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## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

| School Grades Trend Data |
| :--- |
| Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/ Statewide Assessment Trend Data |
| High School Feedback Report |
| K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan |

## ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | \# of Years at Current School | \# of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25\% ), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Principal | Eric Smith | B.S. Ed, M.Ed., School Principal | 13 | 11 | School grade last eight years "A", AYP 2008 |
| Assis Principal | Shenna Payne | B.S. Elem Ed, M.Ed.EdLeadership, Math 5-9, School Principal | 7 | 8 | School grade "A" entire tenure, AYP 2008 |
| Assis Principal | Cody Strother | B.S. Literature, M.Ed, | 3 | 5 | School grade "A" since 2010. |

## 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)/ <br> Certification(s) | \#ears at <br> Current <br> School | \# of Years as <br> an <br> Instructional <br> Coach | Prior Performance Record (include <br> prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide <br> Assessment Achievement Levels, <br> Learning Gains, Lowest 25\%), and <br> AMO progress along with the <br> associated school year) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| WFHS does <br> not have any <br> instructional <br> coaches. | NA | NA |  |  | NA |

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

|  | Description of Strategy | Person <br> Responsible | Projected <br> Completion <br> Date | Not Applicable (If not, please <br> explain why) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Hire NCLB Highly Qualified Teachers; Assign consulting <br> teacher for first year teachers; Assign veteran teachers to <br> experienced teachers new to the school worksite <br> (mentors/buddy); Utilize START teachers | Administration <br> and District | $2012-2013$ <br> School Year |  |

## 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 <br> staff and <br> paraprofessional <br> that are <br> teaching out- <br> of- field/ and <br> who are not <br> highly <br> effective. | Provide the strategies <br> that are being <br> implemented to <br> support the staff in <br> becoming highly <br> effective |
| :--- | :--- |
| West Florida High School <br> has one teacher this year <br> currently teaching out of <br> field. <br> West Florida High School <br> has one teacher that <br> received a less than <br> effective rating. | The one teacher with less <br> than an effective rating <br> has been given strategies <br> to implement, regular <br> participation in <br> recommended <br> professional development |
| along with consistent |  |
| feedback and follow-up to |  |
| include |  |
| classoom walkthrougs |  |
| and observations from |  |
| local and district |  |
| personnel. |  |

## 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)).
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Total Number } \\
\text { of } \\
\text { Instructional } \\
\text { Staff }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\
\text { First-Year } \\
\text { Teachers }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\
\text { Teachers } \\
\text { with 1-5 } \\
\text { Years of } \\
\text { Experience }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\
\text { Teachers } \\
\text { with 6-14 } \\
\text { Years of } \\
\text { Experience }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\
\text { Teachers } \\
\text { with 15+ } \\
\text { Years of } \\
\text { Experience }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of } \\
\text { Teachers } \\
\text { with } \\
\text { Advanced } \\
\text { Degrees }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Highly } \\
\text { Effective } \\
\text { Teachers }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Reading } \\
\text { Endorsed } \\
\text { Teachers }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { National } \\
\text { Board } \\
\text { Certified } \\
\text { Teachers }\end{array}
$$ <br>
\hline 71 \& 2.8 \%(2) \& 14.1 \%(10) \& 28.2 \%(20) \& 31.0 \%(22) \& 38.0 \%(27) \& 69.0 \%(49) \& 7.0 \%(5) \& 7.0 \%(5) <br>
\hline Endorsed <br>

Teachers\end{array}\right\} 22.5 \%(16) |\)|  |
| :--- | :--- |

## 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 <br> Assigned | Rationale <br> for Pairing | Planned Mentoring <br> Activities |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Marjorie Stradley | Paula Petsel | Intergration <br> of curriculum <br> and proximity | Regular Meetings, <br> Observations, Monthly <br> Checklist |
|  |  |  | Regular Meetings, |


| Louise Reeves | Sarah Ingram | Subject Area <br> and First Year <br> Teacher | Observations, Monthly <br> Checklist and <br> Participation in those <br> things needed as a result <br> of the Start Program |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jeff Anderson | Michael Celis | Integration of <br> Curriculum <br> and Proximity | Regular Meetings, <br> Observations, Monthly <br> Checklist |

## 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
West Florida High is not a Title I School.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II
NA

