FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: VENICE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Jack Turgeon

SAC Chair: Lisa Callaghan

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/22/2012



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 | Jack Turgeon | BS Exceptional Student Education, MS Exceptional Student Education, EDS Educational Leadership | 3 | 15 | NA |
| Assis Principal | Tricia Allen | BS Secondary Ed Social Studies MS Education Leadership | 3 | 9 | NA |
| Assis Principal | Michael Jennings | Master's Education Leadership, University of South Florida; B.S. Criminal Justice, West Chester University of PA; University of Hawaii | 8 | 8 | 2009-2010 School Grade- A |

| Accic Drincinal | B.A. Sociology from University of Conn. M.ED. Counseling Psychology from Auburn Univ. M.PA. Public Administration from Auburn Univ. EDD Educational Leadership from Argosy Univ. | 10 | 1 | NA | |
|-----------------|--|----|---|----|--|
|-----------------|--|----|---|----|--|

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.

| Su | ubject 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) |
|----|-------------|------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| NA | Ą | NA | NA | | | NA |

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 | Collaborative Planning Groups in Professional Learning Communities by subject area | Administration | ongoing | |
| 2 | SCIP Mentoring Program | Scott Blubaum | ongoing | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out- of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|--|
| 2 | Reading teacher paired with a highly effective Reading coach. Economics teacher is grouped in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) with highly effective Economics teachers. |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| | Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | | | % Reading Endorsed | Certified | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|
|--|--|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|

| 97 | 8.2%(8) | 22.7%(22) | 40.2%(39) | 28.9%(28) | 86.6%(84) | 0.0%(0) | 13.4%(13) | 5.2%(5) | 8.2%(8) |
|----|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Scott Blubaum | Keith Little | Continuing First year SCIP mentor Program (late hire). | District mentor program with regular meeting dates between mentee and mentor as well as meetings with administration. |
| Larry Burke | Tim Corlett Eric Heminger | First year teachers paired with reading certified mentor. | District mentor program with regular meeting dates between mentee and mentor as well as meetings with administration. |
| Shareefa Amari | Jeanette Moore | First year Art teacher paired with art certified mentor | District mentor program with regular meeting dates between mentee and mentor as well as meetings with administration. |
| Steve Johns | Frank Troxel | First year JROTC instructor paired with chorus teacher. Mentor and Mentee both instruct large classes. | District mentor program with regular meeting dates between mentee and mentor as well as meetings with administration. |
| LaRay Biziewski | Kelsey Sulinski Faith Nellis | First year English teachers paired with English teacher mentor. | District mentor program with regular meeting dates between mentee and mentor as well as meetings with administration. |

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/Rtl Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based RtI Leadership team is comprised of the school guidance counselors, school social worker, school psychologist, School nurse, school attendance worker, school principal, ESE Liaison, ESOL Coordinator and Performance-Based Diploma Coordinator.

Guidance Chair: Provides leadership and allocates resources for the group.

The Guidance Counselors: Provide information about individual students and they are responsible to stay in contact with student families and to set up parent meetings.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers and Liaisons: Provide information about ESE students and to help to guide the team when ESE interventions and testing are necessary.

School Nurse: Provides appropriate health information and concerns regarding medical or potential medical issues.

Classroom Teachers: Classroom teachers will provide information to guide instruction and academic interventions for struggling students.

School Psychologist: Provides information about mental heath and testing resources available.

School Attendance Worker: Provides information about students who are truant and serves as a liaison between the school and families involved with court issues for non-attendance of school.

School Social Worker: Provides information about resources and support for students and families, acts as a liaison between families and the school, and is available to make home visits as needed.

ESOL Coordinator: Provides information about students whose second language is English, acts as a liaison with ESOL parents, and translates or makes arrangements for translators for parent-teacher conferences as needed.

Performance-Based Diploma Coordinator: Provides information about high-risk students and resources available through PBD.

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

The support team meets once a week to engage in the following activities:

Administrators and Guidance Counselors meet weekly to progress monitor students in their alpha assignment. Special attention is given to students in the bottom quartile and with students who meet at-risk criteria. Attendance, discipline, progress toward graduation, and other data are considered and students are placed on the support team (SWST) agenda. The support team reviews the data and recommends a course of action. Examples would include referral to social agencies, guidance or administrative conference, work with a behavior specialist, IEP reevaluation, parent conferences, and behavioral and/or academic interventions to be completed in the classroom. Data is collected and measured over time. If the student concern does not dissipate, support team may recommend student for a CARE

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?

Input will be gathered from the RTI leadership team.

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 school uses a variety of reports produced by the district Office of Research, Assessment and Evaluation on the academic achievement of students at all Tiers. Disaggregated AYP subgroup data by reading, mathematics, science and writing is utilized. Further, the school will participate in the FAIR and FOCUS Reading assessments and utilize the Florida Achieves Mathematics and Science assessments to summarize data for students at Tier 1, 2, and 3. Discipline reports are analyzed to determine sdtudents in need of further consideration. U.S. History teachers will utilize benchmark testing to progress monitor students who will be taking the EOC this year.

