FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: NORTHVIEW HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Escambia

Principal: Gayle B. Weaver

SAC Chair: Sandy Brown

Superintendent: Malcolm Thomas

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/29/2012



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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|----------|------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | Master's Degree in Education and Bachelor's Degree in English from Livingston University | | | School Grade 2011-2012 NA 2010-2011 B 2009-2010 B 2008-2009 Dp 2007-2008 B 2006-2007 C 2005-2006 C 2004-2005 C 2003-2004 C 2002-2003 C 2001-2002 C 2000-2001 C 1999-2000 C 1998-1999 C |

| Principal | Gayle B. Weaver | (University of West Alabama). Certifications include School Principal - All Levels, History 6- 12, and English 6-12. | 17 | 20 | AYP 2010-2011 90% No 2009-2010 79% No 2008-2009 87% No 2006-2007 82% No 2006-2007 82% No 2004-2005 77% No 2004-2005 77% No 2003-2004 90% No 2002-2003 No FCAT Learning Gains Reading 52% Math 67% Lower Quartile Reading 47% Math 71% |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|----|----|--|
| Assis Principal | Gerry Pippins | Master of Science, Educational Leadership, University of South Alabama. Master of Science, Physical Education P-12, Troy State University. Bachelor of Science, Physical Education, Troy State University | | 6 | AYP as Principal, Samson High School (AL): 2011-12 Yes 2010-11 No AYP as Assistant Principal, Zion Chapel High School (AL): 2009-10 Yes 2008-09 Yes 2007-08 Yes AYP as Assistant Principal, Samson High School (AL): 2006-07 No |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|--------------|------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| All Core | Margaret Blum | BA - Cultural Anthropology - University of West Florida MA - Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology - University of West Florida MA - Secondary Education - University of West Florida) Certification - Social Studies Reading Endorsed - K-12 History | 2 | 2 | Analysis of the 2011-2012 FAIR data shows that the percentage of students whose scores increased by 10 points on each segment of FAIR are as follows: 41% on the Reading Comprehension; 46% on the Maze; and 33% on the Word Analysis. The percent of students who increased their Lexile level by 50 points or more is 49%. |

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) |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Use of district's applicant internet-based employment system. Provide mentoring service to new teachers. Staff development for new teachers, including providing for a day of on-campus orientation to the school and/or district. Gather information through Classroom Walkthroughs and provide feedback. | 1. Gayle B. | | |

| developm Individua 6. Utilize Developn May also and helpf 7. Use m dialogue learning a 8. Use of | pment of the district's personal development for the dual's Personal Staff Development Plan (IPDP) ize newly-implemented Truenorthlogic Staff | 2. DISTRICT STATT | On-going through June 1, 2013. | |
|---|---|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
|---|---|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--|

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out- of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|--|
| Two core subject teachers | The teachers must |
| (5.4%) are not highly | complete certification |
| qualified for the 2012-13 | requirements during the |
| school year. | 2012-13 school year. |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 37 | 8.1%(3) | 27.0%(10) | 48.6%(18) | 27.0%(10) | 59.5%(22) | 94.6%(35) | 10.8%(4) | 5.4%(2) | 8.1%(3) |

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|--------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Natalie Nall | Aaron Thompson | Mrs. Nall and Mr. Thompson share the gymnasium for their classes so there are built-in opportunites for communication. Mrs. Nall is an experienced teacher who understands the procedures and policies of the school and district. | New Teacher Orientation Frequent Meetings Observations/Recommendations Direction on Lesson Plan development, instructional and supervision strategies, use of all computer-based applications, and completion of paperwork. |
| | | Mrs. Smith and Mr. Nichols occupy classrooms that share an office. The close | New Teacher Orientation Frequent Meetings Observations/Recommendations |

| Donna Smith | Daniel Nichols | proximity, Mrs. Smith's experience and expertise of school and district policies and procedures make her a logical mentor for Mr. Nichols. | Direction on Lesson Plan development, instructional and supervision strategies, use of all computer based applications, and completion of paperwork. |
|---------------|----------------|---|--|
| Billy Johnson | James Moretz | Mr. Johnson is the Dean of students and will work closely with Mr. Moretz in assigning students to In School Suspension, monitoring student progress, and evaluation of the ISS program and its effectiveness. | New Teacher Orientation Frequent Meetings Observations/Recommendations Direction on Lesson Plan development, instructional and supervision strategies, use of all computer based applications, and completion of paperwork. |

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

Supplemental Educational Services provides extra help for students in academic subjects such as reading, language arts and mathematics, provided free-of-charge to certain students. These services are provided outside the regular school day—before or after school, on weekends, or in the summer.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Services for migrant children are provided by the district level Title I office. After thorough checking of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system and our local Student data Base, we have determined that there are no migrant children at Northview High school.

Title I, Part D

Services to neglected and delinquent students are provided by various district-operated programs. These services are overseen by the Title I office. Our school does not serve Title I, Part D students.

Title II

Professional development is offered at both the school and district level. Please see each goal area for specific professional development activities (inservice education).

Title III

Services for English Language Learners are required by law. Several ESOL centers are provided at various key locations in the district. Students who do not attend centrally-located school-based sites attend their zoned school where ESOL- endorsed teachers provide services. All teachers who serve ELL identified students have ESOL endorsement of their teaching certificate. Our school is an ESOL Center but we currently have no ELL students enrolled in grades 9-12.

Title X- Homeless

The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social service referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This program is overseen by the district Title I office. At Northview High School we have identified eight homeless students and provide additional assistance to these students and their families.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI monies were reduced and/or eliminated from our school's budget.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporate guest speakers, counseling, and classroom discussion. Red Ribbon Week is held in October with school-wide activities and guest speakers. Through our School-Wide Behavior Management Plan, we provide training for faculty, staff, and students regarding bullying. The Jeffrey Johnson Stand Up for All Students Act requires our school district to adopt an official policy prohibiting bullying and harassment of students and staff on school grounds, at school-sponsored events, and through school computer networks. In addition, our district has launched the "bullying" reporting website where bullies may be reported anonymously.

Nutrition Programs

Our school is committed to continue offering nutritional choices in its cafeteria. This includes salad bar, ala carte items, and self serve options. Our school is also a Healthier Generation Alliance School. The school follows the district's nutrition program for summer feeding at select sites. Additional programs and staff address the obesity issue, especially in elementary age children.

Housing Programs

This program is offered at the district level and overseen by the Title I District Office and is not applicable to our school.

Head Start

This program is offered at the district level and several Head Start programs are housed at various elementary schools in the district. This program is overseen by the Title I pre-kindergarten office.

Adult Education

Adult Education is offered in the form of Community School courses, which allows students over the age of sixteen to recover lost credits in core classes. In the 2011-2012 school year, Northview had 36 students take advantage of this program. Of those, 19 earned a passing grade and/or credit. We offered an on-campus class for students in English 2-4 in the spring to recover lost credit from the fall semester.

