FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: NAPLES AREA TEENAGE PARENTING

District Name: Collier

Principal: Dr. Cynthia M. Janssen

SAC Chair: Eric Peltz

Superintendent: Dr. Kamela Patton

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 9/17/2012



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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Principal | | PhD Educational Leadership 4 31 | | | According to statute, the Superintendent has the authority to strategically place administrators within the school district. |
| | Kelley C. Costin | MA Educational Leadership | 3.5 | | According to statute, the Superintendent has the authority to strategically place administrators within the school district. |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

| Subject Area | Name | . 3 (.) . | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the |
|--------------|------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|

| | | | | | associated school year) |
|----------|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Literacy | Jeanine Brakefield | MA Technology Reading Endorsement BA English Education 6-12 | 6 | 1 | History of academic excellence and past work experience with students in alternative programs |

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Strategies are dictated by the District. | CCPS District Personnel | | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out- of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| All staff are highly effective | |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|--|--------------------------------|---------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|----------|--|--------------------------------|
| 3 | 0.0%(0) | 0.0%(0) | 100.0%(3) | 0.0%(0) | 100.0%(3) | 100.0%(3) | 33.3%(1) | 0.0%(0) | 100.0%(3) |

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee | Rationale | Planned Mentoring |
|-------------|----------|-------------|-------------------|
| | Assigned | for Pairing | Activities |
| na | | | |

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 | |
|---|--------|
| | |
| itle I, Part D | |
| | |
| itle II | |
| | |
| itle III | |
| | |
| itle X- Homeless | |
| | |
| upplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) | |
| appromental readonne matraction (orn) | |
| iolence Prevention Programs | |
| olence Prevention Programs | |
| | |
| utrition Programs | |
| | |
| busing Programs | |
| | |
| ead Start | |
| | |
| dult Education | |
| | |
| areer and Technical Education | |
| | |
| bb Training | |
| | |
| ther | |
| | |
| | |
| lulti-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) | |
| School-based MTSS/RtI Team | |
| dentify the school-based MTSS leadership team. | |
| The Alternative Schools literacy team consists of the Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Lead Teacher and a Reading Teac from each of our programs throughout the district. | her |
| rescribe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does in the school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? | t work |
| Leadership Team oversees the PLC and utilizes the problem solving approach to ensure that instruction and interventions students are based on student performance data. PLC meets twice a month to discuss student data and adjust instructio according to individual student needs. Students needing additional intervention receive immediate intensive intervention according to individual student needs. | n |

the point of need..

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

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

MTSS Implementation

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

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

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

Due to the nature of the Alternative Schools, and the distance between school sites, meetings are conducted electronically via email and ANGEL on a monthly basis, at a minimum. In addition, the Reading Coach visits each school weekly, supporting, updating and soliciting information/knowledge from individual team members

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

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

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment

*Elementary Title | Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

| * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)). |
|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need |
| of improvement for the following group: |

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

| | Pi | roblem-Solving Pr | ocess | to Increase | Stude | nt Achievement | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|-----------------|--------------------|
| Anticipated Barrier | Anticipated Barrier Strategy Positing Responsitions for | | erson or osition esponsible or lonitoring | Det Effe | ocess Used to termine tectiveness of ategy | Eval | Evaluation Tool | |
| | | | No Da | ata Submitte | d | | | |
| Based on the analysis of improvement for the f | | | a, and r | eference to | "Guidin | g Questions", identify | and o | lefine areas in ne |
| 2b. Florida Alternate A Students scoring at or reading. Reading Goal #2b: | | | vel 7 in | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Perfori | mance: | | 2013 E | xpecte | d Level of Performa | ance: | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Pı Stra | roblem-Solving Pr | Pi Pi Ri | erson or osition esponsible | Pro Det | nt Achievement cess Used to ermine ectiveness of | Eval | uation Tool |
| | | | | or Ionitoring ata Submitte | | ategy | | |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the factor of | following | g group: | | Percent will be a of the s | of stud at least ame stu | g Questions", identify ents making learning 5 percentage points udents making learnir | gains highe | in reading this ye |
| 2012 Current Level of | Perfori | mance: | | | home school. 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| no data available | | | | no data | availab | ole | | |
| | Pi | roblem-Solving Pr | ocess | to Increase | Stude | nt Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Ba | arrier | Strategy | | Persoi Positi Responsi Monito | on ble for | Process Used Determine Effectiveness Strategy | of | Evaluation Too |
| Most students en program below gra level in reading | | Implement FAIR assessments to m student progress | onitor | Principal Reading Co Lead Teach | | Review FAIR data re | eports | FAIR assessmen |

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

| | | Classroom walkthroughs Classroom walkthrough data |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | Explicitly infuse reading benchmarks in lesson | Observe students reading |
| 1 | plans and instructional delivery of all content areas | Student reading logs |
| | Implement pre, during, and post reading strategies in all content areas | |
| | Engage and monitor all students in daily independent reading | |
| | | |
| Based on the analys | | o "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need |

| Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo | | ta, and refere | ence to "Gi | uiding Questions", ident | ify and define areas in need |
|--|-------------------|----------------|-------------|--|------------------------------|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of P | erformance: | | 2013 Exp | ected Level of Perforr | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving P | rocess to Ir | ncrease St | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data S | Submitted | - | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo | | ta, and refere | ence to "Gi | uiding Questions", ident | ify and define areas in need |
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage making learning gains in | | t 25% | | | |
| Reading Goal #4: | | | | | |

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

| | | | Reading Goa | al# | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|------------------|-------|----------------------|
| | ojectives (AM | ole Annual 10s). In six year nievement gap | | | | | | | <u></u> |
| Dy 50%. | | | 5A : | | | | | | V |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-20 | 014 | 2014 | -2015 | 2015-2016 | 5 | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | tudent achieveme owing subgroup: | ent data, and | d refere | ence to "Gu | iiding Ques | tions", identify | and c | define areas in need |
| 5B. Student s | subgroups b an, America | y ethnicity (Wh | | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal | #5B: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current | Level of Pe | erformance: | | | 2013 Expe | ected Leve | el of Performa | nce: | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem-Sol | ving Proces | s to I r | ncrease St | udent Ach | ilevement | | |
| Anticipated E | 3arrier | Positions of the strategy arrier Strategy for | | | on onsible | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | | Eval | uation Tool |
| | | | No | Data S | Submitted | | | | |
| <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | |
| | | tudent achieveme owing subgroup: | ent data, and | d refere | ence to "Gu | iiding Ques | tions", identify | and c | define areas in need |
| 5C. English La satisfactory p | | arners (ELL) no reading. | t making | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal | #5C: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current | Level of Pe | erformance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem-Sol | ving Proces | stolr | ncrease St | udent Ach | lievement | | |
| Anticipated E | 3arrier | Strategy | | Perso Positi Respo for Monit | on onsible | Process L Determin Effective Strategy | е | Eval | uation Tool |
| | , | | No | | Submitted | | | • | |
| <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | |

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

| of improvement for the t | following subgroup: | | | | |
|--|--|-----------|--|--|------------------------------|
| 5D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress | abilities (SWD) not making in reading. | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5D: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Ехр | ected Level of Perforr | nance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Prod | cess to I | ncrease St | tudent Achievement | |
| for | | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | | No Data S | Submitted | | |
| of improvement for the t | dvantaged students not m | | ence to "Gu | uiding Questions", ident | ify and define areas in need |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | ected Level of Perforr | nance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Prod | cess to I | ncrease St | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data S | Submitted | | |
| | | | | | |