A spreadsheet, combining the above information as well as meeting notes, has been developed for use at the school level.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff was trained in an overview of the RTI model during the 2010-2011 school year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Training of guidance counselors and administrators by district support staff.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

-School-Based Literacy Leadership Team-

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

Jack Turgeon- Principal Tricia Allen- Assistant Principal Larry Burke- Reading Teacher LuAnne Frimmel- Language Arts Teacher Charalise Harris- Science Teacher Rob Lash- Math Teacher Gretchen Myers- CTE Teacher Ann Pinney- Media Specialist Danielle Tanaka - Assistant Principal Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The LLT will use Smaller Learning Community monthly meetings to teach one research-based strategy on incorporating literacy skills into the content area to all content area teachers. Each monthly meeting will include staff discussion of the research which guides LLT. The strategies are correlated to the five recommendations from, Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices". The recommendations are:

- 1. Explicit vocabulary instruction
- 2. Direct and Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction
- 3. Provide opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation
- 4. Increase student motivation and engagement in literacy learning
- 5. Make available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers

LLT team members will summarize the research of one recommendation at a time and teach the teachers how to use the strategy selected by our team in every content area.

VHS also has a Literacy Council in place. The Literacy Council meets monthly to discuss programming, fundraising, and curriculum connections. The role of the council is to promote literacy and the love of reading throughout all academic areas. In recent years, a school-wide reading selection is made and the author is invited to speak with small and large groups of students and parents over a several day period.

This year our guest author will be a Venice High School teacher who authored the book "How Our Government Really Works, Despite What They Say".

Two additional components are built into our LLT plan this year. First, is our school-wide Morph-Mania Program. Morphemes are provided each week to the entire staff, along with an instructional powerpoint to use in instructing students. Teachers are challenged to participate by pointing out, using and encouraging student use of the school-wide weekly morphemes. Incentives are built in to increase teacher participation.

The second new component involves the math department. Because their content is highly specialized, we have researched literacy strategies that are applicable to math literacy. Monthly instruction will be provided to math department members.

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

Teaching the 5 recommendations from the research and a Peer Modeling/Coaching Model School-wide use of morphemic awareness. Research-based math literacy strategies.

See above.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

The LLT is presenting reading strategies each month in SLC meetings. It is the responsibility of all teachers to implement reading strategies in their content area. Administrators will be discussing each teacher's results during their evaluations. A professional development calendar has been created utilizing VHS staff members individual areas of strength. Teachers offer workshops for their peers at VHS on topics such as Text Complexity, Close Reading, and Socratic Seminars for inservice credit. Follow-up sessions are designed to reflect on results of application in the classroom.

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

At Venice High School we have the following Small Learning Communities (SLC): Hospitality Education and Leadership, Business Information and Technology, Physical Science and Engineering, Life Science, Visual Arts, and Performing Arts. Each of these SLCs has multiple Career and Technical Education (CTE) course offerings which are directly related to post-secondary careers.

VHS has focused on STEM SLC's this year by grouping Health Science and Engineering students into pure classes across the curriculum. Teachers collaborate to bring application of their subject to the study of the individual SLC's.

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

The Guidance Department at VHS provides specific academic, career, and post-secondary opportunities for all students in both group and individual counseling sessions throughout the school year. Some of the VHS guidance activities are: Student and Parent Orientation- Four Year Plan /Tribe Advisory/ SLC / Career Pathways, Open House, College Night, Rotary Futures Program, School Showcase Night, and AP/DE Night.

Venice High School provides a comprehensive transition plan from middle school to high school through our Cornerstone Transition Program. Starting in 9th grade students are required to develop a four year plan with their guidance counselors. This four-year plan is an ongoing document that students will address each year throughout high school. The four-year plan addresses the following: Academics, SLC, Career Pathways, Internships, CTE certifications, Rotary Futures Program (Scholarship opportunities), and post-secondary goals.

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PERT? College Readiness Math and English courses

What is High School Feedback Report.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

| | d on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and c | lefine areas in need | | |
|------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| read | CAT2.0: Students scoring ing. ling Goal #1a: | g at Achievement Level 3 | 3 in Levels 3,4,5). T point increase f currently demoi 90% or more st or demonstrate overall proficien | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. | | | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Perforn | nance: | 2013 Expected | Level of Performance: | | | |
| | 3 - 27%(234) 3,4,5 - 61%(532) | | Level 3 - 31% Level 3,4,5 - 65 | 5% | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process 1 | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Several first year teachers will need professional development and mentoring in the area of progress monitoring. | The principal and TI Specialists will create a year long technology plan including the scheduling of compuer labs. The school will implement the district Instructional Focus Calendar. The school will implement the IFC mini- assessments on each benchmark (FOCUS). The school will implement FAIR assessments to monitor student progress. Include research- based literacy strategies from school-wide LLT Plan in lessons. Continue to implement PLCs by content area with the purpose of working on curriculum, common assessments and monitoring student progress. | Principals | APs will provide support through the SCIP mentor process for all new teachers. Conduct classroom walk-throughs to ensure teachers are working in alignment with the district IFCs and the LLT Plan Attend department meetings to discuss implementation of mini- assessments and LLT Strategies. Review FAIR reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule. Conduct discussions of CWT results in department meetings. Assistant Principals will monitor minutes of PLCs. | Minutes from Department Meetings and SLC Meetings CWT Logs Bottom Quartile progress monitoring and results summary | | |

| | | 7. Teachers will use FCAT Explorer and Florida Achieve (FOCUS) strategies to provide students with tools to match their area of deficiency. | | |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| 4 | limitations due to being under construction, therefore teachers will have restricted access to | technology plan, including the use of labs for assessments. | Mid year and final Climate Survey | Survey results |