Career and Technical Education

Northview High School has six areas of Career Technical Education: Business, Agriscience, Construction/Drafting, Family and Consumer Services, Diversified Cooperative Tech, and Culinary Arts. Business classes include Digital Publishing, and computer classes. Construction and Drafting classes are offered on three levels of I, II, III. Northview has both Culinary Arts and Graphic Arts Academies.

Job Training

Students in grades 11th and 12th are allowed to participate in OJT (on job training), which allows them to work with employers in order to gain work experience. This experience can count as electives if all required courses are completed. Students served through Exceptional Student Education (ESE) who are earning an ESE Diploma also have the opportunity to earn job skills either through paid off-campus positions or unpaid on-campus training positions. Vocational Rehabilitation also offers services for several of our ESE students in assisting them with job training and placement during and after high school.

Other

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

-School-based MTSS/Rtl Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal-Gayle Weaver; Assistant Principal-Gerry Pippins RtI chairperson-Barbara Luker Student Services Personnel-Heather Crumm Teachers-Megan Carroll, Anna Barry, Terri Jernigan, Rachel Pleasant

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 Leadership Team functions to answer one question: How does Northview High School develop and maintain a problemsolving system that will bring out the best possible result for our school, our teachers, and our students.

The team will meet to review data, review links to instructional decisions, and to review progress monitoring data at each grade level: to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks and to identify those students at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting the benchmarks. The team will use professional development to assist teachers and will collaborate, problem solve, share effective teaching methods and practices, and make decisions.

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

The MTSS/RtI team is instrumental in making plans to address the academic deficits of the lowest performing students and in recommending the specific times to meet these needs to minimize time out of class, which can often make students fall further behind.

-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.

Baseline data will be derived from Quarterly required Differentiated Accountability testing, FAIR data, Subject Area Examination (SAE) tests, and FCAT results from all previous administrations for Reading. Additional diagnostic data will be gathered from summative assessments in the reading classes. Behavioral data will be available from the dean, guidance counselors, and District intervention Specialist.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

During the 2009-2010 school year, all staff were introduced to RtI professional development introductory activities in both whole group and small group settings. During the 2012-13 school year, team leaders and subject area department chairs will continue to receive training which will be shared within their teams.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Documentation Guideline for RTI Tier I: Note: no forms required (School Data/Leadership Team will have data) Tier II: · PMP · Tier II Worksheet · If behavioral concerns, ERASE form and graph instead of Tier II Worksheet Student Record Review · Developmental Social History · Vision Hearing Screening Form Note: Interventions must be implemented for a minimum of 6 weeks, academic data graphed at least bi-weekly with a minimum of 4 data points (including baseline). Behavior data must be graphed daily. If behavior is of primary concern the school psychologist will be consulted at this level. **The team may decide to complete the second observation (Observation Form) and collect additional data (Screening/Diagnostic Form) at this time. Please include the School Psychologist, Reading/Math Coach, Speech/Language Pathologist and/or other professionals in this process if additional data is warranted. Tier III: · Tier III Form · Intervention Documentation Log · Observation Form · Screening/Diagnostic Form (if needed) · FBA/PBIP if behavior is primary concern Note: Interventions will be implemented at this level for a minimum of nine weeks with academic data graphed weekly, behavior data graphed daily. Tier III Review: Following implementation of Tier III interventions (for a minimum of 9 weeks) data is analyzed at a Tier III Review meeting and documented on the Tier III

Review Worksheet.
If student's progress is determined positive: fade out or continue interventions as deemed necessary (continue monitoring progress)
If student's progress is determined questionable: team decides to modify and/or change interventions (documented on Supplemental Progress Monitoring Form)

· If student's progress is determined to be poor: reassess hypothesis and

change intervention or request a comprehensive evaluation

** Even after a comprehensive evaluation is requested, interventions and progress

monitoring (OPM graphs) will continue during completion of evaluation.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

-School-Based Literacy Leadership Team—

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team is led by the Literacy Coach and composed of varying subject area teachers across the school: science, math, social studies, and elective teachers.

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

The school-based LLT meets as a group, or one-on-one with the Literacy Coach or Assistant Principal to discuss assessment results and student progress. During these meetings, lesson plans, data binders, and student portfolios will be utilized to guide direction.

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

The major initiative this year will be parent/guardian involvement. During Open House 2012-2013, teachers will discuss the importance of student success through parent/guardian involvement. Parents will be directed to the dates of progress reports, report cards, and access to the Parent Portal to know their child's progress. The Guidance Department will assist with teacher and parent conferences.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/16/2012)

*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.

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Literacy Coach will work with all content area teachers to emphasize necessity of good reading skills for success in every subject area. Literacy Coach will share reading strategies relevant to class content and observe teachers and /or co-teach to implement strategies. All Reading Teachers will collaborate with content teachers to support strategies and help differentiate instruction. Reading teachers will differentiate instruction based on available data. They will emphasize Sunshine State Standards through Continuous Improvement Models (CIM) focus lessons and daily classroom instructions.

*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

Northview High School provides a variety of classes that are an intrical part of the future for student success. We provide students with College prepatory classes and opportunities for College Credits through the Dual Enrollment Program at the local colleges as well as prepare them daily for the rigor of college and what the work place demands. Students are encouraged to complete Industrial Certification in Photoshop, Dreamweaver, Flash, Construction Technology, Production Technology, and Autodesk Inventor. They receive instruction related to Construction, Production and Manufacturing Corporations, Drafting, Agricultural and Digital Design that reflects on their core academic courses. All students are encouraged by their teachers to take a vested interest in passing the FCAT 2.0, EOC, and/or applicable concordant ACT/SAT scores as well as Industry Certification. If these strategies are implemented, Northview High School's graduation rate should remain high and prepare students for entering the workforce after high school and/or college.

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?

Northview High School offers students elective courses in art, business, technology, and career study. Many of these focus on job skills and offer students internships. Students and parents are encouraged to participate in a course selection fair that exposes them to next year's curriculum. Every Spring each student meets with a faculty member who guides the student during registration for the following year to decide what classes will be taken and are advised "one-on-one" concerning graduation requirements and Bright Futures eligibilities. This allows the students to personally ask questions about various courses of study and to make selections based on their goals and/or desires. Northview High School also distributes Academic Transcripts twice per year to each student.

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

A variety of strategies have been implemented to prepare high school students for post secondary education and employment. Specific programs and or initiatives that are used at the school and district level as well as increase rigor, in all of the following core academic areas: Math, English, Science and Writing include:

- Dual Enrollment
- Early College
- Career Academies
- High School Showcases
- AVID
- Career and Technical Education Classes
- Advanced Placement Oppertunities
- College Expo
- Making High School Count Programs
- Making College Count Programs
- College Tours
- College Rep Visits

The faculty at Northview will attempt to continue and improve upon these programs and initiatives. Every student will be encouraged to pass the FCAT 2.0 and be advised toward post-graduate goals. Progress Monitoring Plans will have strategies that will enhance the education of all students and improve upon post secondary students' goals.