Title III

NA

Title X- Homeless

NA

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
NA

Violence Prevention Programs

NA

Nutrition Programs
NA

Housing Programs
NA

Head Start

NA

## Adult Education

NA

## Career and Technical Education

NA

J ob Training

## Other

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

```
-School-based MTSS/ Rtl Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.
Eric Smith-Principal, Shenna Payne-Asst. Principal, Allison Grant-Science Teacher, Linda Quinn-Math Teacher, Rachel SimmonsReading Teacher, Terry Thomas-Career Teacher, Laura Rainey-Reading/English Teacher, Stephanie Hurst-English Teacher, Jon Boddy-Science Teacher, Valerie Cope-Guidance Counselor, Melissa Hathcher-English Teacher, John Olson-Foreign Language Teacher, Joseph Rieland-History Teacher, Margaret Blum-Literacy Coach, Allison Grant - Science Teacher and Willie Hunter School Social Worker
```

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 RtI teams meets monthly. The RtI team looks at the overall data for the school and it's essential components: assessment, instruction and parental involvement.

The general education teachers provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrates Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.

Our intervention specialist will identify students with disabilities and participate in the Tier process to provide support and offer strategies to the general education.

Our literacy coach with other reading coaches will identify systematic patterns of the students' needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate evidence-based interventions and strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children considered "at risk"; assists with monitoring "at risk" students, data collection, and data analysis; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

The school guidance counselors will assist in the following ways:

- Providing all students with a standards-based guidance curriculum to address universal academic, career and personal/social development
- Analyzing academic and behavioral data to identify struggling students
- Identifying and collaborating on research-based intervention strategies that are implemented by school staff
- Evaluating academic and behavioral progress after interventions
- Revising interventions as appropriate
- Referring to school and community services as appropriate
- Collaborating with administrators about RTI design and implementation

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 role of the RtI team is to consider student performance data to identify and define learning problems, to develop interventions to solve those problems, and to evaluate the effects of the interventions on the defined problem or problems.

## -MTSS I mplementation

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: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network(PMRN), Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading(FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test(FCAT).

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, CIM Assessments

Midyear: FAIR, FCAT simulation

End of Year: FAIR, FCAT

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during the teachers' common planning time and small sessions throughout the school year. The Rtl team will also evaluate additional staff professional development needs during the Rtl Leadership Team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The Rtl team will meet regularly to make sure the needs of students and teachers are being met.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

## -School-Based Literacy Leadership Team <br> Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

Eric Smith-Principal, Shenna Payne-Asst. Principal, Beverly Bledsoe-Reading Teacher, Renee Giles-Reading Teacher, Rachel Simmons-Reading Teacher, Theresa MacNaughton-Reading Teacher, Mirah Brown-English, Louise Reeves-Math Teacher, Matthew Alford-ESE Teacher, -Career/Technology Teacher, Mark Alberda-English Teacher, Marvetta Nesbitt-Guidance Counselor, Michelle Pennington-Science Teacher

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

At West Florida High School, our Literacy Leadership Team is the Reading Leadership Team. The literacy team is made up of the reading department and one teacher from each academic area along with a career teacher. The team meets monthly and began the year with a review of the reading data and have established goals to encourage reading across the curriculum

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

The major initiative will be to read across the curriculum. Strategies such as accessing prior knowledge before reading will be used in Integrated Science and Reading - grade 9, World History/Reading - grade 10 and through the career classes throughout all grade levels.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 8/28/2012)

## *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.

## NA

*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.

West Florida High School's administration and teachers do believe that the responsibility of reading belongs to every teacher. Each teacher is responsible for a unit plan and daily lessons that involve strategies to make students better in the area of reading. This involves but is not limited to, first knowing both the strengths and weaknesses of each student. For this we rely on the Rtl and Literacy team to work together with administration separating the school's data and presenting this data to the remainder of the faculty. Each teacher is responsible for pulling their class data from FCAT Star and working with not only administrative teams but their faculty leaders in the development of lesson plans that include differentiated instruction, miniassessments, higher-order thinking and essential questions. Our Literacy Team will work closely this year with all teachers to

## *High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.
How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

Because of the number of career academies and series of courses for each academy, career and academic teachers work closely together to provide integrated coursework. Students exposure to foundational classes in each academy help them to see the relevance of the academic classes, in turn, academic classes are able to incorporate many needed employability skills into their classes such as punctuality, dependability, and communication.

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?

Because of the number of career academies and series of courses for each academy, academic and career teachers work closely together to provide integrated coursework. Students exposure in the foundational classes of each academy help them to see the relevance of the academic classes, in turn, academic classes are able to incorporate many needed employability skills into their classes such as punctuality, dependability, and communication. This summer a team of our teachers from various teacher areas including career teachers participated in an intensive currriculum improvement workshop to promote teaming and integration across curriculum. At then end of the workshop there was a developed lesson that will be implemented across our campus the first nine weeks of the school year. Follow up meetings have been scheduled that will include this year's faculty leaders with specific plans and implementations to include vocabulary, differientiated instruction and student data to make sure we are addressing our students on all levels of learning.

## Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

West Florida High School will continue to offer classes of rigor and relevance allowing us to maintain/increase our graduation rate. Our teachers will continue to participate in training and outside coursework needed to teach Honors, AP, and Dual Enrollment (DE) courses on campus. Administration in partnership with the Literacy and Rtl teams will implement proven strategies based on our school's data to increase the number of students reading on grade level per state standards while increasing those students above level in reading. Our strategies will include planning across subject areas and careers to promote integration and reading across the curriculum. Our math department will continue to provide leadership in decreasing the number lower level math students. Finally, our Guidance department will continue to host parent/student workshops to ensure our students are prepared for life after high school. We are active in making sure that our students take college placement tests and that low income students can acquire a waiver for testing and application. Topics discussed include but are not limited to:
ACT/SAT, PLAN, PSAT, College Admissions, Bright Futures and other Financial Aid.

1. Number of high school graduates with standard diploma or GED:

2010-296
2. Percent of graduates who scored at level 3 or better on the 10th grade FCAT in:

Math- 85\%
Reading-59\%
Both Reading and Math- 55.2\%
3. Percent of graduates who completed a college prep curriculum: $54.7 \%$
4. Percent of graduates enrolled in Algebra I or equivalent in a Florida public school prior to 9th grade: $25.6 \%$
5. Percent of graduates who completed at least one level 3 high school math course: $52.3 \%$
6. Percent of graduates who completed at least one dual enrollment math course: $5.4 \%$
7. Percent of graduates who completed at least one level 3 high school science course: $50 \%$
8. Percent of graduates who completed at least one dual enrollment science course: 6.75\%
9. Percent of students who took PSAT or PLAN two years prior to graduation year:

PSAT: 17.6\%

PLAN: 97.1\%
10. Percent of graduates who took the SAT or ACT:

SAT: 21.6\%
ACT: 72.9\%
11. Percent of graduates who took the SAT/ACT/CPT and scored at or above college-level cut scores in:

Math 70.5\%
Reading 83.2\%
Writing 85\%
12. Percent of graduates who were eligible for the maximum Bright Futures award:

Florida Academic Scholars 4.05\%
Florida Medallion Scholars 34.1\%
Florida Gold Seal Vocational 1.01\%
13. Percent of graduates who completed at least one AP, IB, AICE or Dual Enrollment course: 19.5\%
14. Percent of graduates enrolled in a Florida public postsecondary institution in the Fall: $53.7 \%$
15. Percent of graduates found enrolled in Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF): $1.35 \%$
16. Percent of graduates found enrolled in an out-of-state public or private institution in the Fall: NA
17. Percent of graduates at a:
community college in Florida 34.7\%
state university in Florida 18.5\%
technical education center in Florida 1.68\%
18. Percent of graduates enrolled in college credit courses at a Florida public postsecondary institution earning a GPA above 2.0: 77.9\%
19. Percent of graduates enrolled in college credit courses at Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) earning a GPA above 2.0: 80\%
20. Of the graduates enrolled in a Math course in Florida in Fall, the percent who successfully completed the course: Remedial Math (non-college credit) 58.8\%
Intermediate Algebra (for elective credit only) 72.2\%
Entry-level Math (for Math credit) 69.3\%
Advanced Math 68.6\%
21. Of the graduates enrolled in a Math course in Florida in Fall, the percent who successfully completed the course:

Remedial Reading or Writing 83.3\%
Freshman Comp I or II 81.3\%
Other College-level English 81.7\%

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in
reading.

Increase the \# of students achieving proficiency (FCAT 2.0 Level 3 or higher) in reading ( 9 th and 10th grade ) by at least 1 percentage points.
Reading Goal \#1a:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 Current Level of Performance:
$66 \%$ grade 9 students were proficient in reading and $64 \%$ in
2013 FCAT 2.0 will show 67\% and 65\% reading proficient in grade 10. 9th and 10th grade FCAT 2.0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 2 | Time | Bell Ringers, Unit Plans, Essential Questions, Planning Across the Curriculum Text Complexity and Close Reading | ReadingTeacher,Administration, Literacy Team | F.A.I.R Testing, FCAT Simulations | FCAT |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal \#1b: |  |  | NA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| NA |  |  | NA |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | Na |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.