| 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 As | sessment: | | | | |
| Students scoring at Lev | els 4, 5, and 6 in reading. | | | | |
| Reading Goal #1b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | ected Level of Performa | nce: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proc | ess to l | ncrease St | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. |
|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 4,5 - 34%(298) Level 3,4,5 - 61%(532) | Level 4,5 - 36% Level 3,4,5- 65% |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| | | 1. Professional | The Principal | 1. PRIDE and classroom | 1. Enrollment | |

| | development on the what, why, how and when of Differentiated Instruction. 2. Professional development focused or Common Core Standard | | 2. Review of data. | numbers 2. AP passing rate with 3 and above. 3. Dual Enrollment grade verification reports. 4. DEEDT results |
|---|---|----|--------------------|--|
| 2 | implementation. 3. Accelerated curriculu through Honors, Advanced Placement an Dual Enrollment courses | ıd | | 4. PERT results |
| | 4. Increased access and encouragement to enrol into more rigorous courses. 5. Increased focus on | | | |
| | text complexity for all content areas. | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of I | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfor | mance: | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solv | ving Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| for | | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point | | | |
| Reading Goal #3a: | increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 61%(476) | 65% | | | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | | | Person or | Process Used to | |
|-----|---------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| | | | | | |
| 1 I | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position | Determine | Evaluation Tool |
| | | | Responsible for | Effectiveness of | |
| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
| | | Creation of Reading | The Principal | 1. Conduct classroom | 1. Focused walk |
| | | Department Chair person | | walk-throughs to ensure | throughs |
| | | to lead reading-specific | Assistant | teachers are working in | |
| | | initiatives. | Principals | alignment with the | 2. Printout of mini- |
| | | | | district IFCs. | assessment results |
| | | Progress monitoring | | | by teacher. |
| | | conferences conducted | Department Chairs | 2. Attend department | |
| | | for every level 1 and 2 | | meetings to discuss | 3. Printout of FAIR |
| | | students 3 times annually | | implementation of mini- | and FOCUS |
| | | by LA teacher, monitoring | PLC facilitators | assessments and the | Assessments |
| | | FAIR, FOCUS, FCAT, | | new progress monitoring | |
| | | attendance, behavior and | | process. Collect | 4. PLC Logs |
| | | grades. | Teachers | information to help | |
| | | | | teachers problem-solve | 5. Percentage of |
| | | All Students performing | | as we implement this new | |
| | | at Level 1 will be placed | | system. | learning gains on |
| | | in intensive reading | | | the Reading FCAT. |
| | | intervention classes. | | 3. Review FAIR reports to | |
| | | | | ensure teachers are | |
| | | The Fusion Model is used | | assessing students | |
| | | to block Language Arts | | according to the created | |
| | | classes combined with | | schedule. | |
| | | Intensive Reading. | | 4. Construct allocate and | |
| | | Teachers have received | | 4. Conduct classroom | |
| | | training in using this | | walk-throughs to ensure | |
| | | model. | | teachers are utilizing | |
| | | The school will implement | | higher order thinking and | |
| | | The school will implement the district Instructional | | questioning strategies, as well as literacy skills from | |
| 1 | | Focus Calendar. | | school-wide plan. | |
| 1 | | Focus Calendar. | | school-wide plan. | |
| | | The school will implement | | 5. Assistant Principals will | |
| | | the IFC mini-assessments | | monitor minutes of PLCs. | |
| | | on each benchmark. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | The school will implement | | | |
| | | FAIR assessments to | | | |
| | | monitor student progress. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Teachers will implement | | | |
| | | the LLT plan to | | | |
| | | incoporate literacy skills | | | |
| | | in every subject. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Continue to implement | | | |
| | | PLCs with the purpose of | | | |
| | | working on curriculum, | | | |
| | | common assessments | | | |
| | | and monitoring student | | | |
| | | progress. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Teachers will use FCAT | | | |
| | | Explorer and Florida | | | |
| | | Achieve (FOCUS) | | | |
| | | strategies to provide | | | |
| | | students with tools to | | | |
| | | match their area of | | | |
| | | deficiency. | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in neec of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: | | | | | |
| Percentage of students making Learning Gains in | | | | | |
| reading. | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #3b: | | | | | |

| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to Increase St | tudent Achievement | |
|---------------------|--|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| Anticipated Barrier | Perso Posit ticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for Moni | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 56%(110) | 60% | | | |

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 |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| School has a limited number of reading endorsed and Car-pd certified teachers to service our students. | Hire for LA openings from the pool of Reading endorsed applicants. Create Reading Department Chair person to lead the reading related inititatives. Increase use of volunteers for small group and individual assistance with instruction in the classrooms. Include LLT strategies in all classes. Place newly hired teachers with content area PLCs with the purpose of working on curriculum, common assessments and monitoring student progress. Progress Monitoring of all LQ students using standardized form. Placed two Reading endorsed LA teachers in the Social Studies Department to provide | Assistant Principals Department Chairs PLC facilitators Teachers | Review FAIR reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule. Monitor use of progress monitoring standardized form. Assistant Principals will monitor minutes of PLCs. | through log and focused walk throughs. 2. Printout of mini- assessment results by teacher. 3. PLC logs |

| | reading interventions to Level 1 and 2 students. | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| 2 Beginning teachers in the area of reading need to build a repetoire of teaching and progress monitoring strategies. | Create Reading Department Chair person to lead the reading related inititatives. Include LLT strategies in all classes. Place newly hired teachers with content area PLCs with the purpose of working on curriculum, common assessments and monitoring student progress. Progress Monitoring of all LQ students using standardized form (3x annually). Level 1 and 2 students in intensive reading classes, using the Fusion model. All IR students will be instructed using the IFC calendar and mini assessments, as well as district writing prompts. All Reading teachers will use the Townsend PRess and FOCUS strategies to provide students with tools to match their area (s) of deficiency. LQ students and their mentor match will be shared with staff. Provide PD on-site and encourage mentees to attend with mentors. Topics are attached. | Department Chairs PLC facilitators Teachers | Teachers will use a triplicate form, sending one copy home, one to the teacher and one to the following year LA teacher. Review FAIR reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule. Assistant Principals will monitor minutes of PLCs. | PLC logs Percentage of students making learning gains on |

| Based on Amb | Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is | | | | his l population | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 65 | 68 | 72 | 75 | 78 | |

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent

Reading Goal #5B:

| | non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Black 36% | White 71% Black 62% Hispanic 55% |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | | |
| 1 | Low numbers in subgroups create wide variations in proficiency rates, or the lack of available data. | All Students performing at Level 1 and 2 will be placed in intensive reading intervention classes. Teachers will use FCAT Explorer and Florida Achieve (FOCUS) strategies to provide students with tools to match their area of deficiency. Progress Monitoring of all LQ students using standardized triplicate form. Information shared with parents and next year's teacher. Match all LQ students with a staff mentor and share name with all teachers. | The Principal Assistant Principals Department Chairs PLC facilitators • Teachers • BIGS Mentors • Pac Mentors • Media Specialist • Administrativ e Team • SLC and SLC Trio's | attendance at least 6x annually. Communcation with student and parent each time. 2. Teacher Progress Monitoring of all LQ students using standardized triplicate form. Information shared with parents and next year's teacher. 3. APs review FAIR | Printout of mini- assessment results by teacher. Printout of FAIR and FOCUS Assessments Percentage of students making learning gains on the Reading FCAT. Analysis of progress monitoring forms. | | | |

| | 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: | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | | | year from SY 20 The target for y indicated below above 95%, the school can also | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | mance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | | |
| ELL 20% | | | ELL 43% | | | | |
| | | oblem-solving Flocess | | It Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | Low numbers in subgroups create wide variations in proficiency rates, or the lack of available data. | ESOL Students performing at Level 1 and 2 will be placed in ESOL and/or intensive reading intervention classes. The Fusion Model is used | The Principal Assistant Principals ESOL Teacher PLC | 1. Conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure teacher is working in alignment with the district IFCs and school- wide LLT Plan. | Classroom Walk through log and focused walk throughs to monitor use of LLT Strategies. Printout of mini | | |

| | to block Language Arts classes | facilitators | 2. Review FAIR reports to ensure | assessment resul by |
|---|--|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | combined | Teachers | teachers are assessing | teacher. |
| | with Intensive Reading. | • BIGS | students according to the created | 3. Printout of FA |
| | The ESOL teacher will | Mentors | schedule. | and |
| | implement the district Instructional | Pac Mentors | 4. Assistant Principals will | FOCUS Assessments |
| | Focus Calendar and mini- assessments (FAIR and | • Media Specialist | monitor minutes of PLCs. | 4. PLC minutes |
| | FOCUS). | Administrative | | 5. Percentage of students |
| | Implement school-wide LLT plan | Team | | making learning gains on |
| | | SLC and SLC | | the Reading FCA |
| | ESOL teacher will attend reading PLCs with the | Trio's | | |
| 1 | purpose of working on curriculum, common | | | |
| | assessments and | | | |
| | monitoring student progress. | | | |
| | Teacher will use FCAT Explorer and Florida Achieve (FOCUS) strategies to | | | |
| | provide students with tools to match their area of deficiency. | | | |
| | Progress Monitoring of al LQ students using standardized triplicate form. Information shared with parents and next | | | |
| | year's teacher. Match all ESOL LQ students with a staff mentor and share name with all teachers. | | | |
| 2 | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------------------|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | | | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| SWD 32% | | | SWD 39% | SWD 39% | | |
| | 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 | |
| | Low numbers in | All SWD students performing at Level | Principal | 1. Quarterly checks on progress monitoring | Informal accountability | |

| 1 | subgroups create wide variations in proficiency rates, or the lack of available data. | 1 snd 2 will be placed in intensive reading intervention classes. Implement school-wide LLT plan Participation in standardized progress monitoring system. All LQ ESE students will be matched with a mentor and will meet at least 6x anually to review attendance, behavior and grades. Communication with student and parents are part of the program. | system. 2. Quarterly checks with mentors' meetings with mentees. | checks with AP over Reading and LQ. |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | Three new team members were hired to replace ESE teachers over the summer. | | Rounding Monthly check ups with APs on progress monitoring system and particpation in Literacy Plan. SCIP criteria completion. | SCIP criteria completion PRIDE Informal conversations Student FAIR, FOCUS And FCAT scores |