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

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

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

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program | m(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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

| when using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)). | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | | |
| 1. Students scoring pro | oficient in listening/speak | ting. | | | |
| CELLA Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent | of Students Proficient in Ii: | stening/speaki | ng: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to Increase S | tudent Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| CELLA Goal #2: | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | No | Data Submitted | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | | | |
| 3. Students scoring pro | oficient in writing. | | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #3: | | | | | | |

| 3. Students scoring pr | oficient in writing. | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| CELLA Goal #3: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to Increase S | Student Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | | | | | |
| 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 Developmen | t | | |

| 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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

| * When using percentages, | include the number of stude | ents the perc | entage repr | esents (e.g., 70% (35)). | |
|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo | | a, and refer | rence to "G | uiding Questions", ident | ify and define areas in need |
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students mathematics. | scoring at Achievement | t Level 3 ir | ו | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1a: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Ехр | pected Level of Perforr | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Pr | rocess to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion ponsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo | | a, and refer | rence to "G | uiding Questions", ident | ify and define areas in need |
| 1b. Florida Alternate As | ssessment: vels 4, 5, and 6 in math | ometics | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1b: | | ematics. | | | |
| Wathernaties Godi // To. | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of F | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | ected Level of Perforr | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving P | rocess to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion ponsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo | | a, and refer | rence to "G | uiding Questions", ident | ify and define areas in need |
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students Level 4 in mathematics | scoring at or above Acl | hievement | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2a: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |

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

| Based on the a of improvemen | | | ent data, and refe | rence to "Gi | uiding Ques | stions", identify | and (| define areas in need |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| 3b. Florida Al- Percentage of mathematics | f students r | sessment: naking Learninα | g Gains in | | | | | |
| Mathematics | Goal #3b: | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current | Level of Pe | erformance: | | 2013 Exp | ected Leve | el of Performa | nce: | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem-Sol | ving Process to I | ncrease St | tudent Ach | nievement | | |
| Anticipated B | Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp for | | on or tion oonsible itoring | Process I Determir Effective Strategy | ne ness of | Eval | luation Tool | |
| | | | | Submitted | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Based on the a | | | ent data, and refe | rence to "Gi | uiding Ques | stions", identify | and o | define areas in need |
| making learni | ing gains in | of students in L n mathematics. | Lowest 25% | | | | | |
| Mathematics | Goal #4: | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current | Level of Pe | erformance: | | 2013 Exp | ected Leve | el of Performa | nce: | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem-Sol | ving Process to I | ncrease St | tudent Ach | nievement | | |
| Anticipated B | Barrier | Strategy | Posi Resp for | on or tion ponsible itoring | Process I Determin Effective Strategy | ne ness of | Eval | luation Tool |
| | | | No Data | Submitted | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Based on Ambi | itious but Ac | chievable Annual | Measurable Objec | tives (AMOs | s), AMO-2, | Reading and Ma | ath Pe | erformance Target |
| 5A. Ambitious Measurable Obschool will reduby 50%. | jectives (AM | MOs). In six year | | thematics G | Soal # | | | <u> </u> |
| Baseline data | 2011-2012 | 2 2012-2013 | 5A : 2013-2014 | 2014 | 4-2015 | 2015-2016 | , 5 | 2016-2017 |
| 2010-2011 | | | | | | | _ | |
| | | | | | | <u> </u> | | |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups | s by ethnicity (White | Black | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Hispanic, Asian, Ameri satisfactory progress | can Indian) not makir | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5B | 3: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | nance: |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving | Process to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Anticipated Barrier Strategy 1 | | on or tion ponsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f | | lata, and refer | rence to "G | uiding Questions", identi | fy and define areas in need |
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #50 | 3 | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | nance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving | Process to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion oonsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | ' | Submitted | | <u>'</u> |
| | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f | | lata, and refer | rence to "G | uiding Questions", identi | fy and define areas in need |
| 5D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress | | king | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5D |) : | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | nance: |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving | Process to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |

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

| Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol | student achievement data, and lowing subgroup: | d refer | ence to "Gu | uiding Questions", identify | and define areas in need |
|--|---|---------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| 5E. Economically Disadv satisfactory progress in | vantaged students not maki mathematics. | ng | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5E: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Po | erformance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease St | udent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No | Data S | Submitted | | |

End of Middle School Mathematics 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 in need of improvement | f student achievement data, for the following group: | and re | eference to | o "Guiding Questions", i | dentify and define areas |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring a Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process | s to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of in need of improvement | f student achievement data, for the following group: | and re | eference to | co "Guiding Questions", id | dentify and define areas | |
|---|--|--------|-------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| 2. Florida Alternate As or above Level 7 in ma Mathematics Goal #2: | ssessment: Students scori athematics. | ng at | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | 13 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process | s to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | No | Data S | Submitted | | | |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students Percent of students making learning gains in math this making learning gains in mathematics. year will be at least 5 percentage points higher than the percent of the same students making learning gains last Mathematics Goal #3: year in their home schools. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: no data available no data available Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Most students enter Utilize the benchmark Review student Principal Progress of all program below grade assessments to target Lead Teacher grouping charts students on level in math assessments student specific needs for intervention Observe activities Classroom Increase the use of walkthrough data manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce math concepts

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.

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

| Algebra Goal #1: | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|------------------|--------|----------------------|
| 2012 Current Leve | l of Perf | ormance: | | | 2013 Exp | ected Leve | el of Performa | nce: | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem-Sol | ving Proces | s to I | ncrease St | udent Ach | nievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrie | r St | Strategy R | | Posit Resp for | on or lition ponsible Effectiven Strategy | | е | Eval | luation Tool |
| | • | | No | Data : | Submitted | | | • | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analys of improvement for t | | | ent data, and | d refer | ence to "Gu | uiding Ques | tions", identify | and (| define areas in need |
| 2. Students scoring and 5 in Algebra. | g at or a | bove Achieve | ment Level | s 4 | | | | | |
| Algebra Goal #2: | | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | | | 2013 Exp | ected Leve | el of Performa | nce: | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem-Sol | ving Proces | s to I | ncrease St | udent Ach | nievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrie | r St | rategy | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | | Eval | luation Tool |
| | | | No | | Submitted | 1 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Based on Ambitious | but Achi | evable Annual | Measurable (| Object | ives (AMOs |), AMO-2, I | Reading and Ma | ıth Pe | erformance Target |
| 3A. Ambitious but Ad Measurable Objective | es (AMO: | s). In six year | Algebra Goa | l # | | | | | Δ |
| school will reduce th by 50%. | eir achie | evement gap | 3A : | | | | | | ▼. |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 1-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-20 | 014 | 2014 | 1-2015 | 2015-2016 |) | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analys of improvement for t | | | ent data, and | d refer | ence to "Gu | uiding Ques | tions", identify | and (| define areas in need |
| 3B. Student subground Hispanic, Asian, Ar satisfactory progres Algebra Goal #3B: | oups by nerican | ethnicity (Wh Indian) not m | | | | | | | |

| 2012 Current Level of P | erformance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
|--|---|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | N | | Submitted | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo | student achievement data, ar Ilowing subgroup: | nd refer | ence to "Gi | uiding Questions", identify | and define areas in need | | |
| 3C. English Language Lo satisfactory progress in | earners (ELL) not making n Algebra. | | | | | | |
| Algebra Goal #3C: | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of P | ected Level of Performa | ance: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to I | ncrease S ⁻ | tudent Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or ion onsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | N | lo Data | Submitted | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of softimprovement for the fo | student achievement data, ar llowing subgroup: | nd refer | ence to "G | uiding Questions", identify | and define areas in need | | |
| 3D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress ir | oilities (SWD) not making n Algebra. | | | | | | |
| Algebra Goal #3D: | 3 | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of P | erformance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | N | | Submitted | | • | | |

| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f | | nt data, and refer | ence to "G | uiding Questions", ident | ify and define areas in need |
|---|--------------|--------------------|------------|--|------------------------------|
| 3E. Economically Disac satisfactory progress | _ | s not making | | | |
| Algebra Goal #3E: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perforr | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solv | ing Process to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data S | Submitted | | |
| | | | | | |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels
4 and 5 in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #2:

| 2012 Current Lev | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem | n-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | tudent | Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barr | ier | Strategy | | Posi Resp for | on or tion ponsible itoring | onsible Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | | | No | Data | Submitted | | | | | |
| Based on Ambitiou Target | us but | Achievable | e Annual Measurak | ole Ob | ojectives (A | MOs), | AMO-2, Reading a | and Math Performance | | |
| 3A. Ambitious but Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six yea reduce their achie 50%. | e Obje ar scho | ctives ool will | Geometry Goal # | | | | | <u> </u> | | |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 201 | 12-2013 | 2013-2014 | | 2014-20 | 15 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic, Asian, satisfactory prog | Ameri gress [‡] 3B: | ican India in Geome | try. | · K , | 2012 Evn | vootod | Level of Perforn | 20000 | | |
| 2012 Current Le | vei oi | Periorina | nce. | | 2013 EXP | ected | Level of Perform | larice. | | |
| | | Problem | n-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | tudent | t Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barr | ier | Strategy | | Posi Resp for | on or tion oonsible itoring | Deter | iveness of | Evaluation Tool | | |
| <u> </u> | | | No | Data | Submitted | | | | | |
| Based on the anal | | | | and r | reference to | o "Guid | ing Questions", ic | lentify and define area | | |
| 3C. English Lang satisfactory prog | uage | Learners | (ELL) not making | 9 | | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal # | ±3C: | | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Lev | vel of | Performa | nce: | | 2013 Exp | ected | Level of Perform | nance: | | |

| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | | |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| Anticipated Barrier | Posit Barrier Strategy Resp for | | on or ion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | Ŋ | No Data | Submitted | | | |
| | of student achievement data | | eference t | o "Guiding Questions", | identify and define area | |
| <u> </u> | abilities (SWD) not makir | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3D: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Positi Resp for | on or ion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | ľ | No Data | Submitted | | | |
| | of student achievement data for the following subgroup | | eference t | o "Guiding Questions", | identify and define area | |
| | advantaged students not progress in Geometry. | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3E: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfor | rmance: | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or ion onsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | 1 | | Submitted | I | | |

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | m(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 Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | |

| | Problem-Solving Process | s to Increase 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 areas in need of improv | | | d reference | to "Guiding Question | s", identify and define |
|---|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Students scoring at L Science Goal #1b: | | ı science. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | f Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfo | ormance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving F | Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievemen | t |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posi Res for | son or tion ponsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | |
| | | · | <u> </u> | | |

| 3 | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define reas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------|--|--|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Student | ts scoring at or above | | | | | | |
| Achievement Level 4 | in science. | | | | | | |
| Science Goal #2a: | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | | | |
| Posi Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp | | 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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7

| in science. | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| Science Goal #2b: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level o | f Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfo | rmance: | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving P | rocess to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp for | | on or tion Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | | | Submitted | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| lorida Alternate | Assessment High | h School | Science | e Goals | | |
| When using percentage 35)). | s, include the number o | f students th | e percentag | ge represents next to the | percentage (e.g., 70% | |
| Based on the analysis or areas in need of improv | | | I reference | e to "Guiding Questions | ", identify and define | |
| I. Florida Alternate A at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | | ts scoring | | | | |
| Science Goal #1: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level o | f Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfo | rmance: | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving P | rocess to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi for | | on or tion ponsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis or areas in need of improv | | | l reference | e to "Guiding Questions | ", identify and define | |
| 2. Florida Alternate A at or above Level 7 ir | Assessment: Student | | | | | |
| Science Goal #2: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level o | f 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 | | | | | | |

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

| * When using percentages, | include the number | of students the pe | ercentage represents | (e.g., 70% (| (35)). |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|

| ^ when using percentages | s, include the number | r or students th | e percemaç | ge represents (e.g., 70% | o (35)). |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of areas in need of improv | | | l reference | to "Guiding Question: | s", identify and define |
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. | | | | | |
| Biology Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving | Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievemen | t |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi Resp | | II)etermine | | Evaluation Tool | |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | |
| | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. | | | | | | |
| Biology Goal #2: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define a in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | | | | |
| Writing Goal #1a: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------|--|
| Anticipated Barrier | Pers Posi 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: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible Evaluation Tool Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring 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.

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

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| | ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| 1. Students scoring at | Achievement Level 3 in C | ivics. | | | |
| Civics Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp | | 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: | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels4 and 5 in Civics.Civics Goal #2: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | |

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

| Evidence-based Progr | arri(3)/ Material(3) | | A |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developn | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| · | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

| in need of improvement | for the following grou | p: | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Students scoring a History. | t Achievement Level | 3 in U.S. | | | |
| U.S. History Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving F | Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp | | on or tion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |
| | | | | | , |
| Based on the analysis of in need of improvement | | | eference t | o "Guiding Questions", i | dentify and define areas |
| 2. Students scoring a 4 and 5 in U.S. History | | ent Levels | | | |
| U.S. History Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving F | Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| | | Pers | on or | Process Used to | |

Monitoring

Strategy

Anticipated Barrier

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

Position

for

Responsible

No Data Submitted

Determine

Strategy

Effectiveness of

Evaluation Tool

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

| Evidence-based 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 U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Attendance | | | | |
| Attendance Goal #1: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| | | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| | | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |

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

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

1. Suspension

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

| Suspension Goal #1: | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|--|--|---------------------|
| 2012 Total Number of | In-School Suspensions | | 2013 Exp | ected Number of In-S | chool Suspensions |
| | | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | | | 2013 Exp School | ected Number of Stud | lents Suspended In- |
| | | | | | |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of School | Students Suspended Out- | of- | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Parent Involvement | | | | |
| Parent I nvolvement Goal #1: | | | | |
| *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: | | | |
| | | | | |

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage 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: | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to Increase S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

| * | When using percentages, | include th | he number o | f students the | percentage re | presents (e.a | J., 70% (| (35) |
|---|-------------------------|------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|------|
| | | | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|-----------------|--|--|
| 1. CTE | | | | | | |
| CTE Goal #1: | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsibl for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | | No Data Submitt | ed | | | |

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

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

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

CTE 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 |

Additional Goal(s)

ELL AMAO Goal Goal:

| | d on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the | | nd reference to "G | uiding Questions", identif | y and define areas | | |
|-------|---|---|--|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. EL | L AMAO Goal Goal | | | Percent of ELL students making learning gains in CELLA | | | |
| ELL A | MAO Goal Goal #1: | | higher than th | domains this year will be at least 5 percentage points higher than the percent of the same students making learning gains last year in their home school. | | | |
| 2012 | Current level: | | 2013 Expecte | ed level: | | | |
| no da | ta available | | no data availa | no data available | | | |
| | Prob | olem-Solving Process t | to Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | ELL students enter program without English language proficiency | Identify and assess all ELL students on CELLA Provide ELL students | ELL Contact Lead Teacher | Review monthly TERMS report; Review CELLA results | Home Language Survey; CELLA | | |
| 1 | | with appropriate instruction and strategies in listening/speaking, writing, and reading based on individual needs | | Classroom walkthroughs | Classroom walkthrough data | | |

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

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

| PD 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 | | | | | | | |

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

End of ELL AMAO Goal Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance



Are you a reward school: † Yes † No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| No data submitted | |

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

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

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found No Data Found No Data Found