| Reading Goal \#2a: ${ }^{\text {2a }}$ increase by at least 2 percentage |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| $37 \%$ of Grade 10 students scored a level 4 or 5 in reading. |  |  | In 2013, the expected level of students scoring a level 4 or 5 in grade 9 will be at least $39 \%$. |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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: <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#2b: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
|  |  |  | NA |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |


| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#3a: |  |  | The number of students making learning gains in reading will increase by 2 percentage points. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| In 2012, 65\% of our students made learning gains in reading. |  |  | The number of students expected to make learning gains in 2013 will be $67 \%$. |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |


| Teacher planning across <br> content areas that <br> coordinates strategies <br> with others | Reading team and <br> other content area <br> teachers | Mini- Assessments and <br> other evaluations over <br> time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

|FCAT

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Percentage of students making Learning Gains in <br> reading. <br> Reading Goal \#3b: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |


| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25\% making learning gains in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#4: |  |  | The number of students in the Lowest $25 \%$ making learning gains in reading will increase by 3 percentage points. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| In the 2012 FCAT 2, $50 \%$ of the students in the lowest $25 \%$ made learning gains in reading. |  |  | It is expected that for the 2012 FCAT 2, $53 \%$ or better of the students in the lowest $25 \%$ will make learning gains in reading. |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 2 | Lack of interest in having reading instead of another elective of the student's choice | Differentiate instruction to keep students engaged | RtI, Literacy Team, and Reading teachers | Mini- Assessments and Evaluations over time | FCAT |
| 3 | Consistent parentalteacher communication | Parent opportunities and workshops after school hours along with steady in person and phone conferences | Administration, Reading Team, LiteracyTeam | Conference and workshop $\log$ | FCAT |

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual <br> Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year <br> school will reduce their achievement gap <br> by 50\%. |
| :--- |
| Baseline data <br> 2010-2011 $2011-2012$ $2012-2013$ $2013-2014$ $2014-2015$ $2015-2016$ $2016-2017$ <br> achievement gap by 50\% by the year 2016-2017.       |

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal \#5B:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In 2010, $69 \%$ of the White population and $36 \%$ of the African American population scored at or above grade level in Reading. |  |  | In 2011, $72 \%$ of the White population and $39 \%$ of the African-American population will score at or above the grade level in Reading. |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 2 | Lack of interest in reading passages similar to what they see on the test | Include reading materials that interest students, allowing them to pick topics and stories | Reading teachers and Reading Leader | Number of books selected and read by students other than those designated by the reading teacher | Reading Log |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making <br> satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5C: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | Not Applicable |
| NA | NA Expected Level of Performance: |


| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br> Reading Goal \#5D: |  |  | NA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| NA |  |  | NA |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making

| satisfactory progress in reading. |
| :--- |
| Reading Goal \#5E: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: |
| Fifty-three percent economically disadvantaged students <br> were at or above reading level. |

The number of economically disadvantaged students reading at or above grade level will increase by $5 \%$.

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In 2012, fifty eight percent of our economically
disadvantaged students will show reading at or above grade level.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA |  |
| 2 | Lack of needed <br> strategies for <br> independent reading | Professional development <br> of differentiated <br> instruction and CRISS | CRISS trainer, <br> Literacy team, <br> Administration | lesson plans, classroom <br> walk-throughs | FCAT simulations, <br> Progress <br> Monitoring and <br> FCAT |

## 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 <br> Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/ or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., <br> PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Differentiated instruction | Teacher resources | SAI | \$2,000.00 |
| Text complexity/close reading | Teacher resources | SAI | \$1,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$3,000.00 |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Planning across the curriculum | Planning days for teachers | SAI | \$3,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$3,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total: \$6,000.00 |  |  |  |

## 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: |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/ speaking: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |

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

| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. <br> CELLA Goal \#2: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: |
| N/A |

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non- ELL students.
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal \#3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

NA

| Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |  |
| 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |  |  |

## CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |


|  |  | Subtotal: $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Other | Description of Resources | Funding Source |

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at

Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.
Mathematics Goal \#1:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| :--- | :--- |
| NA | NA |

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA |


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


| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas <br> in need of improvement for the following group: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students <br> making learning gains in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#3: |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Level of Performance: | NA |
| NA | NA |


| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |  |  |
| 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |  |  |

## High School Mathematics AMO Goals



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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. $\quad$ No subgroup data has been given

## Mathematics Goal \#5B:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| NA | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |
| 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA |  |  |

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal \#5C:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| :--- | :--- |
| NA | NA |


| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA |


| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. <br> Mathematics Goal \#5D: |  | NA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level o | erformance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| NA |  | NA |  |  |
| 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 |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics

Mathematics Goal E:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| NA |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| Problem- Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |

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

[^0]| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#1: |  |  | West Florida High School had 56\% (124) of the students with an achievement level 3. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| Sixty two percent of the ninth grade students (97) and $42 \%$ (27) of the tenth grade students testing scored an achievement level of 3 . |  |  | Between 9th and 10th grade, the average of students scoring an achievment level three will increase by at least two percentage points. |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 2 | Making sure the pacing guide is covered with students making at or above proficient progress along the way. | Regular homework checks for accuracy and not just completion, miniassessments and student input | Teachers, Department Chair and admin | Assessment grades both minor and major. | Classroom assessment grades and the Algebra EOC. |


| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. <br> Algebra Goal \#2: |  |  | West Florida High School had 21\% (67) of the students taking the Algebra EOC score at an achievement level of 4 or higher. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| Fifteen percent (47) of students testing scored a level 4 and six percent (20) scored a level 5 on the Algebra EOC. |  |  | The level of students scoring at a level 4 or higher will increase by at least two percentage points. |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 2 | Increasing the rigor while moving through the pacing guide. | Giving students the opportunity to solve problems using concepts and skills (application) <br> Common planning with lesson presentations | Teachers, Department chair, Administration | Project based project opportunities as well as increased word problems when testing | Algebra EOC |

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

[^1]| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#1: |  |  | West Florida High School has 42\% (126) of the students testing scoring in the top third of the Geometry EOC. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| Seventy three percent (67) of 9th graders testing scored in the top third while (59) of the 10th graders scored in the top third. |  |  | At least $60 \%$ of students testing will score at or above an achievement level 3. |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 2 | Making sure the pacing guide is covered with students making at or above proficient progress along the way | Regular homework checks for accuracy and not just completion, miniassessments and student input | Teachers, Department Chair and admin | Assessment grades both minor and major | EOC |


| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. <br> Geometry Goal \#2: |  |  | West Florida High School has $42 \%$ of the students testing scoring in the top third of the Geometry EOC |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| Seventy three (73\%) percent of 9th graders testing scored in the top third while $38 \%$ of the 10th graders scored in the top third. |  |  | At least $60 \%$ of students testing will score at or above an achievement level 3. |  |  |
| 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 | 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 <br> Content /Topic <br> and/or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/Subject | PD Facilitator <br> and/or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for Follow- <br> up/Monitoring | Person or Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Questioning <br> Skills | All math <br> subjects | Professional <br> Learning <br> Group | Varying times <br> throughout the <br> years with <br> targeted plo's on <br> teacher plan days | Varying <br> throughout the <br> year | Common planning with <br> developed questioning <br> techniques, shared <br> lessons with questions <br> included | Department <br> Chairs, Teachers <br> and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|  | n/a | n/A | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |

End of Mathematics Goals

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. <br> Science Goal \#1: |  |  | NA |  |  |
|  | Current Level of Perf | rmance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
|  |  |  | NA |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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

| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. <br> Science Goal \#2: |  |  | NA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| NA |  |  | NA |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

## 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. <br> Biology Goal \#1: |  |  | The 2011-2012 year was the first year the Biology EOC was given. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| In grade 9, 71\% (36) students scored in the top third of percentages. In grade 10, 42\% (110) student score in the top third of percentages. |  |  | In the 2013 school year, students will have actual achievement levels. West Florida High School will have at least $55 \%$ of the students scoring at achievement level 3 or higher. |  |  |
| 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 | Science teachers are working together with the district science specialist planning lessons in mid to high level complexity as students transition from FCAT to a Biology End of Course exam. | Focus lessons covering the benchmarks, lab reviews, text complexity assignments | Science teachers | Regular assessments with focus lessons and labs | Focus lessons, evaluations,mini assessments, practice tests |

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 <br> Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. <br> Biology Goal \#2: | The 2011-2012 year was the first year the Biology EOC <br> was given. |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |


| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In grade 9, 71\% (36) students scored in the top third of percentages. In grade 10, 42\% (110) student score in the top third of percentages. |  |  | In the 2013 school year, students will have actual achievement levels. West Florida High School will have at least $55 \%$ of the students scoring at achievement level 3 or higher. |  |  |
| 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 | Science teachers working together with the district science specialist and teachers on special assignment to plan lessons of mid to high level complexity for all students. | FOCUS lessons covering the standards and pacing guide, lab reviews and culminating lab in the spring offered after school multiple days for students. | Science teachers and administration | Regular assessments with focus lesson and labs | Bilogy EOC, focus lesson assessment grades and practice tests |

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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Text <br> Complexity | All grade levels |  |  |  |  |  |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\$ 0.00$ |
|  |  |  | Subtotal: $\$ 0.00$ |
| Technology | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| Strategy | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\$ 0.00$ |
| $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  |  | Funding Source |

## Writing Goals

| * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)). |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. <br> Writing Goal \#1a: |  |  | In grades 10, 80\% (243) of students will be proficient on the 2013 Writing Test. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| Eighty percent (243) of grade 10 students scored 3.5 or higher in Writing and 48\% (146) scored greater than 4.0 in Writing. |  |  | 90\% of students are expected to be proficient in Writing. |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Constant and Developed opportunities to write across curriulum | Essay questions will be used by all teachers during specific periods. | Faculty Leader and AP | Increased classroom writing scores along with student participation and completion | WritingScores |


| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. <br> Writing Goal \#1b: |  |  | NA |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| NA |  |  | NA |  |  |
| 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 | 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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible <br> for Monitoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Common <br> Core | grades 9-12 | District <br> specialists, <br> consultants <br> and teachers | school-wide | teacher planning <br> days and <br> scheduled <br> activities by the <br> district <br> professional <br> learning office | Iesson plans to <br> include strategies <br> from professional <br> learning opportunities <br> and professional <br> conversations | teachers, <br> admin, <br> content <br> specialists |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Common core training for teachers | District specialists | SAI | \$2,000.00 |
|  |  |  | \$2,000.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | otal: \$0.00 |
| Grand Total: \$2,000.00 |  |  |  |

End of Writing Goals

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

| * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., $70 \%$ (35)). |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. <br> U.S. History Goal \# 1: |  | 2012 was a sample year for the US History EOC. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| WFHS gave the sample EOC for US History. |  | For the 2012-2013 year, at least 50\% of the students will receive a 75 or higher. |  |  |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Moving through the <br> pacing guide in a way <br> that allows students to <br> learn and accounts for <br> our struggling readers. | Multiple mini- <br> assessments, group and <br> peer to peer strategies. | Teachers and <br> Administration | Grades throughout the <br> nine weeks. | Report card <br> grades, EOC <br> results |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels

4 and 5 in U.S. History.
WFHS was selected as a sample test school for the 2011-2012 school year.
U.S. History Goal \#2:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WFHS was a sample test school for the 2011-2012 year. |  |  | Fifteen percent of the students takin the US History EOC will score at or above an achievement level 4. |  |  |
| 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 | Incorporating the necessary complex texts. | Following the pacing guides and include activiities that allow students to read and research independently | Teachers, <br> Literacy Coach, and <br> Administration | Varying projects and assignments | History EOC |

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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | PD <br> Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates <br> (e.g., early <br> release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Responsition <br> Monitoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Text <br> Complexity | All grades | District <br> Reading <br> Specialist | Subject area <br> teachers | throughout the <br> school year with <br> targeted PLO's on <br> teacher plan days. | Common planning <br> to include lesson <br> plan writing and <br> best practices | Administration, <br> Department chair, <br> and teachers |

U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s)


| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Train teachrs in text complexity | District workshops | SAI | \$1,000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total: \$1,000.00 |  |  |  |

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

| 1. Attendance | lhe average daily attendance (ADA) for our school will <br> increase or maintain at 95\% or higher.The number of <br> students with excessive absences and tardies will <br> decrease by three percent. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Current Attendance Rate: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Attendance Rate: |
| The current ADA for our school is 95\%. | The expected ADA for our school will be 95\% or higher. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive <br> Absences (10 or more) | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Number of Students with Excessive <br> Absences (10 or more) |
| The current number of students with excessive absences <br> is less than three percent (35). | The expected number of students with excessive <br> absences will be 398. |
| 2012 Cur |  |

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

The current number of students with excessive tardies is 0.

2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

In the 2012-2013 school year, the expected number of students with excessive tardies will maintain.

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 | Helping students understand the importance of consistent school attendance. | Enforce the attendance rules for excused and unexcused absences which does influence academics. | Attendance Secretary, Teachers, Dean, Administration | Reports each nine weeks on absences and tardies | Attendance report |
| 2 | Failure to turn in excused notes for absences in a timely manner or prior arrangements for absences that would not normally be excused. | Inform parents in an earlier and consistent basis of the attendance policy. | Administration, <br> Attendance Clerk, Faculty | Evaluation of number of Iate attendance notes coming into the attendance clerk | Attendance report |

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 <br> 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 Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Data Submitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Attendance Budget:


End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need <br> of improvement: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. Suspension <br> Suspension Goal \#1: | The number of students suspended in Out of School <br> Suspension (OSS) and In School Suspension (ISS) will <br> decrease by 5\%. |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ Total Number of In- School Suspensions | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| In 2012, the total number of students in ISS was 227. | In 2013, the expected number of in- school suspensions <br> will be 216 or less. |


| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended InSchool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In 2012, the total number of students suspended in school was 196. |  |  | In 2013, the expected number of students suspended in school will be 187 or less. |  |  |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Out- of-School Suspensions |  |  |
| In 2012, the total number of out-of-school suspensions was 46. |  |  | In 2013, the expected number of out-of- school suspensions will be 44 or less. |  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- ofSchool |  |  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |  |  |
| In 2011, the total number of students suspended out of school was 43. |  |  | In 2013, the expected number of students suspended out of school will be 40 or less. |  |  |
| 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 understanding of the Rights and Responsibility Handbook | Rights and Responsibility Handbook test will be given to all students through the career class. Classroom visits as needed. | Dean | Need for classroom visits based on tests results | Rights and Responsiblity test results |
| 2 | Creating and maintaining an environment of consistent postivive behavior | Develop individual and school wide plans that will assist in monitoring positive behavior. | Administration, Dean | Make sure that all teachers and faculty members understand the rules and general consequences or at least how to report violations. | School wide behavior management plan |

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

## Suspension Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\$ 0.00$ |
|  |  |  | Subtotal: $\$ 0.00$ |


| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$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

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

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

| 1. Dropout Prevention <br> Dropout Prevention Goal \#1: <br> *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year. |  |  | Maintain or increase the number of graduating seniors of $95 \%$ or above. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Dropout Rate: |  |  | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate: |  |  |
| In 2012, the graduation dropout rate was 2\%. |  |  | It is expected that the graduation rate for 2013 will be $2 \%$ or less. |  |  |
| 2012 Current Graduation Rate: |  |  | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate: |  |  |
| In 2012 the current graduation rate is 95\%. |  |  | In 2013, the expected graduation rate will continue at $95 \%$ or higher. |  |  |
| 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 | Course failure with the number of credits needed to graduate | Review transcripts and courses regularly. Sign students up as needed for Florida Virtual School, Community School, and continued student and parent communication | Administration and Guidance Counselors | Number of students eligible for graduation | Number of students eligible for graduation |
| 2 | Students not achieving success from one grade level to the next considering quitting or | Teacher adjusts content, process, and product in response to student | Faculty leaders, Guidance Counselors and Administration | Number of students eligible for graduation | Number of students eligible for graduation |

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | tal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | tal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | tal: \$0.00 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total: \$0.00 |  |  |  |

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

## 1. Parent I nvolvement

Parent I nvolvement Goal \#1:
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who
participated in school activities, duplicated or

Increase the number of academic activities in which parents can become involved either by internet or on campus.

| \|unduplicated. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent I nvolvement: |  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Parent I nvolvement: |  |  |
| In 2012, there were a minimum of five events available to parents for attendance and input. |  |  | It is expected that in the 2012-13 year, we will maintain or increase our number of parent events. |  |  |
| 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 | Working schedules for parents | Use school messenger and give parents ample notice of events | Administration and Guidance | School messenger reports of answered calls; parent sign-in sheets | Survey of parents in attendance of events |
| 2 | Parents having other students not in high school. | Put together events that welcome younger students when feasible. | Administration | School messenger reports of answered call; parent sign-in sheets | Survey of parents in attendance of events |

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 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { PD } \\ \text { Facilitator } \\ \text { and/ or PLC } \\ \text { Leader } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or schoolwide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Followup/ Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assistance for online applications <br> FOCUS gradebook help | Incoming 9th graders for application assistance and all grades for FOCUS gradebook help | Lori <br> Anderson and Cody McDavid | Parents of any West Florida student or potential parents for application assistance. | From September through <br> November for application assistance and year long assistance for FOCUS | Number of successfully completed online applications <br> Student and parent contact with teachers as a result of regular FOCUS uses | Administration, In-take Specialist and Technology Coordinator |

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s)

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |  |  |  |


| Other | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available <br> Amount |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Strategy | NA | NA | $\$ 0.00$ |
| NA |  |  | Subtotal: $\$ 0.00$ |
|  |  | Grand Total: $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0}$ |  |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. STEM

STEM Goal \#1:

|  |  | the Algebra, Geometry and Biology EOC's |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |
| 1 | Increasing the pass <br> rate and rigorous <br> enrollment of those <br> students below reading <br> proficiency and lower <br> math courses | Differentiation of <br> instruction, reading <br> strategies and regular <br> mini- assessments for <br> progress | Teachers of <br> record, admin and <br> faculty leaders | project based learning <br> grades, student written <br> and verbal <br> communication of <br> subject matter and <br> student surveys | classroom grades, <br> enrollment in <br> named courses, <br> FCAT 2 and EOC's |

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

## STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s)

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |



End of STEM Goal(s)

## Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

1. CTE

CTE Goal \#1:
$100 \%$ of CTE teachers will be trained and implement Common Core strategies.

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring | Process Used to <br> Determine <br> Effectiveness of <br> Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | CTE teachers planning <br> with academic teachers <br> to plan and implement <br> team lessons. | Provide professional <br> learning opportunities <br> for CTE teachers in <br> Common Core and then <br> provide on campus <br> opportunities for <br> planning, <br> implementation with <br> follow up and feedback. | Workforce <br> Education, <br> Administration <br> and CTE <br> teachers. | Regularly scheduled <br> professional learning <br> groups that include CTE <br> and academic teachers. | CTE certification <br> and Matst, FCAT 2.0 and <br> Science EOC's. |

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 <br> Content / Topic <br> and/ or PLC <br> Focus | Grade <br> Level/ Subject | Facilitator <br> and/ or PLC <br> Leader | PD Participants <br> (e.g., PLC, <br> subject, grade <br> level, or school- <br> wide) | Target Dates (e.g., <br> early release) and <br> Schedules (e.g., <br> frequency of <br> meetings) | Strategy for <br> Follow- <br> up/ Monitoring | Person or <br> Position <br> Responsible for <br> Monitoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Common <br> Core | grades 9-12 | Workforce <br> Education | CTE teachers | Teacher planning <br> days and as outside <br> training becomes <br> available through <br> the districts <br> professional <br> learning office | teacher <br> observations, <br> professional <br> conversations and <br> student <br> assessment data | Professional <br> Learning <br> office, school <br> administration <br> and teachers |

## CTE Budget:



## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/ Material(s) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Differentiated instruction | Teacher resources | SAI | \$2,000.00 |
| Reading | Text complexity/close reading | Teacher resources | SAI | \$1,000.00 |
| CELLA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Science | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Writing | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | \$0.00 |
| U.S. History | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| STEM | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| CTE | Common core text coplexity, vocabulary and close reading plo's in addition to professional learning groups. | Common core toolkits,flip your classroom, understanding by design and others as needed | AP funds | \$500.00 |
| Subtotal: \$3,500.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |  |  |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| CELLA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics |  | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/A | \$0.00 |
| Science | n/a | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Writing | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$0.00 |
| U.S. History | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| STEM | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$0.00 |
| CTE | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development |  |  |  |  |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Planning across the curriculum | Planning days for teachers | SAI | \$3,000.00 |
| CELLA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Science | Questioning techniques | workshops | SAI | \$1,000.00 |
| Writing | Common core training for teachers | District specialists | SAI | \$2,000.00 |
| U.S. History | Train teachrs in text complexity | District workshops | SAI | \$1,000.00 |
| Attendance | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| STEM | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |
| CTE | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | \$0.00 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Other |  |  | Subtotal: $\mathbf{\$ 7 , 0 0 0 . 0 0}$ |
| Goal | Strategy | Rescription of | Funding Source |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance
$j \cap$ Priority jn Focus jn Prevent jn NA

Are you a reward school: j Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/28/2012)

## School Advisory Council

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

## Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
| :--- | :--- |
| Supplies and materials needed for parent nights and awards for student recognition | $\$ 600.00$ |

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

The SAC Committee for the 2012-2013 year has committed to assisting in developing more parent involved activities during the school year. Some of these activities will include EOC/FCAT parent nights, and partnership with Pensacola State College for parental meeting involving dual enrollment and other opportunities.

## AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-201
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010
SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Escambia School District

## WEST FLORIDA HIGH SCHOOL/ TECHNICAL

## 2010-2011

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 61\% | 87\% | 88\% | 54\% | 290 | 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 | 60\% | 82\% |  |  | 142 | 3 ways to make gains: <br> - Improve FCAT Levels <br> - Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br> - Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25\% in the School? | 50\% (YES) | 72\% (YES) |  |  | 122 | 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 |  |  |  |  | 564 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent Tested = } \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and \% of students tested |

## Escambia School District

WEST FLORIDA HIGH SCHOOL/ TECHNICAL
2009-2010

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 60\% | 83\% | 92\% | 54\% | 289 | 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 | 59\% | 78\% |  |  | 137 | 3 ways to make gains: <br> - Improve FCAT Levels <br> - Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br> - Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25\% in the School? | 51\% (YES) | 65\% (YES) |  |  | 116 | 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 |  |  |  |  | 552 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent Tested = } \\ & 100 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and \% of students tested |


[^0]:    * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)).

[^1]:    * When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70\% (35)).