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 neer of improvement for the following group:

| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a: | Increase by 1% the number of students scoring achievemen Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 in reading. |
|--|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 52% (286 tested) Met High Standards in Reading (Source: http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/) | At Northview High School, the percentage of 9th and 10th grade students scoring 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will improve by 1%, to a total of 53%. Source: fldoe.org/FCATDemographics) |

| | 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 | Lower socio-economic students and lower 35% of student population.Students lack engagement. Literacy Coach position is .5 at school. | Include higher-order questions in lesson plans. Increased rigor in the reading programs, EDGE and READ 180. Incorporation of more Kagan strategies and Marzano strategies within the teaching strategies. | Principal, the Assistant Principal, and the Literacy Coach | Lesson plans will be reviewed during Classroom Walkthroughs, Frequent monitoring of data, Documentation of Kagan and/or Danielson strategies, etc. | Classroom Walkthrough data source and focused walkthroughs to determine frequency of higher order questions and documentation Learning Communities. | | |
| 2 | Lower socio-economic students and lower 35% of student population.Students lack engagement. Reading Coach position is .5 at school. | The school will implement the FAIR and RCAT assessments to monitor student progress. | Principal, Assistant Principal and the Literacy Coach | Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule. Review new RCAT data. | sessions for FAIR assessments. | | |
| 3 | Lower socio-economic students and lower 35% of student population.Students lack engagement. Literacy Coach position is .5 at school. | The Literacy Coach will provide professional development incorporating reading strategies across the curriculums to all teachers. | Literacy Coach | Literacy Coach will observe classrooms, mentor teachers, provide modeling, provide resources, etc. | Student work and teacher observations will determine effectiveness of reading strategies | | |

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

| | Northview High School has no students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA). |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 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:

 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.
 The percentage of students scoring levels 4 or 5 remains above 20%.

 Reading Goal #2a:
 2012 Current Level of Performance:
 2013 Expected Level of Performance:

 23% of 287 students in grades 9 - 10, scored either a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test. (Source: fldoe.org/FCATDemographics)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Person or Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Evaluation Tool Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Lower socio-economic Include higher-order All teachers, Student assessment, Teacher made students and lower 35% questions in lesson plans. Literacy Coach, classroom walkthroughs, assessments, FAIR of student Increased rigor reading Administration FAIR Assessment, RCAT Assessment, RCAT programs, EDGE for 10th population.Students lack tests, Classroom tests, FL Achieves engagement. Literacy grade and READ 180 for observations, Department FCAT Explorer, Coach position is .5 at Level 1 9th graders. meetings FCAT 2.0 Reading school. 2013 To include reading FCAT Lower socio-economic Literacy Coach, Student assessments, Teacher made 2.0 specifications with all Assistant Principal students and lower 35% Classroom Walkassessments, FAIR of student subjects. & Principal throughs, classroom Assessment, RCAT population.Students lack tests, FL Achieves 2 observations, and engagement. Literacy department meetings FCAT Explorer, Coach position is .5 at FCAT 2.0 Reading school. 2013

| | on the analysis of student provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | g Questions", identify and a | define areas in nee | |
|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--|
| Stude readi | orida Alternate Assessm ents scoring at or above ng. ng Goal #2b: | | 0 | Northview High School has no students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA). | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | o Increase Studer | nt 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 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1 | | | | | |

| | d on the analysis of studen | | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and | define areas in nee |
|-------|--|--|--|---|--|
| | provement for the following CAT 2.0: Percentage of s | |) | | |
| gains | s in reading. | | | students making learning 2 declined by 4%. | gains in grades nine |
| Read | ing Goal #3a: | | and terrior 201 | 2 declined by 4 %. | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | mance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | |
| | 12,51% of students made I ool Accountability Report: S | | Reading. | f students will make Learn ability Report: School Gra | 0 |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process 1 | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lower socio-economic students and lower 35% of student population.Students lack engagement. Literacy Coach position is .5 at school. | The school will implement the FAIR assessments, three times during the year, to assess and monitor student progress. The students will also take the RCAT tests. They will be given a pre and post test, 9 weeks tests and also sememster exams. Literacy Coach will serve as a resource for reading teachers, in order to help implement more successful teaching strategies to become more successful with those students with history of not making learning gains. | Reading Teachers | Review FAIR and RCAT data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule. | Printout and diagnosis of FAIR assessments. Prin out of RCAT data. |
| 2 | Lower socio-economic students and lower 35% of student population.Students lack engagement. Literacy Coach position is .5 at school. | | Principal, and the Literacy Coach | Lesson plans and data notebooks will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted when requested to Assistant Principal. | Classroom Walkthrough log/data and focused walkthroughs to determine frequency of higher order questions and other applicable strategies, such a Kagan. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b: | Northview High School has no students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA). | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |

N/A

N/A

| Problem-Solving | Process | to | Increase | Student | Achievemen | t |
|---------------------|----------|----|------------|---------|------------------|---|
| i i obioini oonning | 11000000 | .0 | 11101 0450 | oradoni | / 10/11/01/10/11 | c |

| | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---------------------|----------|--|--|-----------------|
| 1 | ſ | 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 neer of improvement for the following group:

| | In 2012,the percent of students in the Lower Quartile increased by 1%. |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

In grades 9 and 10, 45% of the students in the lower quartile In grades 9 and 10, 50% of the students will make Learning made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test. Gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.

| | 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 | Lower socio-economic students and lower 35% of student population. Students lack engagement. Literacy Coach position is .5 at school. | Small group instruction, mentoring, tutoring, Kagan strategies, Literacy Coach resource strategies, etc. | Principal, Assistant Principal, and the Literacy Coach | Teacher made assessments, teacher observations, Classroom Walkthroughs, Learning Community revelations, etc. | Classroom Walkthrough log/data, and focused walkthroughs to determine frequency of small group instruction, documentation from Learning Communities. | | |
| 2 | Lower socio-economic students and lower 35% of student population. Students lack engagement. Literacy Coach position is .5 at school. | Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FAIR and RCAT assessment data for all students with disabilities. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within 90-minute reading block. Utilize Advisor- Mentoring Program, with more rigor. More tutoring and one-on-one assistance. | Literacy Coach, Reading Teachers, Assistant Principal, and Principal | Student progress is assessed using FAIR and RCAT Assessment. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated. | FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring data wi be used to determine progres from Benchmarks. | | |
| 3 | Lower socio-economic students and lower 35% of student population. Students lack engagement. Reading Coach position is .5 at school. | Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR and RCAT data and will include explicit instruction, guided practice, and independent practice. | Literacy Coach, Reading Teachers, Assistant Principal, and Principal | Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring three times a year for students and RCAT pre and post tests, 9 week exams, and semester exams. Provide supplemental materials. Literacy Coach provides resources and strategies. | FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring data and RCAT data wil be used to determine progres from Benchmarks. | | |

