

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: WABASSO SCHOOL

District Name: Indian River

Principal: Dr. Tom Gollery

SAC Chair: Mr. Thomas J. Moorehead

Superintendent: Dr. Frances J. Adams

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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	Dr. Tom Gollery	Doctorate	20.25	20.25	N/A

### INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

	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)
No data submitted					

## 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	Continue to provide high-quality, relevant inservice offerings to strengthen those teachers already declared "highly qualified" Involve teachers in mentoring activities throughout district	Dr. Tom Gollery	June 2012	

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

## Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
9	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	22.2%(2)	77.8%(7)	44.4%(4)	88.9%(8)	0.0%(0)	22.2%(2)	0.0%(0)

## 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
Geraldine Guaragna Barbara Assad	Leonora Koenig	Professional development in areas of instruction & classroom management.	Scheduled meetings; scheduled classroom observations

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RTI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based RTI Team is comprised of the following professionals: Principal; SSS; ESE Resource Specialist; School Psychologist; Related Therapists (OT/PT/S & L); and Classroom teachers.

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 school-based RTI Team meets regularly to review various diagnostic, screening, and progress monitoring data.

Subsequent activities and interventions are scheduled and directed via respective team reviews of student data. Initial referral is made through the school's ESE Resource Specialist, and relevant staff are then notified for participation on a respective review.

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 was taken by the school's principal & SAC Chairman relative to the RTI Team's opinions/concerns regarding the development of the current SIP.

#### 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.

Alternative Assessment (AA); Teacher-made assessment of student progress; and a variety of standardized assessment procedures through most relevant to student educational functioning level/need.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Inservice is provided via the school's regularly scheduled staff meetings (2x/month), and on an as needed basis.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

#### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

##### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Wabasso School is a "sui generis" of sorts when one defines public schooling within the district. It is the only ESE Center-School operating under the aegis of the SDIRC. As such, LLT at Wabasso School is comprised of administration and all instructional staff (teachers & teaching assistants).

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

LLT meets on an "as needed" basis (no less than 2x/year) in an attempt to fluidly define the literacy needs of Wabasso School's special needs student population. Specific students, and groups of students are at times identified for specific intervention/enrichment of literacy programming.

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

In light of the degree and severity of Wabasso School's special needs student population, the palmary effort of LLT is always aimed at "emergent literacy". In some cases, teachers are able to proceed beyond this "emergent" level in their instructional efforts, fostering student efficacy with functional reading, writing, and overall language development.

#### 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.

Efforts are made by all instructional staff, regardless of student level of functioning, to ensure the optimal achievement level in the critical area of reading. Reading instruction is both specifically addressed, and "interwoven" in all subject areas, including those emphasizing vocational skills.

**\*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?

Wabasso School has a legacy of effectual programming for adolescents in preparation for integration into the community & the workplace upon graduation. Sanctioned State of Florida coursework is utilized to prepare students for successful transition. Moreover, community partnerships have allowed students the opportunity to practice/develop "real-world" vocational skills in preparation for transition to the workplace.

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?

Wabasso School utilizes relevant coursework, "Transition IEP" Meetings (starting at age 14), and Community-Based Instructional opportunities to enhance successful transition into the community & the workplace. Further efforts are being commissioned by the SAC member Tony Mancuso. Tony is lobbying at the state level to provide for more equitable cost sharing of services beyond schooling.

**Postsecondary Transition**

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The school will increase the percentage of white students achieving "proficiency" on the state's AA from 24 % to 32 %
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% on state's AA	32% on state's AA

#### 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	Intellectual functioning of students; handicapping conditions that impact attendance, daily function, and intellectual growth	Utilization of a variety of "Code Emphasis" & "Meaning Emphasis" strategies to enhance student performance in reading	Classroom teachers	Quarterly review of achievement/improvement data	Teacher-made tests; Quarterly reports.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Students will increase reading achievement levels in 4,5,& 6 from 29% to 35% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%	35%

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student Handicapping condition	Differentiated, individualized instructional techniques utilizing a tech-based, multi-modal approach	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	On-going assessment procedures	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA

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.	Students will increase performance in the upper levels of AA
--	--

Reading Goal #2a:	(7-9) from 12% to 20%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
12% at levels 7-9 on State's AA	20% at levels 7-9 on State's AA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student intellectual functioning; handicapping condition that may inhibit/interfere with targeted progress	Utilization of more "Meaning Emphasis" reading strategies to facilitate higher order reasoning & commensurate performance	Classroom teachers	Monitoring of Quarterly Reports	Teacher-made tests; Quarterly Reports

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:	Students will raise reading achievement at level 7 from 4% to 10% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4%	10%

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized, differentiated instruction utilizing a multi-modal, tech-based approach.	Dr. Tom Gollery	Multi-dimensional on-going assessment procedures	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA
2	Student handicapping conditions	Differentiated, multi-modal instructional strategies	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Assessment on an ongoing basis, utilizing the "Quarterly Report" as a benchmark of sorts.	Quarterly Reporting; AA; ULS

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. Reading Goal #3a:	N/A-Data reported over the last two (2) years have been reported in differing formats, thus comparisons at this point may be less fruitful than similar comparisons in years to come.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A-2011 data will represent "baseline" for future comparisons in the area of "learning gains"	10% projected gain from 2011 to 2012 data

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	Intellectual status of students; effect of respective handicapping conditions upon reading achievement	Increased emphasis/time spent in literacy activity in each classroom; Utilization of a variety of both "Code Emphasis" & "Meaning Emphasis" reading approaches in each classroom	Classroom teachers	Ongoing monitoring of student progress; Data comparisons/disaggregations at end of 2010-2011 School Year	Teacher-made assessments; Data comparison protocol (Principal of School)

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3b:	10% or more students will make learning gains in Reading on AA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10%	20%

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized, differentiated instructional approach utilizing a multi-modal/tech-based focus in all subject areas	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive, on-going assessment process	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA

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:	Although the data from the last two school years lack contiguity for true comparative purposes, it is interesting to note that Wabasso School's students performing at the lowest "quartile" in Reading was reduced by 7% (87% to 80%)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% performing at the lowest quartile (levels 1-3) on AA in Reading	70% performing at the lowest quartile on AA 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
1	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized, differentiated instructional approach featuring an emphasis on	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive, on-going assessment procedures	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA



		technology and multi-sensory approaches			
2	Intellectual limitations of students; Effects of handicapping condition upon student progress in reading	Increased focus on creative strategies and time focused on reading that will move more students beyond the "Emergent" level of functioning	Classroom teachers	Specific monitoring of performance of students occupying the lowest quartile in reading; teacher-made assessment of student progress	Teacher assessment & recording of student progress; Quarterly Reports

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 # 5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5B:	The two ethnic minorities that comprise the majority of Wabasso School's ethnic minority student population are defined as "Black" and "Hispanic". It is projected that "Black" students will increase achievement from 13% to 22%, and "Hispanic" students will increase achievement from 0% to 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% ("Black" students); 00% ("Hispanic" students) as measured on the state's AA	44% ("Black" students); 10% ("Hispanic" students) as measured on the state's AA

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized, culturally-sensitive instructional approach featuring an emphasis upon use of technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive, on-going assessment procedures	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA
2	Low SES associated with both ethnic groups; intellectual limitations; handicapping conditions that may intervene negatively with student achievement	Continuing to model "Culturally Sensitive" teaching techniques/methodologies; promoting "Cultural Difference" approaches to teaching ethnic minorities; Participation in PIE	Classroom teachers; all Wabasso School staff	Quarterly Report monitoring; Teacher assessment of progress	Quarterly Report; Ongoing assessment; Principal observation/assessment

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:	N/A-Insufficient cohort data available for comparative purposes
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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	Severity of student handicapping condition & communication limitations	Individualized, cultural/linguistic sensitive instructional approaches featuring technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive, on-going assessment of student progress in this area	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA
2	Language, in addition to handicapping condition may intervene with student growth in reading of "prospective" ELL students.	Implementation of innovative reading strategies that take into account student variability with regard to language & intellect.	Classroom teachers; district ELL Specialist	To be determined by cooperative work of classroom teachers of prospective ELL students and district ELL specialists	Cella; Teacher-made assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	SWD students will increase reading achievement (measured on AA) from 20% in 2012 to 30% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% on State's AA	30% or better on State's AA

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized, differentiated instructional approaches featuring a tech-based, multi-modal focus	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive, on-going assessment of student progress	IEP; Quarterly reporting; AA
2	Intellectual capabilities; handicapping conditions that intervene in the effectiveness of reading interventions	Continue to implement reading strategies that are sensitive to individual learning style/preference, and have validity in fostering reading achievement in students with special needs	Classroom teachers	Teacher observation; teacher data collection on intervention efficacy; teacher recording/analysis of achievement data	Teacher-made assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Students who listed as "Economically Disadvantaged" at Wabasso
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

25% as measured by performance on State's AA			35% as measured by performance on State's AA		
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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized instructional strategies emphasizing enrichment and exposure to a variety of community-based experiences	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	On-going assessment of instruction and activities	Weekly meetings; IEP; Quarterly reports; AA
2	Increasing numbers of students occupying "Low SES". SES remains the single greatest predictor of school achievement.	Continue to implement strategies that foster "Resilience"-the key factor that allows students from Low SES backgrounds to achieve...Provide a school environment that reflects more Middle to High SES values & expectations of its students...Continue grant writing efforts aimed at raising funds for student enrichment	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal; SAC	Evaluation of ED student achievement in reading	Teacher-made assessment; Data analysis by principal

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
Individualized reading strategies	PreK-12	Geraldine Guaragna	School-wide	Inservice days; Quarterly meetings	Comprehensive, ongoing monitoring of student progress	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal

Reading 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 Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.				
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
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 read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.				
CELLA Goal #2:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students write in 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 Proficient in writing:				
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				

CELLA 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

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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 group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1b:	Elementary students will raise achievement in math at the 4, 5, & 6 levels by 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	10%

### 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	Severity of handicapping condition	Individualized, multi-dimensional math instruction featuring manipulatives and technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment of progress	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA; ULS

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 2a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving 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				

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 mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:	Students will increase the percentage achieving level 7 on AA by 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	10%

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Intensive, individualized math instruction featuring authenticity & technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going evaluation of progress	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA; ULS

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 mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 3b:	Students making learning gains will rise 10% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10%	20%

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	Severity of student handicapping condition		Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment of student progress	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA; ULS

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving 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				

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%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #					
	5A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:		Students of all ethnic backgrounds will demonstrate a 10% increase in manifested learning gains.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0%		10%			
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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Culturally sensitive, individualized math instruction featuring technology & authenticity	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive, on-going assessment of student progress	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA; ULS

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:		Although the cohort in this category is very small, students in this category will raise achievement gains by 10%			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0%		10			

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Culturally/linguistically sensitive math instruction featuring authenticity & technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive, on-going assessment of student progress	IEP; Quarterly reports; ULS; AA

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:		Students will make a 10% increase in learning gains in 2013			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0%		10%			

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized math instruction featuring a multi-sensory, tech-based approach	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive ongoing assessment og student progress	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA; ULS

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	ED students will make 10% learning gains in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	10%

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	Severity of student handicapping condition & SES	Individualized math instruction featuring enrichment, authenticity, and technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive, on-going assessment of student progress	IEP; AA; Quarterly reports; ULS

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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 group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	Middle school students will raise achievement in levels 4, 5, & 6 from 25% to 30% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25%	30%

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized math instruction featuring authenticity & technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment of student progress	IEP; AA; Quarterly reports; ULS

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 2a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving 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				

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 2b:	Students will raise achievement at level 7 by 10% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	10%

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized math instruction featuring technology and authenticity	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment of student progress	IEP; AA; ULS; Quarterly reports

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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 group:

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

Mathematics Goal #4:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving 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				

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%.			Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:			All ethnic groups will reduce % not making satisfactory progress from 75% to 50% in 2013		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
75%			50%		
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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized, culturally sensitive math instruction focusing on authenticity & technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment of student progress	IEP; AA; ULS; Quarterly reports

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	N/A

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:	SWD will decrease % of those not making progress from 75% to 50% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75%	50%

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized math instruction featuring authenticity & technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment of student progress	AA; IEP; Quarterly reports; ULS

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5E:	ED students will decrease the percentage of those not making progress from 83% to 50% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83%	50%

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized math instruction emphasizing enriching activity	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment of student progress	Quarterly reports; IEP; AA; ULS

## 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:	Students will increase math performance at the 4, 5, & 6 levels on AA from 33% to 40% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33%	40%

### 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	Severity of student handicapping condition	individualized, multidimensional, authentic math instruction featuring technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment	IEP; Quarterly; AA

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	Students will raise achievement in level 7 of AA by 10% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	10%

### 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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized, multi-dimensional math instruction featuring technology applications	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment of progress	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA

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 making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	Students will make learning gains of 10% on AA in 2013
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
10%			20%		
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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized, multidimensional instruction in math featuring authenticity & technology	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment of progress	IEP; Quarterly reports; AA

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

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

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

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:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				



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

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 # 3A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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.  Algebra Goal #3B:		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>

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				

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3C:		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>

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				

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

## 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

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 group:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.  Geometry 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
No Data Submitted				

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%.	Geometry Goal #				
	3A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

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

Geometry Goal #3B:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Geometry Goal #3C:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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:

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 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				

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Authentic applications of mathematics	PreK-12	Dr. Tom Gollery	School-wide	Inservice days; Quarterly meetings	Comprehensive, ongoing monitoring of student progress	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal

Mathematics 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 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:	Students will increase % of performance in levels 4-6 from 33% to 50% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33%	50%

### 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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized & group project-based instruction	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive assessment of student progress	Quarterly Reports; IEP; AA; ULS

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1b:	Students will increase achievement in level 7 from 33% to 50% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33%	50%

### 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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized & project-based	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive assessment of student	Quarterly reports; AA; IEP;

		instruction		progress	ULS
2	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized & project-based instruction	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive assessment of student progress	Quarterly reports; AA; ULS; IEP

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 science.

Science Goal #2a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:

Students will increase % performing at level 7 on the AA from 14% to 20% in 2013

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

14%

20%

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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized & project-based instruction	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive monitoring of student progress	AA; ULS

## 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:		Students will increase % of performance in levels 4-6 from 33% to 50% in 2013			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
33%		50%			
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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized & group project-based instruction	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive assessment of student progress	Quarterly Reports; IEP; AA; ULS

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:		Students will increase achievement in level 7 from 33% to 50% in 2013			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
33%		50%			
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	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized & project-based instruction	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive assessment of student progress	Quarterly reports; AA; IEP; ULS

## Biology 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 Biology. Biology Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			



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

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
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
Project-based applications of Science	3-12	Thomas J. Moorehead	School-wide	Ongoing; Project based	Ongoing monitoring of student participation and progress	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Promote authentic, project-based learning	Materials relevant to respective projects (2 per year)	Donation; Both school & internal funds	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Technology			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$1,500.00</b>

End of Science Goals

## Writing Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:			Students will raise achievement at a level 4 or higher from 36% to 50% in 2013		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
36%			50%		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Severity of student handicapping condition	Individualized instruction	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive assessment of student progress	AA; ULS

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
Developmental writing	3-12	Geraldine Guaragna	School-wide	Inservice days; Quarterly meetings	Comprehensive ongoing monitoring of student progress	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal

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)).

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 Civics.	N/A
Civics Goal #1:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
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
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 Civics.  Civics Goal #2:	N/A
--	-----

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

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

End of Civics Goals

## U.S. History 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 U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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
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						

U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
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:	Student attendance is affected by numerous variables at Wabasso School. In that the school serves a significant portion of students possessing serious /chronic medical conditions, great sensitivity and attention is given to matters of students attendance.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
88%	90%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
5	3
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
0	0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time interval for students experiencing chronic absence from school enrollment to possible HHB placement.	Refine the transition process of school absence to placement in HHB	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	TST Process	Data monitoring (TERMS)
2					

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

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

PD 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 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 Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	To maintain a posture of a continuum of responses to behavioral infractions on campus.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
0	0
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	



	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Differences of staff opinion on student discipline	Meet regularly to refine intervention on a continuum scale	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal  Alex Remy, Student Support Specialist	Evaluation of behavioral data	Observation Graphing Charting Recording

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
Behavioral intervention; TEAM Training; CPI	PreK-12	Alex Remy, Student Support Specialist	School-wide	Quarterly; As needed	As needed meetings following observations/interventions	Alex Remy, Student Support Specialist

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

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

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

1. Dropout Prevention  Dropout Prevention Goal #1:  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	Although "Dropout Rate" has not been an issue in past years at Wabasso School, it is our goal to continue to focus on the provision of meaningful academic & vocational programming for adolescent ESE students in hopes to prepare them for gainful employment & successful adjustment within the community upon graduation.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
0%	0%
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
100%	100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of skills in the areas of functional academics, prosocial skill, and vocational preparation	Continue to provide educational services via each student's IEP; services that address individual needs that similarly prepare each student for successful integration within the community & the workplace upon graduation	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Quarterly monitoring with teacher's responsible for student programming	Student Quarterly Reports; Weekly observation; Checklists

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						

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

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

*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 involvement is essential to the student success in school. The professional literature contains evidence of various levels of parent participation deemed related to student success in school. It is our goal to involve all parents in one fashion or another in this participatory process.			
Parent Involvement Goal #1:  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
100%		100%			
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	Parent time; transportation; economics.	Daily notes home via "notebooks"; Monthly Newsletter; periodic memo's to alert parents to items/events of interest	Dr. Tom Gollery, principal  All Teaching Staff at school	Feedback from parents via various means (ie; recording of parent response; surveys)	Data recording; Survey 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						

Parent Involvement 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
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*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:		Teachers will use no less than 2 STEM projects during the course of the 2012-2013 to increase the % of students performing at level 4 or better (30%-2012 to 40% 2013).			
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	Severity of student handicapping condition; lack of understanding of STEM	Provision of no less than 2 major STEM projects during the 2012-2013 school year.	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Monitoring of STEM projects on an ongoing basis.	Quarterly reports; IEP; AA; ULS

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Procur donations for STEM Projects	Materials specific to STEM projects will vary by project	Donation	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
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: \$500.00

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:			Students will continue to participate in pre-vocational, vocational, and community-based instructional offerings		
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	Severity of student handicapping condition	School & community-based instructional offering featuring authenticity of	Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal	Comprehensive on-going assessment of student progress	IEP; ULS; Quarterly reports

experience
------------

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 Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Using internal funding, students will be provided with necessary equipment & uniforms necessary for participation	Internal Fund Accounts	Internal Account (Fundraisers; benevolences)	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$2,500.00
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: \$2,500.00

End of CTE Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

### Refine data collection & analysis procedures Goal:

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. Refine data collection & analysis procedures Goal  Refine data collection & analysis procedures Goal #1:	In light of the nature & operation of Wabasso School, data collection & analysis procedures fulfill an essential role in the instructional paradigm. As such, it is critical for all instructional staff to continually refine skills relative to this important aspect of instruction.			
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:			
100% of Instructional staff are well-versed and functional in their use of anecdotal/narrative forms of data collection. 50% are versed and practitioners of the use of more empirical/ABA cetered approaches to data collection/analysis.	75% or greater of Wabasso School's instructional staff will become adequately "versed" and active practitioners in more empirical forms of collection & analysis.			
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				

### 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
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Refine data collection & analysis procedures Goal(s)*



## FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	Promote authentic, project-based learning	Materials relevant to respective projects (2 per year)	Donation; Both school & internal funds	\$1,500.00
STEM	Procur donations for STEM Projects	Materials specific to STEM projects will vary by project	Donation	\$500.00
CTE	Using internal funding, students will be provided with necessary equipment & uniforms necessary for participation	Internal Fund Accounts	Internal Account (Fundraisers; benevolences)	\$2,500.00
				Subtotal: \$4,500.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
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: \$4,500.00

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

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 (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

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  
No Data Found  
No Data Found