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:

| satisf | conomically Disadvantag actory progress in read ng Goal #5E: | ged students not making ing. | g year from SY 20 The target for y indicated below above 95%, the school can also | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). | | | |
|--------|--|---------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|--|--|
| 2012 | Current Level of Perforr | nance: | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 51% | | | 63% | | | | |
| | 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 | | |
| | Lack of awareness of | Use at-risk spreadsheet | The Principal | 1. Spreadhseet of | 1. Classroom Walk | | |

| | which students are economically disadvantaged. | with the contributing factors of economics and free and reduced lunches to become aware of needy students. | | through log and focused walk throughs to monitor use of LLT Strategies. |
|---|--|---|---------------|---|
| 1 | | Assistance through back pack food program. Monitor students in weekly admin/counselor meetings and record progress on spreadsheet with follow actions and person responsible. Increase awareness of needy students through an improved use of the MTSS system. | Michele Cross | Printout of miniassessment results by teacher. Printout of FAIR and FOCUS Assessments PLC minutes Percentage of students making learning gains on the 2012 Reading |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Common Core State Standards: an overview | 9-12 Common Core Subjects | Allen | 9-12 CCSS teachers | 8-15-12 | Monitoring PLC minutes | Allen |
| The Differentiated School Book Study | Department Chairs and Administration | Turgeon | Department Chairs and Administration | Monthly Department Chair meeting | Monthly discussion | Turgeon |
| Text Complexity | CCSS teachers- optional | Cocozza | 9-12 CCSS teachers | 9-4-12 and 9-19-12 | follow up session built in after application | Cocozza |
| Socratic Seminars | 9-12 | Biziewski | 9-12 optional | November 2012 | follow up built in after application | Biziewski |
| Text Dependent Questioning | 9-12 | Cocozza | 9-12 optional | 10-2-12 and 10-25- 12 | follow up session built in after application | Cocozza |
| Reciprocal Teaching | 9-12 | Amari | 9-12 optional | 10-3-12 and 12-5- 12 | follow up session built in after application | Amari |
| Literacy Remix Online Book Study | 9-12 | Burke & Pinney | 9-12- optional | 3-16-13 through 5- 16-13 online | online monitoring | Burke & Pinney |
| Understanding PRIDE: What are the Look Fors? | 9-12 | Allen | 9-12- optional | 11-5-12, 11-12-12, 11-19-12 | Formal and informal conversations with their administrator about performance. | Administration |
| Formative Assessment by Subject Area | 9-12 | Department Chairs | All | October Department Meeting school- wide | Discuss at monthly meetings | Department Chairs and APs |
| CIS Model | 9-12 | Cocozza | All | 1-22-13 and 3-29- 13 during faculty meeting | follow up built in after application | Turgeon |
| Text and Lessons for Content Area Reading | 9-12 | Frimmel & Schmucker | 9-12 optional | 10-16-12, 11-13- 12, 12-11-12 | follow up built in after application | Frimmel & Schmucker |

| Book Study | | | | |
|------------|------------|--|--|--|
| | Book Study | | | |

Reading Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|----------------|-------------------------|
| Townsend Press textbooks and online progress monitoring resources for INtensive Reading classes. | Townsend Press textbooks and online progress monitoring resources for INtensive Reading classes. | SIP | \$2,300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$2,300.00 |
| 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: \$2,300.00 |

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents payt to the percentage | $2 \left(0 \right) \alpha$ | 70% (25)) |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------|
| * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentag | J (C.Y., | 1070 (33)). |

| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|--------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 1. Students scoring p | roficient in listening/ | 'speaking. | | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #1: | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent | of Students Proficie | nt in listening/ | speaki | ng: | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person o Position Respons for Monitori | sible | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | • | No Data Sub | mitted | | | | |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|-----------------|--|
| 2. Students scoring pr | . Students scoring proficient in reading. | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss 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 | | | | | |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. | | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #3: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent | of Students Profici | ent in writing: | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving | Process to Increase | Student Achievemen | t | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

CELLA Budget:

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I | | | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No Data Submitted | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 2. Florida Alternate A or above Level 7 in m | | nts scoring at | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2 | : | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvin | g Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | İ |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No Data Submitted | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3: | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | |

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

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| | on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | g Questions", identify and o | define areas in need |
|------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | udents scoring at Achiev ora Goal #1: | ement Level 3 in Algebra | percentage poir than 70% are c a. Levels 3,4,5). T point increase f currently demoi 90% or more si or demonstrate overall proficier | 3, there will be a minimum at increase for Level 3 stud urrently demonstrating pro- bere will be a minimum of or Level 3 students where instrating proficiency (across tudents are proficient, the an increase in the percen- ncy target will be less than ar any subgroup. | dents, when less oficiency (across a two percentage 70% or more are ss Levels 3,4,5). If school can maintain t proficient. No |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | |
| | 3 - 56%(119) 3,4,5 - 65%(137) | | Level 3 - 60% Level 3,4,5 - 69 | 9% | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | New and young teachers have been added to the department. | Use of IFC and mini assessments. Use of research-based literacy strategies geared towards math. Match teachers to content area PLCs to assist and guide with curriculum, IFCs, use of mini assessments, common assessments and progress monitoring, as well as CCSS. | Principal Assistant Principal Department Chairs PLC facilitators Teachers | CWTs to ensure teachers are using the IFC and mini assessments, as well as the LLT plan. Review mini assessment results. APs monitr PLC minutes | results |
| 4 | N/A | Create a Math lab for students for both before and after school | Principal Department Chair Math teachers | Progress monitoring: Progress Reports and Report Cards | Mini assessments EOC exam |

| 5 | N/A | Common Core Training | Specialist | Mini assessments EOC exam |
|---|-----|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 6 | N/A | Teachers will create and implement formative assessments utilizing dry erase boards, ActiVotes, ActivExpressions, and TI N-spire. | Assistant Principal Department Chair | Mini assessments EOC exam |

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. |
|---|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 4,5 - 9%(18) Level 3,4,5 - 65%(137) | Level 4,5 - 13% Level 3,4,5 - 69% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | New CCSS | Matching all teachers in PLCs with same content area teachers to investigate and begin implementation of CCSS. | Turgeon Robertson | CCSS Departmental Self Evaluation of progress | Informal meetings with staff and Department Chair. |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|----|--|--|--|
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | Algebra Goal # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOS each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2016-2017 | | | | |
| | 71 | 73 | 76 | 79 | 81 | | | |

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent

Algebra Goal #3B:

| r r | | | non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). | | |
|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | Hispanic 75% White 73% Exceeded AMO Target | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I r | | | | tudent 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 s of improvement for the fo | student achievement data, an llowing subgroup: | d refer | ence to "Gi | uiding Questions", identify | y and define areas in need |
|--|---|---------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C: | | | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | | |
| | 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 student achievement data, and r of improvement for the following subgroup: | reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need |
|---|---|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 49% | 50% |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position | 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 Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E: | | | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| 77% | | | 69% Exceeded AMO Target | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | is to I r | ncrease St | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. | | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #1: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expecte | d Level of Performanc | e: | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Prot | olem-Solving Process | to I | ncrease Stude | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | R | Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | |

| | New and young teachers have been added to the | Use of IFC and mini assessments. | Principal Assistant Principal | teachers are using the | Benchmark test results |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| 3 | department. | Use of research-based literacy strategies geared towards math. Match teachers to content area PLCs to assist and guide with curriculum, common assessments and progress monitoring, as well as CCSS. | Department Chairs PLC facilitators | assessments, as well as the LLT plan. Review mini assessment results. APs monitr PLC minutes | department and PLC meetings CWT logs |
| 4 | N/A | Create a Math lab for students for both before and after school | | | Mini assessments EOC exam |
| 5 | N/A | Common Core Training | | 5 | Mini assessments EOC exam |
| 6 | N/A | Teachers will create and implement formative assessments utilizing dry erase boards, ActiVotes, ActivExpressions, and TI N-spire. | | Progress Reports and | Mini assessments EOC exam |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas n need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|-----------|--|-----------------|
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to I | ncrease S | itudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|
| 3A. Ambitious but Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six yea reduce their achie 50%. | e Objectives ar school will | Geometry Goal # | | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

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:

| | s by ethnicity (White, Blac ican Indian) not making in Geometry. | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|-----------|--|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data 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: | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| 0 0 0 | 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3C: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to l | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position 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 n need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | is to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for | | son or tion ponsible Effectiveness of Strategy | | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | No Data Submitted | | | | | |

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade | 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 |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| Inquirybased instruction training | Algebra and Geometry Teachers | | Evie Eddins | 8/7/12 to 8/9/12 | Classroom Walkthroughs | J. Turgeon |
| Text Dependent Questioning | 9-12 | Cocozza | 9-12 optional | 10-2-12 and 10-25-12 | follow up session built in after application | Cocozza |
| Text Complexity | CCSS teachersoptional | Cocozza | 9-12 CCSS teachers | 9-4-12 and 9-19- 12 | follow up session built in after application | Cocozza |
| Common Core State Standards: an overview | 9-12 Common Core Subjects | Allen | 9-12 CCSS teachers | 8/15/12 | Monitoring PLC minutes | Allen |

Mathematics Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| echnology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| rofessional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| ther | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | | | |
| Science Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to Ir | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for | | Posit Resp for | son or tion ponsible Effectiveness of Strategy | | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |

| | Problem-Solving 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 | | | | | | |

ī

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| | | lent achievement data, t for the following group | | Guiding Questions", ide | ntify and define | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Biolo | udents scoring at Achi egy. egy Goal #1: | ievement Level 3 in | percentage po when less that proficiency. Th percentage po 70% or more Any subgroup demonstrate a | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No target will be less than 35% for any subgroup. | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfe | ormance: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performan | ce: | | |
| White Black Hispa Low I | nic- 43% ncome- 37 · 26% | | | White- 55% Black- 35% Hispanic- 47% Low Income- 41% SWD- 30% | | | |
| | 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 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | No Barrier | Apply guided inquiry strategies to the NGSSS to meet the various learning styles of students. Attend training to understand and incorporate inquiry-based instruction as it relates to the NGSSS. Incorporating | | Angel Web progress monitoring for Biology in preparation for EOC exam. | Angel Web progress monitoring records and EOC exam | | |

| | | | Instructional Focus Calendar for Biology and Physical Science. | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 4 | 4 | 9th graders taking | Summer Bridge classes to encourage continued scientific skill development | Carole Losey | Student surveys | Student Surveys |
| í | ō | No Barrier | Biology teacher attended TI Inspire training on use of biological probes. | | | Increased EOC scores |

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. | | | | | | |
| Biology Goal #2: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving | Process to | Increase S | Student Achievemen | t | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Po Re for | rson or sition sponsible nitoring | 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 |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Text Dependent Questioning | 9-12 | Cocozza | 9-12 optional | 10-2-12 and 10-25-12 | follow up session built in after application | Cocozza |
| | 9-12 Biology, Physical Science | Brad Porinchak | Biology, Physical Science Teachers | 8/7/12 to 8/9/12 | Classroom Walkthroughs | Jennings |
| Common Core State Standards: an overview | 9-12 Common Core Subjects | Allen | 9-12 CCSS teachers | 8-15-12 | Monitoring PLC minutes | Allen |
| Text Complexity | CCSS teachersoptional | Cocozza | 9-12 CCSS teachers | 9-4-12 and 9-19- 12 | follow up session built in after application | Cocozza |

| TI Inspire Biology Probe training | Biology | District | Harris- modeling for all Biology teachers | 08-2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs | Jennings, Compton, Pfundtner and Harris |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Continued Inquiry- based instruction training and review and revise IFC | 9-12 Biology, Physical Science | Brad Porinchak | Biology, Physical Science Teachers | Oct, Jan and March PD Days | Classroom Walkthroughs follow up discussion after training in Deptartment meeting | Jennings |

Science Budget:

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

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 in need of improvement for the following group: | eference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Leve 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| 89%(415) | 91% | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I | ncrease Student Achievement | | |
| | Person or Process Used to | | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | need professional | Form PLCs for Writing instruction and scoring. Participate in Writing Workshop so teachers can calibrate scoring with other 9th and 10th grade teachers in the Language Arts Department. Teachers will maintain student writing folders to track individual progress. | Assistant Principals | Essay portfolio and review Evaluation of writing folders | Monitoring of PLC logs District writing prompt results Effectiveness assessed using writing rubric on district writing prompts and FCAT |
| 2 | | | | | |

| | d on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the | | nd reference to "Gu | uiding Questions", identify | y and define areas | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b: | | | g percentage poi less than 75% on the writing percentage poi 75% or more a the writing ess must maintain | 13, there will be a minim int increase for all studer are currently demonstrat essay. There will be a mi int increase for all studer are currently demonstratir say. Any subgroup that is or demonstrate an increa- proficiency target will be | at subgroups when ing 4.0 or higher nimum of a two at groups where ag 4.0 or higher on 90% or higher ase in the percent | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expecte | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| 49%(229) | | | 53% | 53% | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | There are several beginning teachers in our LA and Reading and ESE classes. | Form PLCs with Reading teachers and Reading Chair to get the suppor they need. | Allen, Burke and Patterson | FAIR and FOCUS scores | Progress monitoring FAIR and FOCUS | |

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) | (e.g., early release) and | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Engish District-wide Training on FCAT Writing | 9 & 10 | Brustan | 9th and 10th grade teachers | 10-9 and 10-10- 12, as well as 1- 15 and 1-16-13. | Formal and informal discussions between teachers and their administrators. | Aministration |
| ccss | 9-12 CCSS subject areas | Allen | 9-12 All | 8-15-12 | Discussions of progress in PLCs. | Administration |

Writing 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 Writing 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 | | nd reference to "Gu | iding Questions", identif | y and define areas |
|--|---|------------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. | | | | | |
| U.S. H | History Goal #1: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expecte | d Level of Performanc | e: |
| | | | | | |
| | 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 | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 2 | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas n need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. | | | | | |
| U.S. History Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for | | on or tion ponsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | Ν | lo Data S | Submitted | | |

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Description of Resources Funding Source | |
|----------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | es 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.a. | 70% (35)) |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------|-------------|
| | when using percentages, | include the number | or stadents the | percentage represents | (C.g., | 1070 (33)). |

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference of improvement: | ce to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need |
|---|--|
| 1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: | ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage. ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease . ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 94.4% (1932/2047) | 96.4% |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 1004 | 922 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| N/A | N/A |
| Problem-Solving Process to | Increase Student Achievement |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | | Teacher phone calls for excessive tardies/absences Use of Connect-Ed to notify parents of absences Administrators and counselors will meet weekly regarding students with excessive absences and refer them to SWST and CARE and social workers when appropriate. FTE registrar prints weekly attendance reports and identifies attendance issues. Assistant principals follow-up and meet with individual students to address issues. FTE registrar monitors and reports attendance for driver's state law regarding license revocation. | Teachers, attendance clerks and Assistant Princiapls Attendance Clerk and Administrators Guidance counselors and administrators. FTE registrar | Ongoing phone calls, Analysis of attendance data Analysis of attendance rate reports Weekly administrator and counselor pair meetings with action steps assigned to members for each child of concern. District attendance worker collaborating with school personnel to ensure fidelity of process. | Attendance rate |

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) | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------|--|
| Technology in the New School (focused on using Crosspoint to communicate with parents) | 9-12 | Tanaka and Gambo | all | 8-16-12 | Pride discussions | APs |

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | on the analysis of suspe provement: | ension data, and reference | e to "Guiding Que | stions", identify and define | ne areas in need | |
|---|---|----------------------------|---|--|------------------|--|
| 1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: | | | By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%. | | | |
| 2012 | Total Number of In–Sc | hool Suspensions | 2013 Expected | d Number of In-School | Suspensions | |
| 285 | | | 183 | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | | | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In- School | | | |
| 175 | | | 165 | 165 | | |
| 2012 | 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | |
| 129 | | | 119 | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of- School | | | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | |
| 107 | | | 97 | | | |
| | Prok | blem-Solving Process to | Increase Stude | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool | |

| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
|---|---|---|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | | repeat offenders and | Behavior Speciaist | Admin and counselor spreadsheets for at-risk students and school actions leading to SWST and CARE | Spreadsheet |
| 2 | | achievement and | Guidance | achievement and behavior data | Spreadsheet |
| 3 | Lack of data regarding number of events for ISS and OSS | Run the ISS and OSS report at the end of the year | | Comparison of available data for 10/11 and 11/12. | Comparison of profile tool for SIP |

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

| | ed on the analysis of pare eed of improvement: | ent involvement data, and | d reference to "Guid | ding Questions", identify | and define areas | |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| Drop *Ple | ropout Prevention bout Prevention Goal # ase refer to the percenta apped out during the 2011 | age of students who | in the percent If the current of a .4 percent re If the current of a .2 percent re Graduation Goa For the school students gradu If the current of there will be a for all subgroup | For the School year 2012-2013, there will be a reduction in the percent of students who dropout of school. If the current dropout rate is 2.5 or higher, there will be a .4 percent reduction. If the current dropout rate is less than 2.5, there will be a .2 percent reduction. Graduation Goal For the school year 2012-2013, the percentage of students graduating from high school will increase. If the current graduation rate is less than 84 percent, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point increase for all subgroups. If the current graduation rate is 84 percent or higher, | | |
| 201 | 2 Current Dropout Rate | : | | d Dropout Rate: | | |
| 1.9% | 6 (37) | | 1.7% | | | |
| 201 | 2 Current Graduation R | ate: | 2013 Expecte | d Graduation Rate: | | |
| 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Prc | blem-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 Too | |
| 1 | Some students need alternative learning opportunities | APEX software continued implementation Virtual School options- Florida Virtual School, Sarasota Virtual Academy | Administrators PBD Teachers and support staff Guidance | Record of completion in each of the programs | Report cards Drop out rate | |
| | Funding for Drop Out Prevention Resources | Teacher/guidance counselor phone contact with parents and follow-up parental conferences if needed. Admin/Counselor pair meetings, SWST/CARE, RTI meetings to review student issues. PBD for students who are falling behind in credits and below GPA. Adult night-school classes available on campus for | Parents | night school completion | Report Cards and progress reports | |

| | credit retrieval. | |
|---|--|--|
| 2 | 5. Drop-out prevention manager working with guidance counselors and teachers to identify at-risk studnts. | |
| | 6. BIGS mentoring program | |
| | 7. Decisions to Win mentoring program for PBD students. | |
| | 8. Increase parental awareness and involvement in progress monitoring through the use of the Crosspointe student management system | |
| | system | |

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

| 5 | 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 |

| 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: | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. | Begin monitoring parent involvement in SPIN night, open house, college night, AP/DE night, guest speakers, and other school activities. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: | | | |
| 140 Pals volunteers | 50% parent involvement | | | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | | | Person or | Process Used to | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Too |
| 1 | Progress monitoring of parental involvement. | Collect sign in sheets from open house. Sign in system for SPIN night, AP/De night, college night, and other parent informational class meetings. The use of Crosspointe reports to verify parental access to the student management system. | Administration Support Staff Rotary Futures College Resource Center SLC Leaders | data collection. Ratio of parental involvement to student | Separate sign in systems per event. Crosspointe reports |
| 2 | Communication | Increase parental communication/awareness of email capability of Crosspointe Student Management System. Increase teacher utilization of Crosspointe Student Management System to communicate with parents and detail issues related to attendance, assessments, and student progress. | Teachers SLC Leaders Support Staff | Monitoring enrollment and use of Crosspointe System | Crosspointe reports |
| 3 | | Increase opportunities for parents to become involved through volunteering. Advertise opportunities in Pathfinder, on marquees | Allen | PALs roster | PALs roster |

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

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

Parent Involvement 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: \$0.0 |
| Гесhnology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Professional Developn | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.0 |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1. STEM | | | | |
| STEM Goal #1: | Increased Inquiry-based teaching by STEM teachers. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 1 | Need to increase training on Inquiry- Based Teaching. | Provide summer training for physical science and biology, algebra and geometry teachers whose students will take the EOC at the end of the year. | 0 | Classroom walkthroughs Department Meetings PLC group discussions | EOC results |

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 Submitted | d | | |

STEM Budget:

ī

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Т

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

 1. CTE
 Increase the industry certification pass-rate for all CTE classes. 200 certifications earned. 61 failures to earn certification. 77% p[ass rate of all exams taken.

 CTE Goal #1:
 Goal to increase to 81%

| | | | Goal to increas | e to 81%. | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| | Pro | blem-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 | Amount of information to be taught and tested to align with CTE industry exam testing windows. | Align classroom instruction to CTE industry certification exam requirements. | M. Jennings | Pass rate of CTE exams | CTE Industry- certification exams |
| 2 | Updated software requiring teacher training. | Providing teachers with certification opportunities. Matching teachers in PLCs to work together on this. | Melissa Morrow | Earned certifications | Earned certifications |

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 | 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 Submitteo | d | | |

CTE Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | • | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | | | Available |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available |
| 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 Goal |

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Prog | ram(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|----------------|-------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Townsend Press textbooks and online progress monitoring resources for INtensive Reading classes. | Townsend Press textbooks and online progress monitoring resources for INtensive Reading classes. | SIP | \$2,300.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$2,300.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Develop | ment | | | |
| 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: \$2,300.00 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| | jn Priority | jn Focus | jn Prevent | ja NA |
|--|-------------|----------|------------|-------|
|--|-------------|----------|------------|-------|

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds

Amount

No data submitted

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

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

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 58% | 87% | 89% | 52% | 286 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/o science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 58% | 77% | | | | 3 ways to make gains: Improve FCAT Levels Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 51% (YES) | 66% (YES) | | | 117 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 548 | |
| Percent Tested = 98% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | в | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| | Reading | Math | Writing | | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---------|-----------|---------|-----|---------------------------|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 61% | 86% | 92% | 48% | 287 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the Distric writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 58% | 78% | | | 136 | 3 ways to make gains: Improve FCAT Levels Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | | 67% (YES) | | | 114 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 547 | |
| Percent Tested = 99% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |