3 in Civics.				
Civics Goal #1:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving	ncrease S	Student Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis o in need of improvement			eference to	o "Guiding Questions", ic	dentify and define areas	
2. Students scoring at 4 and 5 in Civics.	t or above Achiever	nent Levels				
Civics Goal #2:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No Data Submitted					

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

	d on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the			iding Questions , identil	y and define areas	
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:				Students will increase performance by 5%		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
No data available			Students will ad	Students will achieve learning gains by 5%.		
	Prok	olem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1						

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2. Students scoring at 4 and 5 in U.S. History	or above Achievement Le	evels			
U.S. History Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to Ir	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi for		for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference of improvement:	to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	NBEC would like to meet the District's goal of 95%
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Accountable Absences:	
Grade 2 - 0	
Grade 3 = 0	
Grade 4 = 0	
Grade 5 = 3	
Grade 6 = 7	
Grade 7 = 46	Decrease the number of absences by 15
Grade 8 = 99	
Grade 9 = 164 43	
Grade 10 = 43	
Grade 11 = 58	
Grade 12 = 33	
Total number of absences from 8/29/2011 to 6/7/2012 is 453.	
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
Unable to locate data	Decrease the number of excessive absences by 10%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

	e were 772 tardy - excus e were 9 unexcused tardi		Decrease the n	number of unexcused tard	dies by 10%.
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The number of parents that do not place a high priority on school attendance as it relates to student achievement.	Send home a letter to all parents, specifically addressing the importance of school attendance. Address the need to schedule doctor appointments, vacations, pre-arranged absences, etc. so they do not conflict with school contact hours.	and District Social Worker	Review absences routinely, focusing on the reduction of absences unrelated to sick or medical.	Daily, weekly and monthly attendance reports
2	The number of students that do not make it a priority to convey to his/her parents that they have a desire to be in school for the purpose of reaching their highest potential.	Create an attendance incentive program		Review of absences routinely, focusing on the reduction of all absences	Daily, weekly and monthly attendance reports

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: 1. Suspension Reduce the number of suspensions by 10% Suspension Goal #1: 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions There were a total of 603 ISS: K=1 Grade 1=5 Grade 2= 5 Grade 3=12 Grade 4=6 Grade 5 = 16 Grade 6 = 42 Reduction of ISS by 10% Grade 7 = 65 Grade 8 = 99 Grade 9 = 81 Grade 10 = 99 Grade 11 = 65Grade 12 = 43 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School School See note No data available 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions Suspensions There were 1260 days of OSS: Grade 2 = 1Grade 3 = 1Grade 4 = 2Grade 5 = 15 Grade 6 = 106 Reduction of days of OSS by 10% Grade 7 = 281 Grade 8 = 134

Grade	9 = 383					
Grade	e 10 = 213					
Grade	e 11 = 103					
Grade	2 12 = 21					
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of- School			- 2013 Expecte of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School		
212			Decrease this r	number by 10%.		
	Pro	blem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	Acclamation of new students to NBEC	All new students will receive orientation information explaining NBEC expectations and policies. Each student will be given a mentor that will work with them towards acclamating to NBEC.		*Reviewing classroom, cafeteria and hallway behavior *Reviewing office referral data * Tracking form from Mentor	ODMS	

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement:	ased on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas a need of improvement:				
1. Dropout Prevention					
Dropout Prevention Goal #1:					
*Please refer to the percentage of students who					
dropped out during the .	2011-2012 School year.				
2012 Current Dropout	Rate:		2013 Exp	pected Dropout Rate:	
2012 Current Graduati	on Data.		2012 Eve	acetad Craduation Do	210
2012 Current Graduati	on Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No Data Submitted				

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 Grade and/or PLC Level/Subje Focus	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
---	--	--	--	--	--

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

	Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:						
1. Pa	rent Involvement						
Pare	nt I nvolvement Goal #	1:	To increase the	To increase the percent of parent participation by 3%			
*Plea	se refer to the percenta	ge of parents who	from the 2011-		cipation by 576		
'	cipated in school activitie	es, duplicated or					
undu	plicated.						
2012	! Current Level of Parer	nt Involvement:	2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
There is minimal participation (2%) of the parents at NBEC			Parent particip	Parent participation will increase to 5%			
	Pro	blem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	Family conflicts with competing activities outside of the school	*Increase communication through newsletters. *Post upcoming events on the school website *Hold 3 Open House	Leadership Team SAC Chairperson	Participation in conferences and school related activities	Sign-in logs		

sessions in the		
evenings for parents,		
students and the		
community		
* Celebration for FCAT		

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define a	areas in need of improvement:
1. STEM	
STEM Goal #1:	

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
		Ν	lo Data Submitte	d		

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

1. CTE					
CTE Goal #1:					
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to Increase S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance



Are you a reward school: † Yes † No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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



No. Disagree with the above statement.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Inviting Parents at Open House and various activities being held

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Funds will be used to sponsor student achievement activities	\$3,176.31

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

Sponsor student achievement activities:
FCAT BBQ
Semester Honor Roll
Senior Graduation

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found No Data Found No Data Found