| Basec | l on Amb | itious but Achie | vable Annual | Measurable Ob | jectiv | ves (AMOs), AM | 10-2, | Reading and Math Pe | erformance Target |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|--------------|--|--------|--|-------------------------------|
| Measu | urable Ob I will red | but Achievable jectives (AMOs) uce their achiev | . In six year | | view | / High School, 0% in six yea | | achievement leve | l gap will be 🔺 |
| | line data 0-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-201 | 4 | 2014-201 | 5 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | | 52 | 3 | 66 | | 70 | | 74 | |
| | | analysis of stude at for the followi | | | efere | nce to "Guiding | g Ques | stions", identify and | define areas in nee |
| Hispa satisi | anic, Asia | ubgroups by e an, American I progress in rea #5B: | ndian) not n | | | | | roups of White, Blac ake satisfactory proc | |
| 2012 | Current | Level of Perfo | rmance: | | 4 | 2013 Expected | d Leve | el of Performance: | |
| | | making adequa conomically Disa | | | á | attaining the fo | llowin | adequate yearly prog g: cally Disadvantaged ⁻ | |
| | | | Problem-Sol | lving Process | to I n | icrease Studer | nt Ach | nievement | |
| | Antic | ipated Barrier | St | rategy | | Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | students of stude Student engager Coach p school, within h | ocio-economic and lower 35% nt population. s lack nent. Literacy osition is .5 at lack of compute ouseholds with comes, low self | activities t involved in more comm through ne semester)of increase p understand operation and the as available f | nt through to get parents a school more, munication ewsletters Open House one each designed to arent ding of the of the school ssistance or the especially for are | Read Assi | racy Coach, ding Teachers, stant Principal, Principal | Read | parison of FCAT 2.0 ing subgroup cores een 2012 and 2013 | FCAT 2.0 2013 Reading Test |
| | | | | | efere | nce to "Guiding | g Ques | stions", identify and | define areas in nee |
| 5C. E satisi | nglish La | anguage Learn progress in rea #5C: | ers (ELL) no | | r | N/A | | | |

| l | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| ſ | | |
| I | | |
| | N/A | N/A |

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

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

| | | 1 | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|--|--|-----------------|
| | 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 referred of improvement for the following subgroup: | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | A strong effort to implement more co-teaching and inclusion teaching practices will be designed to increase SWD learning | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| Students With Disabilities had an 86% of not meeting proficiency levels. | SWD will show a decrease to 85% of students not making proficiency levels. | | | | |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1 | Acclimation of teachers to co-teaching and inclusion models; Acclimation of students to increased rigor for academics | Implementing the increased co-teaching and inlusion models, Increasing tutoring and monitoring, and Providing more incentives for increased Learning Gains | ESE Department, and Administration | Success on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading | 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading | | |
| 2 | 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 nee |
|---|
| of improvement for the following subgroup: |

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | The subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged met proficiency levels.(Source: School Grades.fldoe.org) |
|--|--|
| 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 |

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 fc Monitoring |
|---|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| Escambia County Reading Teachers' Association (ECRTA) Conference. | School Wide | Escambia County Reading Dept. | ESE Teachers, Science Teacher, Language Arts Teacher | August 7,2012 | Implementation in the classroom | Literacy Coach |
| READ 180 Conversion Training | 9th Grade Level 1 Reading | Scholastic | READ 180 Teacher | August 8, 2012; November 6, 2012 | Implementation in the classroom. Classroom Coaching Day | Literacy Coach, Scholastic |
| ccss | School-wide | Literacy Coach | School-wide | Faculty Meetings; Monthly Dept. Meetings | Classroom Walkthroughs; Meetings with Literacy Coach; Lesson Plans | Literacy Coach |
| Data Meetings | School-wide | Principal and Vice Principal | School Wide | Monthly Meetings | Classroom Walkthroughs; Lesson Plans; Data Notebooks | Principal and Vi Principal |

Reading Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|----------------|-----------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Keynote speakers and breakout sessions designed to enhance reading instruction. | Six Teachers attending the Escambia County Reading Teachers' Association Conference | Faculty Funds | \$135.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$135.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$135.00 |
| | | | |

End of Reading Goa

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: Northview High School does not assess any the CELLA test. Not applicable. | | | | | any students with | |
|---|---|----------|--|--|-------------------|--|
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | | | | | | |
| 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 | |

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

1

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----|--|
| 2. Sti | udents scoring proficie | nt in reading. | | | | |
| CELL | A Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Percent of Stu | idents Proficient in rea | ading: | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process | to Increase Stude | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible for Monitoring Strategy Evaluation Tool | | | | | |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | | |
|---|-----|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. Northview High School does not assess any students with the CELLA Goal #3: Very students Northview High School does not assess any students with the CELLA test. Not applicable. | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process | to Increase Stude | ent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy | | | | | |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s) | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of CELLA 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 refer of improvement for the following group: | ence to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee |
|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: | At Northview High School, the number of Algebra I and Geometry students who will be proficient on the 2012 EOC will improve by 1%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The percentage of 10th grade students proficient in 2011 was 46% (66 students). | The percentage of Algebra I and Geometry students showing proficiency in 2012 will be 47%. Source: School Grades.fldoe.org) |
| Source: School Grades.fldoe.org | |

| | 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 preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate and various outside influences. | NHS math department will provide scheduling for End of Course exam practice for all Algebra I and Geometry students. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, District provided Subject Area Exams, and the final EOC assessment. | meetings, | | | |
| 2 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate and various outside influences. | NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 10th graders and for Algebra I and Geometry students not passing the End of Course exams. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs EOC practice test, PMP's, Subject Area Exams, and final End of Course exam. | meeting, | | | |
| 3 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate and various outside influences. | NHS Department Chairs will continue to develop math plans and EOC practices for Algebra I and Geometry students. NHS will continue to use resources to develop our students through assessments. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs EOC practice test, PMP's, Subject Area Exams, and final End of Course exam. | meeting, | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in ne of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in new of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: | The percentage of students scoring above proficiency will increase 1% on the 2012 Algebra and Geometry EOC. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| Scores for 2011 were the following: | Algebra I/Geometry Students: 37% of students taking Algebra I/Geometry EOC exams will score above proficiency. | | | | |
| 10th 27% (39) of students scored above proficiency on the FCAT Math assessment. | | | | | |

| | 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 preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences. | NHS math department will provide scheduling for End of Course exam practice for all Algebra I and Geometry students. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | | | |
| 2 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences. | NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 10th graders and Algebra I and Geometry students not passing End of Course Exams. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT Explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | | | |
| 3 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences. | NHS Department chairs will continue to develop math plans and EOC practices for all Algebra I and Geometry students. NHS will continue to use resources to develop our students through assessments. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | | | |

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:

| mathematics. | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Mathematics Goal #2b | Mathematics Goal #2b: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of I | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvi | ng Process to I | ncrease S ⁻ | tudent Achievement | |
| | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | ated Barrier Strategy Res for | | on or tion ponsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference of improvement for the following group: | rence to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee |
|--|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | The percentage of students making Learning Gains in Math will increase 1% in 2011-2012. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2011 percentage of students making Learning Gains was 72% (103 students). | In 2012 Algebra and Geometry EOC, 73% of the students w make Learning Gains. |

| | 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 preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences | NHS math department will provide scheduling for End of Course Exam practice for Algebra I and Geometry students. | department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | | | |
| 2 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences | NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 10th graders, Algebra I, and Geometry students not passing End of Course exams. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs FCAT practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | | | |
| 3 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences | NHS Department chairs will continue to develop math plans and EOC practices for Algebra I,and Geometry students. NHS will continue to use resources to develop our students through assessments. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee 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 P | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | | ance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proc | ess to I | ncrease St | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for | | on or ion onsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, | and reference to "G | uiding Questions", | identify and defi | ne 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: | Students in the Lowest 25% will increase 1% in Learning Gains. |
|--|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2011 the percentage of students in the Lower 25% who made Learning Gains was 64% (92 students). | In 2012 the percentage of students in the Lower 25% who will make Learning Gains will be 65%. |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and | NHS math department will provide scheduling for End of Course exam practice for all Algebra I and Geometry students. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. |
| 2 | student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences | NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 10th graders and for Algebra I and Geometry students not passing End of Course exams. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, FCAT practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exam. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. |
| | student abilities, unanticipated barriers, | NHS Department chairs will continue to develop math plans and EOC practices for all Algebra I | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of | Classroom observations, Department meeting, |

various outside influences.

3

and Geometry students. NHS will continue to use resources to develop our students through assessments.

| Based on Amb | itious but Achi | evable Annual | Measurable Objectiv | ves (AMOs), AMO-2, | Reading and Math Pe | erformance Target |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 5A. Ambitious Measurable Ot school will red by 50%. | ojectives (AMO | s). In six year | Middle School Math | ematics Goal # | | × |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 2012-2013 | | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 5 | dent achievem ving subgroup: | ent data, and refere | nce to "Guiding Ques | tions", identify and | define areas in nee |
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: | | | n 2012, all subgroup | s will make AYP. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | | 2013 Expected Leve | el of Performance: | |

In 2011, the only subgroup that did not make AYP was the Economically Disadvantaged. Only 57% of Students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup were at or above grade level in Math.

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 abilities, unanticipated barriers, | practice for all Algebra I | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs FCAT practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. |
| 2 | unanticipated barriers, school climate, and varous outside influences | NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 10th graders,Algebra I, amd Geometry students not passing End of Course exams. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs FCAT practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Suject Area Exams. |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making | |
|--|-----|
| satisfactory progress in mathematics. | N/A |
| Mathematics Goal #5C: | |

2012 Current Level of Performance:

| N/A | N/A |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | |
| | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I | ncrease Student Achievement |
| | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|--|--|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Г

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | N/A | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5D: 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 |

| | I on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and a | define areas in need | |
|---|--|---|--|---|----------------------|--|
| satisi | onomically Disadvantage factory progress in math ematics Goal E: | 0 | | The Economically Disadvantage Subgroup will improve by 1% on the 2012 Algebra and Geometry EOC. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| 57% (57) of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup were below grade level in Math. | | | re 58% of the Eco AYP. | 58% of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will make AYP. | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process 1 | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier Strategy R | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, FCAT practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | | |

| 2 | student abilities, unanticipated barriers, | policies for math remediation of low performing 10th graders | department Chair, Math teachers | classroom walkthroughs, FCAT practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. |
|---|--|---|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 3 | student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences | will continue to develop math plans and EOC practices for Algebra | | classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, En of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. |

End of Middle School Mathematics Goa

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group: | eference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas | |
|--|--|--|
| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.Mathematics Goal #2: | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | |
| | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Pos Pos Res for | | on or tion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

| Based on Amb | Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|--|---|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Within a six | | | # year school peri achievement gap | | h School will 🔺 | |
| | | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | | |
| | 67 | 61 | 65 | 69 | 73 | |
| | analysis of stud nt for the follov | | ent data, and refere | ence to "Guiding Ques | stions", identify and | define areas in nee |
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: | | | naking | All subgroups met tar | get math goals in 20 | 011-2012. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| African American: 73% Scoring Satisfactory White: 63% Scoring Satisfactory | | | | African American: 74% Scoring Satisfactory White: 64% Scoring Satisfactory | | |

| | 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 neer 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 |
|---|---------------------|----------|--|--|-----------------|
| 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 nee of improvement for the following subgroup: | | |
|---|---|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: | All subgroups met target math goals in 2011-2012. | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | |
| In 2012, 50% of SWD students did not make satisfactory progress. | In 2013, the percentage of SWD not making progress will decrease to 49% | |

| | 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 subgroup:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

The subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged met proficiency levels.

Mathematics Goal E:

| | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| | N/A | | | N/A | N/A | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I | | | to Increase Studer | 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 | |

End of High School Mathematics Goa

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: | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Algel | udents scoring at Achi ora. ora Goal #1: | evement Level 3 in | students who | At Northview High School, the percent of Algebra 1 students who will be proficient on the 2013 End of Course Exam(EOC)will improve by 1%. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | ormance: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performanc | e: | |
| | percent of Algebra stude (66 students). | nts proficient in 2012 wa | The percent of 2013 will be 60 | f Algebra 1 students sho 6%. | wing proficiency in | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process | to Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate and various outside influences. | NHS math department will provide scheduling for End of Course exam practice for all Algebra I students. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, District provided Subject Area Exams, and the final EOC assessment. | Classroom observations, Department meetings, assessments,FCAT Explorer, Subject Area Exams, and the final End of Course exam. | |
| 2 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate and various outside influences. | NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 10th graders and for Algebra I students not passing the End of Course exams. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, District provided Subject Area Exams, and the final EOC assessment. | Classroom observations, Department meetings, assessments,FCAT Explorer, Subject Area Exams, and the final End of Course exam. | |
| 3 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate and various outside influences. | NHS Department Chairs will continue to develop math plans and EOC practices for Algebra I students. NHS will continue to use resources to develop our students through assessments. | | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs EOC practice test, PMP's, Subject Area Exams, and final End of Course exam. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, Subject Area Exams, and the final End of Course | |

| | | | | | exam. | |
|-------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
| 4 and | udents scoring at or ab d 5 in Algebra. ora Goal #2: | oove Achievement Leve | The percentage | The percentage of students scoring above proficiency will increase 1% on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expecte | d Level of Performance | e: | |
| | percent of students scori ra 1 EOC was 17% (17 s | | the In 2013, 18% above proficier | | ra 1 will score | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences. | NHS math department will provide scheduling for End of Course exam practice for all Algebra I students. | | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | |
| 2 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences. | NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 10th graders and Algebra I students not passing End of Course Exams. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT Explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | |
| 3 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate, and various outside influences. | NHS Department chairs will continue to develop math plans and EOC practices for all Algebra I students. NHS will continue to use resources to develop our students through assessments. | Chair, math | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, FCAT explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, End of Course exam, and Subject Area Exams. | |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area in need of improvement for the following group: | | |
|---|--|--|
| | At Northview High School, the mean scale score of students taking the Geometry EOC will improve by 1%. | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | |

The mean scale score of Geometry students taking the EOC in 2012 was 53.

The mean scale score of Geometry students taking the EOC in 2013 will be 54.

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
| 1 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate and various outside influences. | NHS math department will provide scheduling for End of Course exam practice for all Geometry students. | Principal, AP, Math department Chair, Math teachers | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, District provided Subject Area Exams, and the final EOC assessment. | Classroom observations, Department meetings, assessments, FCAT Explorer, Subject Area Exams, and the final End of Course exam. | | | |
| 2 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate and various outside influences. | NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 10th graders and for Geometry students not passing the End of Course exams. | Chair, Math | Student assessment, classroom walk throughs EOC practice test, PMP's, Subject Area Exams, and final End of Course exam. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, Subject Area Exams, and the final End of Course exam. | | | |
| 3 | Student preparation, student abilities, unanticipated barriers, school climate and various outside influences. | NHS Department Chairs will continue to develop math plans and EOC practices for Geometry students. NHS will continue to use resources to develop our students through assessments. | | Student assessment, classroom walk throughs EOC practice test, PMP's, Subject Area Exams, and final End of Course exam. | Classroom observations, Department meeting, assessments, FCAT Explorer, Subject Area Exams, and the final End of Course exam. | | | |

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

| 4 and | udents scoring at or ab d 5 in Geometry. netry Goal #2: | ove Achievement Leve | | Data is not available for the current year. | | | |
|---|---|------------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expecte | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| Data is not available for the current year. | | | Data is not ava | Data is not available for the current year. | | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | | |
| 2 | 2 NA NA NA | | NA | NA | NA | | |

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 |
|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Implementation of instruction using technology. Algebra 1 and Geometry students will improve in proficiency and mean scale score. | Algebra 1 and Geometry (9th | Principal and | District Staff, all grade level teachers (including 9th and 10th grade), School staff, Math teachers, and RTI Team. | | Student assessment, classroom walkthroughs, EOC practice test, PMP's, Subject Area Exams, and EOC Exams. | Principal and Assistant Principal |

Mathematics Budget:

| | | | Available |
|--|---|--|--------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amoun |
| NHS Department chairs will continue to develop math plans and EOC practices for all Algebra I and Geometry students. NHS will continue to use resources to develop our students through assessments. | Graphing calculators for 9th and 10th grade classes. | Supplemental Academic Instruction Supply Budget | \$1,372.00 |
| | | Su | ıbtotal: \$1,372.0 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| NHS math department will provide scheduling for End of course exam practice for all 9th and 10th graders. | District Funds | | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 9th and 10th graders and for 11th and 12th graders not passing FCAT or End of course exams | | | \$0.00 |
| NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 9th and 10th graders and for 11th and 12th graders not passing FCAT or End of course exams | FCAT materials, software, professional development | | \$0.00 |
| | | • | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | - | - | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| | | Crap | d Total: \$1,372.0 |

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: | | | 0 | Northview High school serves students in grade 9-12. This section is not applicable. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | ormance: | 2013 Expecte | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | | |
| | Prob | lem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | 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 Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b: | | | Northview high school serves students in grades 9-12. This section is not applicable. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for | | on or tion ponsible Effectiveness of Strategy | | Evaluation Tool | | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a: | Northview high school serves students in grades 9-12. This section is not applicable. | | | | |
| 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 | Lower socioeconomic students, minority, and exceptional students | | Learningcommunities, grade communities, and ESE teachers. | assessments for focus lessons. Provide | experience with writing scientific |

| 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: | | | Noethview high school serves students in grades 9-12. This section is not applicable. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process | s to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy for | | son or Ition ponsible Effectiveness of Strategy | | | | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

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: | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1: | Northview High school serves students in grade 9-12. This section is not applicable. | | | | |
| 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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | | | | | |
| Science Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for | | on or tion ponsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the 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: | | | 2013 | At Northview, students achieving proficiency on the 2013 Biology EOC will increase by 1%. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | ormance: | 2013 Expecte | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| On the 2012 Biology EOC test, 56%(72) of tenth grade students scored at a C level. (Source: Evaluation Services EOC report for Escambia District schools) | | | achieve profici ia (Source: Evalu | On the 2013 Biology EOC 57% of Biology students will achieve proficiency. (Source: Evaluation Services EOC report for Escambia District schools) | | |
| | Prob | lem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Position Determine Evaluation Effectiveness of | | | |
| with lower levels in instruct benchmarks cor | | Learning communities. Science chair | Learning communities meeting to assess problematic areas | Focus less and mini assessments. | | |

| 1 | Socioeconomic and minority students who perform below level in reading and math. | students in lower proficiency. | and Science supervisor. | individually for each student. Monitoring focus strands and give extra instruction to students who need it. | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| 2 | Students in the Tier 1 and 2 subgroups. | Use different methods of instruction to reach all of the students. Hands on experiments, visual and oral teachniques,students will benefit from technology and direct instruction. | Learning communities will meet monthly to assess problematic areas of each student. | Use differntiated instructions in classes, creating different groups of instruction levels. Other times, pair students of different achievement levels for cooperative learning. | Monitoring by grade level community learning groups. Using mini assessments to record proficiency and determine problems. |
| 3 | Students who need extra method of instruction and determined groups in need of Tier 1 and Tier 2 | EOC practice assignments, EOC simulators and mini assessments to establish progress and proficiency in the subject. | and record focus | Weekly monitoring of students, studying data and comparing it to previous years. Identify problematic areas for every student and identify new effective methods of instruction using differentiated instruction. | EOC practice assessments done throughout the year. Focus assessments attached to science standards will be given weekly |
| 4 | Subgroups of students with lower levels in reading and math. Socioeconomic and minority students who perform below level in reading, writing and math | Use focus lessons to instruct benchmarks and strands with students in lower proficiency. | Learning communities . Science chair and Science supervisor. | Learning communities meeting to assess problematic areas for each students. Monitoring focus strands and give extra instruction to students who need it. | Focus lesson and mini assessment. |
| 5 | Students who do not reach 80% of proficiency will recieve differentiated instruction. | Determine each problematic science area for each student and develop extra instruction with cooperative or differentiated instruction. Use different methods of instruction according to students needs. | Rachel Pleasant learning communities, science teachers. | Close monitoring of 10th grade science teachers and core teachers. Cooperative learning groups for teachers to establish problematic areas for each individual student. | Data entry provided by focus lessons, students monitored throughout learning communities and grade level communities. |

| 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: | | | On the 2013 Biology EOC, the percentage of students scoring above proficiency will increase by 1%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 10%(13)of Biology students scored 4 or 5 level on the Biology EOC test. | | | 11% of the students will score above proficiency on the Biology EOC. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for | | son or ition ponsible itoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool | | 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 | | | | | | | |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Progr | | | Available |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |
| | | | End of Science Go |

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 Level3.0 and higher in writing.Writing Goal #1a: | On the 2013 FCAT Writing 2.0 Test, the goal of proficiency will be met. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| On the 2012 FCAT Writing test,a score of 3.0 was | On the 2013 FCAT Writing test, 98% or above will make 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 | Lower socio-economic students and lower 35% of student population. | Monitoring through Learning Communities, monthly meetings, and parental involvement, individualized mentoring programs faculty-led, analyzing data and making data available to all faculty. | English Department Chairperson and the Principal and tenth grade English teachers, and LearningCommunities | Meeting monthly with Learning Communities and writing teachers to compare and discuss strengths and weakness of individual students' writing needs. | Periodic writing assessment, daily focus lessons in writing, and writing journals. | | | |
| 2 | These lower quartile students will be monitored closer with the advisor-mentor program to identify weaknesses; more parent involvement; Learning Communities designed to facilitate individual weaknesses of these students; introduce more technology with writing to these students to help increase writing scores. | lower quartile students; concentrating on six traits of writing and increased technology; Focus lessons will be compiled according to | weekly and monthly,Depart Chair and Principal and | instruction within the | Writing assessments, journaling, focus lessons designed strictly from FCAT Star Data pinpointing individual strengths and weaknesses, and writing assessments with varying prompts | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |

| 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 A at 4 or higher in writin Writing Goal #1b: | NA | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| NA | | | NA | | | |
| | ncrease S | itudent Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for | | son or Ition ponsible itoring | | | | |
| | No Data Submitted | | | | | |

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. | | | | | | |
| Civics Goal #1: | N/A | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | | |
| N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I | ncrease Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Person or Process Used to | | | | | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | 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: | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels4 and 5 in Civics.Civics Goal #2: | | | N/A | N/A | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expecte | d Level of Performance | e: | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process to | o Increase Stude | nt 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 | | |

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

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

Civics Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | ent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |

| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | | • | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |
| | | | |

End of Civics Goals

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

| | d on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the | | nd reference to "G | uiding Questions", identif | y and define areas | |
|-------|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Histo | udents scoring at Achie ory. History Goal #1: | evement Level 3 in U.S | At Northview | At Northview High School, 45% of U.S. History students will achieve proficiency on the 2013 U.S. History End of Course Exam. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expecte | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| TBD | | | TBD | TBD | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stud | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | with lower levels in reading. Socioeconomic | students in lower | Learning communities will meet monthly to assess and evaluate successful strategies. | Use differentiated instruction in classes, creating groups of different levels. Also, pairing students of different achievement for cooperative learning. | Focus lesson and mini assessments. EOC practice assessments done throughout the year. | |

| | d on the analysis of stude ad of improvement for the | ent achievement data, and e following group: | d reference to "Gu | iding Questions", identif | y and define areas | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--------------------|--|--|--|
| 4 and | udents scoring at or ab 15 in U.S. History. History Goal #2: | ove Achievement Level | At Northview H | At Northview High School, 45% of U.S. History students will achieve proficiency on the 2013 U.S. History End of Course Exam. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| TBD | | | TBD | TBD | | | | |
| | 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 | | | |

| | Students in Tier 1 and | Use different methods | Learning | Use differentiated | Focus lesson and |
|---|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| | Tier 2 subgroups. | of instruction to meet | communities will | instruction in classes, | mini assessments. |
| | | the needs of all | meet monthly to | creating groups of | EOC practice |
| 1 | | students. Visual and | assess and | different levels of | assessments |
| | | oral students will | evaluate | instruction. | done throughout |
| | | benefit from technology | | | the year. |
| | | and direct instruction. | strategies. | | |

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 | (e.g. , PLC, | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|---|--------------|--|-----|--|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

U.S. History Budget:

| Evidence-based Progr | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Professional Developn | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.0 |

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

| 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: | Northview's attendance goal is to increase average daily attendance by one-half percent and to decrease the number of students with 10 or more absences by 1%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |

| | | | | The expected attendance rate for the 2012-2013 school years is 94% (490/540). | | |
|---|---------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | |
| | | | | The expected number of students with excessive absenses for the 2012-2013 school year is 145 (27%). | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | |
| The number of students with 10 or more tardies for the 2011-2012 school year was 3% (15). | | | | The expected number of students with excessive tardies for the 2012-2013 school year is 2% (11). | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process | to Increase Stud | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Student motivation | Attendance clerk calls home on student absences. | Dean and Attendance clerk | attendance and tardy rates from the 2011- 2012 school year to the | Data Clerk's Job Submission TERMS Report for End-of-Year Attendance and Dean's report. | |

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

Subtotal: \$0.00

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

| | l on the analysis of susp provement: | ension data, and referen | ce to "Guiding | g Que | stions", identify and define | ne areas in need |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| | spension ension Goal #1: | | reduce by | It is the goal of the faculty and staff at Northview to reduce by 3% the number of Out-of-School Supensions for the 2012-2013 school year. | | |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | | | | pecte | d Number of In-School | Suspensions |
| There were 282 In-School Suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year. | | | | There will be 270 or fewer In-School Suspensions for 2012-2013. | | |
| 2012 | Total Number of Stude | ents Suspended In-Scho | ool 2013 Exp School | pecte | d Number of Students | Suspended I n- |
| There were 232 (43%) students that served an In-School Suspension for the 2011-2012 school year. | | | | There will be 225 (42%) or fewer students serving In- School Suspension for 2012-2013. | | |
| 2012 | Number of Out-of-Sch | ool Suspensions | | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | |
| | were 143 (26%) Out-of D11-2012 school year. | School Suspensions for | | There will be 125 (23%) or fewer Out-of-School Suspensions for 2012-2013. | | |
| 2012 Scho | | ents Suspended Out-of- | | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | |
| There were 117 (22%) students with an Out-of-School Suspension for the 2011-2012 school year. | | | | There will be 105 (19%) or fewer Students Suspended Out of School. | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process t | o Increase S | Stude | ent Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person c Position Responsible Monitorir | n e for | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students being out of class for suspensions. | Increase teacher strategies for improving behavior before writing referrals resulting in suspension. | Dean, administratio teachers, and School-wide Behavior Management Team | d | Reports generated through TERMS (SIS) to reflect relevant data | Dean's report; call logs |

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

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

Suspension Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developn | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Dropout Prevention | | | |
| Dropout Prevention Goal #1: | The dropout rate for 2013 will be 25% or less. | | |
| *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year. | | | |
| 2012 Current Dropout Rate: | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate: | | |
| The dropout rate for 2011-2012 was 26% (36) | The dropout rate for 2012-2013 will be 25% (30). | | |

| | 1 |
|--|--|
| 2012 Current Graduation Rate: | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate: |
| The graduation rate for 2011-2012 was 94% (101/108). | The graduation rate for 2012-2013 will be 95% (115/121). |

| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | nt Achievement | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | | 1. a. Progress Monitoring Plan details strategies. b. Progress reports or reports cards every 4 1/2 weeks. c.Tutoring assistance provided before or after school. d. Conference with Guidance and meeting with the parents to layout a plan for meeting all graduation requirements. Outside Resource Referrals for assistance and school visiting counselor, Reading and Math remediation as prescribed. | Guidance Counselor and Data Clerk | Dropout codes and graduation rate provided via Data Clerk | Dropout codes and graduation rate provided by data clerk |
| 2 | Students required to pass FCAT for graduation requirement | Reading and or Math Intensive remediation. Encourage students to take the ACT for an equivalant score to the FCAT | Intensive Reading and Math Teacher | Students who meet requirements for graduation. Graduation rate will increase. | PMP Data Base, FCAT Star, Graduation requirements met in TERMS |
| 3 | | | | | |

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | m(s)/Material(s) | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |

| Technology | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | ent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and r in need of improvement: | 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 Goal #1: | Increase the opportunties for home-to-school and | | | | | |
| *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. | school-to-home communications about school programs and students' progress. | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: | | | | | |
| Approximately 25%, which equates to 150 out of 600 students being represented. | Approximately 30%, which equates to 180 out of 600 students being represented. | | | | | |

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 | Working parents job schedule may not allow attendance, transportation, parents unaware of school goals and activities. | activities and events through local news | | Parent attendance during student activites. | Surveys and documentation of attendance |

| 2 | No Data |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 3 | No Data |

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 |
|---|------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | Γ | No Data Submittee | d | | |

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of 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:

Increase the percentage of students successful at each level (9 - 12 and postsecondary, including career and technical, undergraduate and graduate) to ensure our diverse population is:

| 1. ST | 1 Goal #1: | blem-Solving Process t | inquiry; o Capable of a o Proficient in a skills through S o Proficient in succeed on a g o Knowledgeat | English and other langua global scale; and ble about and interested | e problem solving; knowledge and ges in order to |
|-------|--|--|---|---|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Increase the performance of all students and their interest in STEM, and Decrease the gaps in interest and achievement between groups of students. Student lack of motivation to participate in higher level classes. | Sequence the curriculum to promote maximum student learning. Concepts should build on one another as students progress and students must be expected to apply learning. Provide students with clear communication of the benefits of participating in higher level classes. Create incentives for the hiring and retention of experienced, effective mathematics, science and technology teachers Provide cultural competency training to all educators. Work with teacher preparation programs in Florida's colleges and universities to implement the supporting action items related to undergraduate programs. | | Monitoring of instruction, evaluation of lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, classroom evaluations | Lesson plans; instructional focus calendar, data talks, walkthrough feedback, Mini assessments |

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 |
|---|------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| Using data to drive instruction | All | School level Adminstrators | All CTE teachers | | | School level administrators, instructional coaches |

STEM Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developmen | ıt | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

| Base | d on the analysis of scho | ool data, identify and def | fine areas in need | of improvement: | |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. CT | Goal #1: | oblem-Solving Process | level (9-12 a technical, un diverse popu o Capable of inquiry; o Capable of o Proficient ir skills through o Proficient ir succeed on a o Knowledge | conducting realworld authentic and collaborat applying multidisciplina STEM; English and other langu global scale; and able about and intereste | ding career and te) to ensure our STEM projects and ive problem solving; ry knowledge and uages in order to |
| | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Increase the performance of all students and their interest in STEM, and Decrease the gaps in interest and achievement between groups of students. | Sequence the curriculum to promote maximum student learning. Concepts should build on one another as students progress and students must be expected to apply learning. Create incentives for the hiring and retention of experienced, effective CTE teachers. Provide cultural competency training to 9-12 educators. Work with teacher preparation programs in | | Formative assessments, weekly mini- assessments,Lesson plans, walk throughs,classroom walkthroughs, classroom evaluations | FCAT 2013 Learning gains, Formative and mini- assessments, Industry certifications,Florida Alternate Assessment 2013 |

| un im | prida's colleges and iversities to plement the pporting action items | | |
|----------|---|--|--|
| rel | lated to | | |
| | dergraduate ograms. | | |

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

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

CTE Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | | | Available |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s) No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Progr | am(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|---|----------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| CELLA | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | NHS Department chairs will continue to develop math plans and EOC practices for all Algebra I and Geometry students. NHS will continue to use resources to develop our students through assessments. | Graphing calculators for 9th and 10th grade classes. | Supplemental Academic Instruction Supply Budget | \$1,372.00 |
| Civics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| U.S. History | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$1,372.00 |

| Technology | | | | |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| CELLA | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | NHS math department will provide scheduling for End of course exam practice for all 9th and 10th graders. | District Funds | | \$0.00 |
| Civics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| U.S. History | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |

| Professional Developm | nent | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|----------------|------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Keynote speakers and breakout sessions designed to enhance reading instruction. | Six Teachers attending the Escambia County Reading Teachers' Association Conference | Faculty Funds | \$135.00 |
| CELLA | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 9th and 10th graders and for 11th and 12th graders not passing FCAT or End of course exams | | | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | NHS will follow district policies for math remediation of low performing 9th and 10th graders and for 11th and 12th graders not passing FCAT or End of course exams | FCAT materials, software, professional development | | \$0.00 |
| Civics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| U.S. History | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |

| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|--------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$135.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| CELLA | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Civics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| U.S. History | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| STEM | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| CTE | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$1,507.00 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| jn Priority | jm Focus | jn Prevent | jn NA | |
|-------------|----------|------------|-------|--|
| | | | | |

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| The SAC has no funds at this time. | \$0.00 |

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) met on October 8th to elect officers for the 2012-13 school year, and to address old and new business. The Council heard from Northview students Johnathan Moretz, Deidra Steele, and Hannah Gibson, and also received a school progress and information report prepared by Principal Weaver. Questions from members of the Council were addressed. The Council set the next meeting date for December 3rd.

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

| Escambia School Distr NORTHVI EW HI GH SCH 2010-2011 | | _ | _ | | | |
|--|---------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|--|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 55% | 73% | 87% | 46% | | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 55% | 71% | | | 126 | 3 ways to make gains: Improve FCAT Levels Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | | 64% (YES) | | | 108 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 505 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | в | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| NORTHVI EW HI GH SCH 2009-2010 | HOOL | | | | | |
|---|---------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 40% | 74% | 86% | 61% | 261 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the Distric writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 47% | 72% | | | 119 | 3 ways to make gains: Improve FCAT Levels Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | | 54% (YES) | | | | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 483 | |
| Percent Tested = 99% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | в | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |